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### Appendix L
#### Possible Monitoring Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Framework objective</th>
<th>New sub-objectives Will the policy/allocation:</th>
<th>SEA Topic</th>
<th>Indicative Indicators to use</th>
<th>For Policy Monitoring</th>
<th>For Site Allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To meet the diverse housing needs of the population in a sustainable way.</td>
<td>Deliver homes to meet the needs of the population in terms of quantity, quality;</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Not additional homes provided;</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliver improvements to the existing and future housing stock;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply of ready to develop housing sites;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locate sites in areas of known housing need;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of new houses completed at densities in the policy:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliver community facilities for the needs of the population;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 100 units/ha within the city centre;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliver pitches required for Gypsies and Travellers and Showpeople.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 50 units/ha within the York urban area;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Improve the health and well-being of York’s population</td>
<td>Avoid locating development where environmental circumstances could negatively impact on people’s health;</td>
<td>Human health</td>
<td>Losses of community facilities;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve access to open space / multi-functional open space;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number, type, size and location of new community facility;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotes a healthier lifestyle though access to leisure opportunities (walking / cycling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Losses of built sports facilities;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improves access to healthcare;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number, type, size and location of new built sports facility;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides or promotes safety and security for residents;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year in which and time elapsed since last appropriate assessment of housing need undertaken;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure that land contamination / pollution does not pose unacceptable risks to health.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year in which, and time elapsed since last appropriate assessment of housing need undertaken;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improve education, skills development and training for an effective workforce</td>
<td>Provide good education and training opportunities for all;</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Number of new on-campus bed spaces;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support existing higher and further educational establishments for continued success;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of additional purpose-built off-campus bed spaces;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide good quality employment opportunities available to all;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of on-campus bed spaces;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No of 16 – 18 year olds in education or employment or training;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% of the population with GCSEs / NVQs / Further education qualifications;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployment rates;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of people out of work for over 12 months;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of JSA claimants;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The number of educational facilities which are available for use by the wider community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Create jobs and deliver growth of a sustainable</td>
<td>Help deliver conditions for business success and</td>
<td>Total amount of additional employment floorspace by type (gross and</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>economy - Deliver pitches required for Gypsies and Travellers and Showpeople</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to:</th>
<th>Doctors</th>
<th>open space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress on provision of ambulance spoke facilities at sites ST7, ST8, ST9, ST15 and ST16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Framework objective</td>
<td>New sub-objectives Will the policy/allocation:</td>
<td>SEA Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and inclusive economy</td>
<td>• Deliver a flexible and relevant workforce for the future; • Deliver and promote stable economic growth; • Enhance the city centre and its opportunities for business and leisure; • Provide the appropriate infrastructure for economic growth; • Support existing employment drivers; • Promote a low carbon economy…</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help deliver equality and access to all</td>
<td>• Address existing imbalances of equality, deprivation and exclusion across the city; • Provide accessible services and facilities for the local population; • Provide affordable housing to meet demand; • Help reduce homelessness; • Promote the safety and security for people and/or property.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the need to travel and deliver a sustainable integrated transport network</td>
<td>• Deliver development where it is accessible by public transport, walking and cycling to minimise the use of the car; • Deliver transport infrastructure which supports sustainable travel options; • Promote sustainable forms of travel; • Improve congestion.</td>
<td>All Climatic factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To minimise greenhouse gases that cause climate change and deliver a managed response to its effects</td>
<td>• Reduce or mitigate greenhouse gas emissions from all sources; • Plan or implement adaptation measures for the likely</td>
<td>Climatic factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conserve and enhance York's historic environment

Improve air quality

Reduce waste generation and increase level of reuse and recycling

Improve water efficiency and quality

Conserve and enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna for high quality and connected natural environment

Minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in York

Promote and increase resource efficiency

Minimise and manage emissions to air from new developments

Conserve and enhance local culture

Promote and enhance local culture;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Framework objective</th>
<th>New sub-objectives</th>
<th>SEA Topic</th>
<th>Indicative indicators to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>environment, cultural heritage, character and setting</td>
<td>• Preserve and enhance designated heritage assets and their setting;</td>
<td>heritage landscape</td>
<td>For Policy Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preserve or enhance those elements which contribute to the special character and setting of the historic city as identified in the Heritage Topic Paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stock of Grade 1, 2 &amp; 2* listed buildings;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of buildings on the At Risk Register;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of Conservation Areas in York;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• % of Conservation Areas with an up to date character appraisal;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• % of Conservation Areas with published management proposals;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of planning applications referred to English Heritage;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of planning applications approved despite sustained objection from English Heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For Site Allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Listed Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Scheduled Ancient Monuments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Areas of Archaeological Importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect and enhance York’s natural and built landscape</td>
<td>• Preserve and enhance the landscape including areas of landscape value;</td>
<td>Cultural heritage Landscape</td>
<td>Within:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protect and enhance geologically important sites;</td>
<td></td>
<td>• An area of Historic Character and setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote high quality design in context with its urban and rural landscape and in line with the “landscape and Setting” within the Heritage Topic Paper.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Conservation Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Central Historic Core Character Appraisal Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix M
### Schedule of Changes to Policies and Implications for SA scoring

#### Table M1 Schedule of Changes to Policies in the Pre-Publication Draft (Regulation 18 Consultation) 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Summary of change to the policy following the Local Plan Pre-Publication Draft (Regulation 18 Consultation) as appraised by Amec Foster Wheeler</th>
<th>The implications for the appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Development Principles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP1</td>
<td>Removal of reference to ring road as part of the range of public transport improvements.</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed - no changes are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP2</td>
<td>Changes include: additional requirements re supporting the visitor economy; clarification of environmental policy; and additional environmental policy objective including in relation to protection of groundwater quality.</td>
<td>There are considered to be changes to the policy which have required review of the SA scoring. The outcome of this review in relation to water resources (SA Objective 10) is that significant positive effects are considered likely from the policy changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP3</td>
<td>Minor clarifications.</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed - no changes are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP4</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial strategy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS1</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS2</td>
<td>Minor change to state that the primary purpose of the Green Belt is to ‘safeguard’ rather than ‘preserve’</td>
<td>Minor change of wording. SA scoring assessment of likely effects has been reviewed. Scoring is not considered to be affected by the change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS3</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS4</td>
<td>Changes relate to the number of houses and office floorspace proposed for allocation and the specific uses to be permitted. Changes also enhances reference to primary and nursery education facilities provision. Changes to associated site boundary (ST5).</td>
<td>Review of SA Scoring in light of changes and the changes in site boundary (ST5) linked to the policy. No changes in scoring have been identified for the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS5</td>
<td>Changes relate to the purpose and aims including enhanced reference to the importance of the public realm reflecting ongoing local consultation. The changes introduce policy related to two further sub areas: Castle and the Eye of York and St. George’s Field.</td>
<td>Review of SA Scoring in light of changes in the policy provisions. No changes to the SA scoring have been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS6</td>
<td>Minor clarification re provision of social infrastructure.</td>
<td>Minor change of wording. SA scoring assessment of likely effects reviewed. Scoring is not considered to be affected by the change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS7</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS8</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS9</td>
<td>Minor change reflects increase in number of dwellings on site and incorporates specific reference to Highways England.</td>
<td>Review of SA Scoring in light of changes and the changes in site boundary and number of dwellings (site ST7) linked to the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS10</td>
<td>Minor clarification re provision of social infrastructure.</td>
<td>Minor change of wording. SA scoring assessment of likely effects reviewed. Scoring is not considered to be affected by the change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS11</td>
<td>Minor clarification of highways access to ST9.</td>
<td>Minor change of wording. SA scoring assessment of likely effects reviewed. Scoring is not considered to be affected by the change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS12</td>
<td>No change to policy wording. Changes to site ST14 boundary and number of dwellings provided.</td>
<td>Review of SA Scoring for policy in light of the appraisal of changes in site boundary and number of dwellings (site ST14) linked to the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS13</td>
<td>No change to policy wording. Changes to site ST15 boundary and number of dwellings provided.</td>
<td>Review of SA Scoring in light of the appraisal of changes in site boundary and number of dwellings (site ST15) linked to the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS14</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS15</td>
<td>Minor changes to policy wording to transport issues including additional reference to direct access of cycle path along boundary of ST17 and consideration for level crossing at Haxby.</td>
<td>Minor change of wording. SA scoring assessment of likely effects reviewed. Scoring is not considered to be affected by the change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS16</td>
<td>Minor change to ensure factually correct re conservation and clarification of open space prior to first phase rather than commencement of development.</td>
<td>Minor change of wording. SA scoring assessment of likely effects reviewed. Scoring is not considered to be affected by the change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS17</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS18</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS19</td>
<td>There are number of changes to the policy: substantial changes relate to including criteria that ensures mitigation hierarchy to ensure no net loss of biodiversity and not allowing development an adverse impact on integrity of SAC and SSSI. Also included is additional policy requirements regarding the requirement for a visitor impact mitigation strategy and seeking to increase the area and quality of open space in light of HRA. There are also changes to policy provision regarding the assessment of architectural interest and reflecting character and drainage assessment requirements. The changes also include a decrease in housing provision.</td>
<td>SA scoring has been reviewed for the policy - particularly regarding biodiversity (SA Objective 8), facilities (3), water (10) and cultural heritage (14). No changes have been identified for SA Objectives 3 (which already recognises significant positive effects); 8 (in recognition that the changes do not overcome the uncertainty at this stage although commentary has been updated); 10 (reaffirms minor positive effects); and 14 (where a mix of minor positive and negative effects is considered appropriate).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS20</td>
<td>Changes include enhanced references to historic assets and the requirement for assessment in relation to assets.</td>
<td>SA scoring requires review - particularly regarding cultural heritage (SA Objective 14) due to enhanced policy references.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS21</td>
<td>Change relates to increase in proposed employment floorspace.</td>
<td>Review of SA Scoring in light of the appraisal of changes in site boundary and employment floorspace (site ST26) linked to the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS22</td>
<td>Minor changes as reflected in EC1.</td>
<td>Review of SA Scoring in light of the appraisal of changes in site boundary and employment area (site ST27) linked to the policy and reflected in EC1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS23</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Economy and Retail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC1</td>
<td>Changes relate to site size boundaries and clarification re floorspace for York Central (ST5).</td>
<td>Review of SA scoring in light of site based changes undertaken. No changes have been made to the policy appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>Removal of ‘deliverable’ as clarification of relevant sites.</td>
<td>The scoring has been reviewed. No changes require to scoring but minor change to commentary required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4</td>
<td>Changes include: removal of specific reference to 4* and 5* accommodation. The policy now includes explicit reference to the enhancement of the built environment and public realm.</td>
<td>The SA scoring to be reviewed in light of changes, particularly in relation to SA Objectives 14 and 15. No changes are required. Minor changes to commentary have been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5</td>
<td>Minor editorial change to provide clarity.</td>
<td>The scoring has been reviewed. No changes are required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>No change to policy wording. Change to number of dwellings for York Central (ST5) and Queen Elizabeth Barracks, Strensall (ST35) sites in Table 5.1.</td>
<td>No change to SA scoring required in light of change to numbers of houses in sites ST5 and ST35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Changes related to amendments in T6 re proximity to transport hubs.</td>
<td>No change to SA scoring but minor amendments to commentary against transport (SA Objective 6) have been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Minor change regarding avoid undue impacts on amenity of current residents and future occupiers.</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed (particularly for impacts on health SA Objective 2) and no changes are required. Minor amendments to commentary have been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HW1</strong></td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HW2</strong></td>
<td>Change amends threshold of open spaces audit requirements from development of ten houses or more to strategic developments and clarifies that provision should be provided onsite or via developer contributions.</td>
<td>The change adjusts the threshold at which an audit of existing facilities will be required. The SA scoring has been reviewed. The remaining elements of the policy are considered to score the same as at the Pre-publication Draft stage against health (SA Objective 2) although minor commentary amendments have been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HW3</strong></td>
<td>Change relates to the expectation that strategic sites will deliver sport facilities onsite.</td>
<td>SA scoring reviewed. No changes have been assessed for the scoring. Minor changes been made to the commentary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HW4</strong></td>
<td>Change clarifies that approach that 'new' strategic site proposals will be required to audit childcare and that viability will be considered.</td>
<td>The change clarifies the approach to the audit of childcare. The SA has been reviewed (particularly in relation SA Objective 5) and no changes to the scoring are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HW5</strong></td>
<td>Minor amendment related application stages and name of NHS organisations.</td>
<td>No changes required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HW6</strong></td>
<td>Removal of ST16 as a site requiring 'spoke' facilities.</td>
<td>SA scoring has been reviewed. No changes are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HW7</strong></td>
<td>Clarifies that requirement for Health Impact Assessment relates to 'new' strategic sites.</td>
<td>No changes required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ED1</strong></td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ED2</strong></td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ED3</strong></td>
<td>Minor changes reflect change site ST27 changes.</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed in light of changes to the site but no changes to the scoring have been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ED4</strong></td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ED5</strong></td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ED6</strong></td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ED7</strong></td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ED8</strong></td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1</strong></td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2</strong></td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3</strong></td>
<td>Minor changes clarify approach to assessment of cultural provision linked to the development of strategic sites.</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed and no changes in the assessment scoring are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Changes provide clarification of approach to development affecting Conservation Areas to align with national policy.</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed and no changes in the assessment scoring are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Changes provide clarification of approach to development affecting Listed Buildings to align with national policy.</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed and no changes in the assessment scoring are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Changes provide clarification of approach to development affecting archaeology to align with national policy.</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed and no changes in the assessment scoring are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>Changes provide clarification of approach to development affecting non designated assets to align with national policy.</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed and no changes in the assessment scoring are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Changes provide clarification of approach to development affecting register parks and gardens to align with national policy.</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed and no changes in the assessment scoring are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>Change provides enhanced reference to Heritage Topic Paper.</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed and no changes in the assessment scoring are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Green Infrastructure**

| GI1 | Change relates to removal of former criterion I reference to biodiversity enhancement. | SA scoring reviewed and unchanged. The remaining elements of the policy support biodiversity conservation enhancement (SA Objective 8). |
| GI2 | Change incorporates reference to SINC in accordance with NPPF. | SA scoring reviewed and unchanged. The enhanced references support the scoring of the policy against biodiversity (SA Objective 8). |
| GI3 | Minor change to reference green infrastructure networks across LA boundaries. | SA scoring has been reviewed. The enhanced reference is not considered to affect overall SA scoring of the policy |
| GI4 | Change strengthens reference to retention of trees and hedgerows. | SA scoring has been reviewed. The enhanced reference is not considered to affect overall SA scoring of the policy |
| GI5 | Change in policy name to refer to playing ‘fields’ rather than ‘pitches’. | No change to scoring. |
| GI6 | Change incorporates reference to update playing pitch strategy when determining the suitability for offsite contributions. | SA scoring reviewed and no changes are required for the scoring |
| GI7 | No change. | N/A |

**Managing Development in the Green Belt**

<p>| GB1 | Change related to recognising the benefits that may accrue from redevelopment of some existing development sites in the Green Belt | Review SA scoring undertaken but no changes have been identified. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GB2</th>
<th>No change.</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GB3</td>
<td>Change clarifies reference to re-use of buildings improving character and appearance of the Green belt.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB4</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Climate Change**

| CC1 | Change includes reference of ‘viability’ in Energy Statement. | Review of SA to reflect viability changes. No changes to the scoring have been identified. |
| CC2 | Includes specific reference to demonstrating water efficiency; and states BREEAM standards would only be required is compatible with the manner of conversion of a heritage asset. | Review scoring of policy and commentary as the policy no longer requires all development to connect/or be capable of connecting to chip. This now only applies to strategic sites. No changes have been identified to the Sa scoring although changes have been made to the commentary for climate change (SA objective 7). |
| CC3 | Clarifies approach to combined heat and power. | |

**Environment Quality and Flood Risk**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENV1</th>
<th>No change.</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5</td>
<td>Minor change to clarify that run-off reduction relates to existing measures and that SUDS enhancing biodiversity will be supported.</td>
<td>Review of SA scoring, particularly with regard to SA Objective 8.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Waste**

| WM1 | Minor change specific highlighting that provision of ‘recycling’ of construction waste as well of management. | SA scoring reviewed. The minor change does not affect the overall ‘significant positive’ score in relation to SA Objective 11 (waste) |
| WM2 | No change | N/A |

**Transport and Communications**

| T1 | Clarification of provision of new or enhanced services. | The SA scoring has been reviewed and no changes have been identified. |
| T2 | Changes relate to improvements to York Station being brought into the short term objectives whilst designer outlet park and ride is included in the long term objectives. This reflects latest evidence. | The SA scoring has been reviewed and no changes have been identified. |
| T3 | Changes clarify approach to the setting and significance of the rail station as an historic asset. Clarification is also provided in relation to maintaining operation rail lines and facilities. Minor changes include enhanced references to cycling access and parking. | The SA scoring has been reviewed and no changes have been identified. Minor changes to commentary required to reference Northern Powerhouse Rail rather HS3 is required and relating to policy provisions to conserver and enhance elements that contribute to the significance of the asset. |
### Changes

| Change | Description | SA Scoring
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Changes include the incorporation of reference to delivering the projects set out in LTP3, reference to access to ST5, access to serve ST15</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed and no changes have been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Changes include the incorporation of reference to delivering the projects set out in LTP3; amendments to when projects are expected to be delivered and additional clarifications over specific projects</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed and no changes have been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Changes introduce additional critical that development will be supported where it does not compromise the purposes of the green belt. Policy is also provided in relation to impacts on operational rail lines.</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed and no changes have been assessed. The assessment against landscape (SA Objective 15) notes neutral effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Changes include clarification over the monitoring of trips and thresholds for taking action; and introduce a specific requirement for strategic site TAs to consider impacts on A64 and for proposals near railways to TAs should assess impact on rail infrastructure.</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed and no changes have been assessed. The changes complement the significant positive effects assessed for transport (SA Objective 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Minor change to incorporate reference to hydrogen and electric charging</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed. No changes have been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Policy removed at Pre-Publication Plan Stage.</td>
<td>Removed from SA matrix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Provides additional policy re Next Generation Access (NGA) broadband connections in all new development and seeks strategic sites to engage with providers can be provided.</td>
<td>The SA scoring has been reviewed. The changes in draft policy are considered to complement the positive effects assessed against economic growth (SA Objective 4) and access to services (SA Objective 5) as assessed in the Pre-Publication Draft stage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Delivery and Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery and Monitoring</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM1</td>
<td>No change.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table M1 Schedule of Changes to Policies in the Publication Plan 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision, Outcome or Policy (as set out in Draft Local Plan)</th>
<th>Summary of change since Publication Draft Local Plan presented to LPWG and Executive Members in September 2014, as appraised by Amec.</th>
<th>Why this change is considered significant for the SA and what are the implications for the appraisal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*indicates policy name/number in Publication Draft Local Plan presented to LPWG and Executive Members in September 2014 where policy now deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 2: Vision and Development Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Summary of Change</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Changes to reflect importance of heritage and contemporary culture in the City of York.</td>
<td>The appraisal has been reviewed and no changes to the scoring have been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Reordering of Outcomes to bring ‘Protect the Environment’ first.</td>
<td>Amend appraisal table to reflect re-ordering. No effects from this change are considered significant and do not require re-appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Changes to the names of following outcomes to reflect new Council Plan: 'Create Jobs and Grow the Economy' to 'Create a Prosperous City for All'; 'Get York Moving' to 'Ensure Efficient and Affordable Transport Links'; and 'Build Strong Communities' to ‘Provide Good Quality Homes and Opportunities’.</td>
<td>Reflect the changes to the names of the ‘Outcomes’ in the appraisal table. No significant effects to appraise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>A number of changes to add clarity, reflect latest position of the Council and reflect latest Council Plan and One Planet York principles.</td>
<td>The changes have been reviewed and no changes to the appraisal are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP1: York Sub Area</td>
<td>Updates relating to the York, North Yorkshire and East Riding LEP.</td>
<td>No changes to appraisal scoring but commentary has been updated to reflect latest Local Plan position regarding preferred employment growth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 3: Spatial Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Summary of Change</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS1: Delivering Sustainable Growth for York</td>
<td>Significant changes to the housing and employment growth requirements included within the policy.</td>
<td>The changes to housing and employment requirements are significant for the plan as a whole. The appraisal has been revised and updated to reflect the preferred growth options incorporated into the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS2: The Role of York’s Green Belt</td>
<td>Changes reflect that the Local Plan will not include safeguarded land.</td>
<td>The appraisal has been reviewed in light of the changes to the policy. No changes to the scoring have been found but minor changes to the commentary have been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS3: The Creation of an Enduring Green Belt</td>
<td>Policy deleted.</td>
<td>The draft Local Plan no longer includes safeguarded land. The appraisal has been updated to reflect the deletion of the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision, Outcome or Policy (as set out in Draft Local Plan) *indicates policy name/number in Publication Draft Local Plan presented to LPWG and Executive Members in September 2014 where policy now deleted</td>
<td>Summary of change since Publication Draft Local Plan presented to LPWG and Executive Members in September 2014, as appraised by Amec.</td>
<td>Why this change is considered significant for the SA and what are the implications for the appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS4 – SS10 SS1 - SS24</td>
<td>Changes to the policies under the original (SS4-SS10) and reordering and the introduction of a number of new policies relates to the identified strategic allocations.</td>
<td>The changes are significant in their extent and scope and relate to the strategic allocations identified in the plan. The revised and renumbered existing policies and the new policies included in the Pre-Publication Draft have been appraised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 4: Economy and Retail**

Policy EC1: Provision of Employment Land

| The revised policy incorporates the amendments to the proposed allocations set out in the 2014 plan. | The SA has been reviewed to reflect the change in policy and the employment land evidence which supports the policy approach. Although no changes to the appraisal scoring have been found, the commentary has been revised and updated. |

*Policy EC2: Economic Growth in the Health and Social Care Sectors*

| Policy deletion. | The SA has been updated to reflect the removal of the Policy. The removal of the policy has meant that the policies in this chapter are now assessed as having a minor rather than significant positive effect on SA Objective 2. Subsequent policy numbers have been changed to reflect the deletion of the policy. |

Policy R1: Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach

| Removal of ‘neighbourhood parades’ as a designation where main town centres being directed. | The SA has been updated to reflect that the neighbourhood parades have been removed from the classification of centres where main town centres will be directed to. Having considered the appraisal in 2014 no changes are required to the appraisal scoring however there are changes required to the commentary. |

Policy R2: District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades

| Policy name change from District, Local And Neighbourhood Centres. Additionally, policy provisions are included for protecting the vitality and viability of Neighbourhood Parades. | The SA has been updated to reflect the policy name change and the amendments to the protection for the viability and vitality of the Neighbourhood Parades. Having considered the appraisal in 2014 no changes are required to the appraisal scoring however there are changes required to the commentary. |

**Section 5: Housing**

Policy H1: Housing Allocations

<p>| The amendment to the policy reflect the changes to the allocations included in 2014. There are no other policy wording changes although SS1, which is cross referenced to has been revised. | The SA has been revised to reflect the change to the allocations included in the Local Plan Pre Publication Draft. The changes in SS1, in terms of the levels of housing growth have also been appraised. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision, Outcome or Policy (as set out in Draft Local Plan)</th>
<th>Summary of change since Publication Draft Local Plan presented to LPWG and Executive Members in September 2014, as appraised by Amec.</th>
<th>Why this change is considered significant for the SA and what are the implications for the appraisal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*indicates policy name/number in Publication Draft Local Plan presented to LPWG and Executive Members in September 2014 where policy now deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H3: Balancing the Housing Market</td>
<td>Amendment to focus consideration of the required housing mix linked to the SHMA, and up-to-date evidence of need.</td>
<td>The SA appraisal commentary has been revised to account for the change in the policy approach to include the requirement for up to date evidence to inform need in this policy. Addition the latest SHMA has been reflected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Policy H4: Housing Mix</td>
<td>Policy deletion with elements incorporated into H3.</td>
<td>The SA has been updated to reflect the removal of the Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H4: Promoting Self and Custom House Building</td>
<td>Renumbered from H5 to reflect change above and amendment to title from Promoting Self Build. A number of changes to the application of the policy for custom housebuilding.</td>
<td>The changes reflect the Housing White Paper’s support for custom self-build to play a significant role in housing delivery. The policy approach also includes the requirement for all strategic sites (5ha and above) to provide 5% of plots for self or custom build as opposed to 2% of land within the four named strategic sites in the previous policy. This has been reflected in the updated appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Policy H6: Gypsy, Roma, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites</td>
<td>Policy deletion with elements incorporated into a new H5 and H6.</td>
<td>The SA has been updated to reflect the removal of the Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H5: Gypsies and Travellers</td>
<td>New policy which incorporates some elements of former H6 plus updated need evidence and amends approach to the allocation and delivery of pitches.</td>
<td>The changes reflect the updated evidence base. The appraisal has been amended to reflect the change in policy title and number and the split of the policy provisions between this policy and H6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H6 Travelling Showpeople</td>
<td>New policy which incorporates some elements of former H6 plus updated need evidence and amends approach to the allocation and delivery of plots.</td>
<td>The changes reflect the updated evidence base. The appraisal has been amended to reflect the change in policy title and number and the split of the policy provisions between this policy and H5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H7: Student Housing</td>
<td>Changes to the reference from student 'accommodation' to student 'housing'. Amendment to the approach for housing. The approach is for housing to be located on either campus for the University of York and for locations convenient to the main campus for York St John University.</td>
<td>The appraisal has been reviewed but no changes to the scoring have been identified. A number of changes to the explanatory text have been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision, Outcome or Policy (as set out in Draft Local Plan)</td>
<td>Summary of change since Publication Draft Local Plan presented to LPWG and Executive Members in September 2014, as appraised by Amec.</td>
<td>Why this change is considered significant for the SA and what are the implications for the appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H9: Older Persons Specialist Housing</td>
<td>New policy.</td>
<td>The appraisal has been revised to take into account the new policy for older person’s specialist housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy H10: Affordable Housing</td>
<td>New policy provisions.</td>
<td>The appraisal has been revised to take into account the new policy for affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 6: Health and Wellbeing  Formerly Community Facilities**

| Policy CF1: Community Facilities*                      | Deletion of policy.                                                                             | Appraisal updated to reflect deletion of policy.                                                                                         |
| Policy CF3: Childcare Provision*                        | Deletion of policy.                                                                             | Appraisal updated to reflect deletion of policy.                                                                                         |
| Policy HW1: Protecting existing facilities             | New policy.                                                                                     | The appraisal has been revised to take into account the new policy.                                                                  |
| Policy HW2: New Community Facilities                   | New policy.                                                                                     | The appraisal has been revised to take into account the new policy.                                                                  |
| Policy HW3 Built Sport Facilities                      | New policy which incorporates some elements of former Policy CF2.                                | The appraisal has been revised to take into account the new policy.                                                                  |
| Policy HW4: Childcare Provision                         | New policy which incorporates some elements of former Policy CF3.                                | The appraisal has been revised to take into account the new policy.                                                                  |
| Policy HW5: Healthcare Services                         | New policy.                                                                                     | The appraisal has been revised to take into account the new policy.                                                                  |
| Policy HW6:                                           | New policy.                                                                                     | The appraisal has been revised to take into account the new policy.                                                                  |
| Policy HW7: Healthy places                             | New policy.                                                                                     | The appraisal has been revised to take into account the new policy.                                                                  |

**Section 7: Education**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision, Outcome or Policy (as set out in Draft Local Plan)</th>
<th>Summary of change since Publication Draft Local Plan presented to LPWG and Executive Members in September 2014, as appraised by Amec.</th>
<th>Why this change is considered significant for the SA and what are the implications for the appraisal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy ED1: University of York</td>
<td>Removal of 'campuses' from title.</td>
<td>The appraisal has been updated to reflect policy name change and to reflect the minor changes to the policy. There are no changes to the SA scoring but the commentary has been revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy ED2: Campus West</td>
<td>Removal of Heslington in title.</td>
<td>The appraisal has been updated to reflect policy name change. Minor changes to policy have been reviewed but there is no change to the appraisal scoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy ED3: Campus East</td>
<td>Removal of Heslington in title. Changes to the detail of the site referenced in the policy.</td>
<td>The appraisal has been updated to reflect the change in name. The changes in policy wording reflect site related changes. The appraisal scoring has been reviewed and no changes to the scoring have been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy ED4: York St. John University Lord Mayor’s Walk Campus</td>
<td>Amendment to policy name and changes to the consideration of applications for student housing.</td>
<td>The policy changes set out that a reduction in on site housing provision will be supported subject to adequate provision being made off campus. Additionally, off campus provision must be in locations convenient to the campus. The appraisal has been updated to reflect this change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy ED5: York St. John University Further Expansion</td>
<td>Removal of site due to its development since 2014.</td>
<td>The SA has been reviewed for this change although the scoring has not required revision in light of the policy changes. Minor commentary changes have been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy ED6: Preschool, Primary and Secondary Education</td>
<td>Amendment to reference to provision of education facilities within strategic housing allocations to be subject detailed viability and deliverability work.</td>
<td>The SA has been reviewed for this change although the scoring has not required revision in light of the policy changes. Minor commentary changes have been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy ED7: York College and Askham Bryan College</td>
<td>Change in policy name and focus. The policy specifically focuses solely on further education and does not include higher education.</td>
<td>The SA has been reviewed for this change although the scoring has not required revision in light of the policy changes. Minor commentary changes have been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8: Placemaking, Heritage, Design and Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy D3: Cultural Wellbeing</td>
<td>New policy.</td>
<td>The appraisal has been revised to take into account the new policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy D11: Extensions and Alterations to Existing buildings</td>
<td>Amendments include new design criteria for where extensions and alterations.</td>
<td>The amendments include new references to the retention of trees and the design of safe places as additional criteria. The appraisal has been revised to take into account the likely effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision, Outcome or Policy (as set out in Draft Local Plan)</td>
<td>Summary of change since Publication Draft Local Plan presented to LPWG and Executive Members in September 2014, as appraised by Amec.</td>
<td>Why this change is considered significant for the SA and what are the implications for the appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*indicates policy name/number in Publication Draft Local Plan presented to LPWG and Executive Members in September 2014 where policy now deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 9: Green Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy GI2: Biodiversity and Access to Nature</td>
<td>Inclusion of for policy provisions related to waste water treatment works (WwTW) capacity to ensure the maintenance of water quality in the Rivers Ouse and Derwent to provide routes for migratory fish.</td>
<td>The appraisal of Policy GI2 has been revised in light of the additional policy requirements in relation to water quality. Although the scoring remains the same across the majority of SA Objectives, changes have been identified in relation to water quality (SA Objective 10).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy GI7: Burial and Memorial Grounds</td>
<td>New policy.</td>
<td>The appraisal has been revised to take into account the new policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 10: Green Belt</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 11: Climate Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CC1 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation</td>
<td>Significant changes to the policy in light of national legislation and guidance changes and new local evidence. Sites have also been removed from the policy.</td>
<td>The changes include giving significant weight to the contributions that renewable and low carbon technology development makes to the low carbon dioxide emissions targets and removal of site allocations. The policy changes have been appraised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CC2 Sustainable Design and Construction of New Development</td>
<td>Significant changes to the policy in light of national legislation and guidance changes and new local evidence.</td>
<td>The changes include inclusion of a new target for reductions in the Dwelling Emissions Rate against the Target Emissions Rate. The policy changes have been appraised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3: District Heating and Combined Heat and Power Networks</td>
<td>New policy.</td>
<td>The appraisal has been revised to take into account the new policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 12: Environmental Quality and Flood Risk</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy ENV1: Air Quality</td>
<td>The changes introduce a new requirement for an exposure assessment where a development will introduce new exposure to air pollutants in an area of existing, or future, air quality concern.</td>
<td>The policy change introduces a new requirement for exposure assessments to accompany applications for new development under certain circumstances. The revised policy has been appraised and changes are proposed to the commentary but no changes to the scoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 13: Waste and Minerals</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision, Outcome or Policy (as set out in Draft Local Plan)</td>
<td>Summary of change since Publication Draft Local Plan presented to LPWG and Executive Members in September 2014, as appraised by Amec.</td>
<td>Why this change is considered significant for the SA and what are the implications for the appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*indicates policy name/number in Publication Draft Local Plan presented to LPWG and Executive Members in September 2014 where policy now deleted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 14: Transport and Communications**

**Policy T1: Sustainable Access**
Changes to explanatory text. The changes are not considered significant for the appraisal. However, the appraisal has been reviewed in light of the changes but no changes in scoring have been identified.

**T2: Strategic Public Transport Improvements**
The changes primarily relate to the specific schemes identified as part of the public transport improvements and heightened reference to the Local Transport Plan. The changes to the schemes identified in the policy are significant in scope. The appraisal has been reviewed in light to these changes. The appraisal scoring has not required revision although changes to the commentary have been identified.

**T3: York Railway Station and Associated Operational Facilities**
The change incorporates references to developing York Station to be a hub and gateway for York and the wider sub-region and as a hub high speed rail (HS2 and HS3). The incorporation of references to the developing York station as a hub for the wider sub-region and for HS2 and HS3 in significant addition to the policy. The appraisal scoring has been reviewed and no changes have been identified. However, the commentary has been updated to reflect the references to developing the station as a hub.

**T4: Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements**
The changes relate to the specific schemes identified as part of the network capacity improvements, including removal of the reference to the James Street Link Road. The changes to the schemes identified in the policy are significant in scope. The appraisal has been reviewed in light to these changes. The appraisal scoring has not required revision although changes to the commentary have been identified.

**T5: Strategic Cycle and Pedestrian Network Links and Improvements**
The changes relate to the specific schemes identified as part of the cycle and pedestrian network. The changes to the schemes identified in the policy are significant in scope. The appraisal has been reviewed in light to these changes. The appraisal scoring has not required revision.

**T9: Alternative-fuel fuelling stations and freight consolidation centres**
Site removed from policy. The changes includes the removal of a site referenced in the 2014 appraisal of the policy. The appraisal and the commentary has been revised in light of the policy changes.

**Policy C1: Communications Infrastructure**
The changes include incorporation of new requirements regarding sites with landscape or nature conservation and historic assets sensitivities. The changes include incorporation of new requirements regarding development impacts on landscape, nature and historic designations. The SA has been revised to reflect the changes to the policy. The appraisal scoring has not changed but the commentary has been revised in light of the policy changes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vision, Outcome or Policy (as set out in Draft Local Plan)</th>
<th>Summary of change since Publication Draft Local Plan presented to LPWG and Executive Members in September 2014, as appraised by Amec.</th>
<th>Why this change is considered significant for the SA and what are the implications for the appraisal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Section 15: Delivery and Monitoring**

| N/A | N/A | N/A |
### Appendix N
Housing and employment growth figures appraisal

Table N.1 Preferred Housing Growth Figure and reasonable alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Housing Figure</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Housing Figure – 867 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td>Government’s consultation housing need figure for CYC - 1,070 dpa 2016-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Housing Figure in SHMA 2017 Update – 953 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. To meet the diverse housing needs of the population in a sustainable way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likely Significant Effects</strong></td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preferred housing figure represents the DCLG baseline housing need based on 2014 sub-national population and household projections. The preferred housing growth option of 867 dpa has been assessed as resulting in minor positive effects in the short and medium term reflecting that the preferred housing figure would positively contribute to the delivery of a range of housing types and tenures in locations across the City. However, the assessment of negative effects in the long term reflects the anticipated inability of the...
Baseline figure to fully meet the identified housing need for the City of York identified in the technical work of GL Hearn in the 2017 Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Update. The figure identified by GL Hearn (953 dpa) comprises the Government’s baseline household projections and modest market signals upwards adjustment (equivalent to 10%), in accordance with the implementation of the existing Planning Practice Guidance (which supports the National Planning Policy Framework). However, the extent to which negative effects occur, and their significance, would be dependent on the delivery of housing over the plan period above the baseline figure. Careful monitoring is therefore required.

The 953dpa reasonable alternative reflects the figure identified by GL Hearn in the 2017 SHMA Update. The figure represents an objectively assessed need of 953 dpa (867 dpa baseline with market signals adjustment). This has been assessed as resulting in minor positive effects in the short and medium term increasing to significant positive effects in the long term. The scale of housing delivery associated with this figure would meet housing demand based on the most recent population forecasts and would support the delivery of affordable housing. Analysis by GL Hearn in the 2017 SHMA Update identifies a shortfall in housing provision against previous targets. This past under delivery of housing may suggest that there is a ‘backlog’ of need.

The Government’s consultation figure of 1,070 dpa represents a significant uplift on the preferred figure (867dpa) and increase on the reasonable alternative of 953dpa. The Government’s figure derives from a proposed standard methodology for calculating need. This is based on 2014 household projections for 2016-2026 with a formula applied to reflect median house price to median income affordability ratios in York for 2016. The figure would be likely to drive significant positive effects in the medium term. The Government’s consultation figure option is not directly comparable over the same time period as for the plan; however, it is assumed for this assessment that the dpa target would be carried forward in the long term. Although long term effects have been assessed as significantly positive this is to some extent uncertain due to the 10 year period of the Government’s consultation housing need figure.

Mitigation
None.

Assumptions
It is assumed that the delivery of housing will accord with the Spatial Strategy for York; namely to prioritise development within and/or as an extension to the urban area and through the provision of a single new settlement.
## SA Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Preferred Housing Figure – 867 dpa 2017-2033</th>
<th>Alternative Housing Figure in SHMA 2017 Update – 953 dpa 2017-2033</th>
<th>Government’s consultation housing need figure for CYC - 1,070 dpa 2016-2016</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2. Improve the health and wellbeing of York’s population** | | | | **Uncertainty**

The assessment of likely effects depends on the monitoring of housing delivery through the plan period in line with housing need incorporated into the Local Plan.

There is some uncertainty related to the Government’s consultation figure option over the long term due to the time period covered by the figure (2016-2026) which is less than the Plan Period covered by the Publication Draft preferred and alternative figure.

| | Short Term | Medium Term | Long Term |
| | - | - | - |

**Housing growth is likely to generate minor, temporary adverse effects on health in the short term during construction (e.g. as a result of emissions to air from HGV movements and plant). In the longer term, new housing could also adversely affect health due to, for example, emissions and increased traffic. Whilst effects will be dependent on the exact location of new development and its proximity to sensitive receptors, it can be assumed that new housing would be delivered within and in close proximity to existing residential areas. It is anticipated that the preferred housing figure option, the SHMA 2017 Update and the Government’s consultation figure option will necessitate the need to accommodate development at greenfield sites which could result in the loss of open space. The Government’s consultation figure option is likely to generate the requirement for a larger release of greenfield land.**

However, the provision of housing could also lead to improvements in health, particularly for those residents who may be able to move from poor quality housing to newer properties. Poor housing condition is recognised as a key determinant of overall health. This may be particularly apparent with regards to older affordable housing stock and poor quality private rented accommodation. It would be expected that the higher housing figures would enable the development of higher number of affordable homes. The effects in the long term of the higher figures may therefore be potentially positive. However, the existence and extent of any positive effects is uncertain and dependent on the implementation and number of other factors. |
### SA Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Housing Figure – 867 dpa 2017-2033</th>
<th>Alternative Housing Figure in SHMA 2017 Update – 953 dpa 2017-2033</th>
<th>Government’s consultation housing need figure for CYC - 1,070 dpa 2016-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Figure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Commentary on effects of each option</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The preferred option and the SHMA 2017 Update reasonable alternative have both been appraised negatively over the short, medium and long term. The SHMA 2017 Update reasonable alternative figure and Government’s consultation figure may have a greater effect than the Publication Draft preferred option over the long term although this is unlikely to be significant. There may be positive effects although these are uncertain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation**

New housing development may provide opportunities to incorporate health facilities, open space and measures to facilitate walking and cycling. Local planning policy should be put in place to minimise impacts on health. Additionally, regulatory requirements to limit detrimental effects on health and wellbeing, beyond the remit of the local plan, will also mitigate effects.

**Assumptions**

None

**Uncertainty**

None

3. Improve education, skills development and training for an effective workforce.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects**

Investment in new development has the potential to stimulate increased investment in new facilities by generating demand (through the influx of new residents) and through developer contributions. Any investment in educational facilities and services would support educational attainment, which is recognised as being good within the City of York area.

Furthermore, both the preferred housing growth option and 2017 SHMA Update alternative housing figure are expected to help deliver student accommodation and a new settlement may encourage additional educational provision. The Government’s consultation figure option would similarly enable this development and in the long term
4. Create jobs and deliver growth of a sustainable, low carbon and inclusive economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Term</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects**

Housing development will generate economic benefits associated with construction e.g. direct job creation, supply chain benefits and increased spend in the local economy by contractors and construction workers. However, effects in this regard will be temporary and the extent to which the jobs that may be created will benefit the City of York’s residents will depend on the number of jobs created and the recruitment policies of prospective employers.

In the medium and longer term new housing and associated population growth will in turn help enhance the viability and vitality of existing businesses within central York as well as other centres.

All options could support the objectives of the York Economic Strategy 2016 – 2020 and help ensure that York would benefit from investment through the Leeds City Region, Local Enterprise Partnership, and the Northern Powerhouse programme.

The preferred housing option has been assessed as having minor positive effects in the short, medium and long term.

The 2017 SHMA Update alternative housing figure will provide a scale of housing growth to support economic growth and as such it is considered to have significant positive effects in the long term.

The Government’s consultation figure option would help enable significant positive effects in the medium term by driving the housing development industry in the City and supporting economic development helping to meet objectives of the York Economic Strategy.
### Strategy

These significant effects are likely to be felt sooner than the 2017 SHMA Update alternative growth figure.

Overall, the preferred housing figure and 2017 SHMA Update alternative have been assessed as having minor positive effects on this objective. The alternative housing figure is considered to have a significant positive effect in the long term, due to benefits derived from the quantum of development proposed. The Governments’ consultation figure has been assessed as having significant positive effects in the medium and long term as the scale of proposed housing would mean such benefits are more likely to accrue earlier.

#### Mitigation

None.

#### Assumptions

None.

#### Uncertainty

The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market) and the recruitment policies of prospective employers.

### Likely Significant Effects

- **Short Term**: + + +
- **Medium Term**: + + ++
- **Long Term**: + ++ ++

All three options would assist in meeting, but not fully, the net affordable housing requirement of 573 dwellings as identified in the 2016 SHMA.

Residential development of the scale proposed under all the housing need figures has the potential to improve the viability and vitality of existing shops, services and facilities in the areas where growth is located. New development may also encourage and support investment in existing, and the provision of new, services and facilities in the City of York through, for example, the receipt of developer contributions. This could help enhance the accessibility of existing and prospective residents to key services and facilities, although this would be dependent on the exact location of new development and the level of investment generated. However, depending on where new development is located, there is the potential for growth to increase pressure on existing community facilities and services.

The Local Plan Site Selection Methodology identifies the need to locate development with sustainable access to facilities and services. The preferred housing figure option has been assessed as having minor positive effects on this objective in the short, medium and long term. The 2017 SHMA Update alternative housing growth option and
6. Reduce the need to travel and deliver a sustainable integrated transport network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects**

No significant effects have been identified for the preferred housing option or alternative option. However, a mix of minor positive and significant mixed negative effects have been assessed for the Government’s consultation figure option.

Focusing development in accordance with the Council’s spatial strategy would have positive effects on the objective as it would significantly encourage people to live close to the town centres where services and facilities are more accessible, reducing the need to travel and provide for sustainable developments. Housing growth could also help to maintain existing, and (potentially) stimulate investment in new, public transport provision in the City of York area.

The scale of a stand-alone settlement is likely to vary with each of the options with the result that the highest growth option will result in the development of a new local centre(s) and facilities which could help reduce the need for out-commuting.

In the short term (during construction) and once development is complete there is likely to be an increase in transport movements and associated congestion.

Overall, the levels of growth proposed under the preferred housing growth figure and the 2017 SHMA Update alternative option have been assessed as having minor positive and negative effects on this objective. The Government’s consultation figure option is assessed having the potential for a mix of minor positive and significant negative effects in the long term. Positive effects could arise from focusing housing growth around existing (or new) service centres and from increased transport infrastructure investment, whilst negative effects
would arise from the overall higher levels of private car use and associated traffic congestion.

**Mitigation**

Measures should be put into effect to ensure consistency with the requirements of paragraph 17 of the NPPF which identifies as a core principle of planning the active management of patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are, or can be made, sustainable.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainty**

None.

7. To minimise greenhouse gases that cause climate change and deliver a managed response to its effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likely Significant Effects</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant effects have been identified for either the preferred housing option or the 2017 SHMA Update alternative. However, significant effects have been identified for the Government’s consultation figure option in the long term.

Minor negative effects are anticipated to arise from housing growth generating an increase in greenhouse gases both during construction (e.g. due to emissions from HGV movements and plant and associated with embodied carbon in construction materials) and once development is complete (e.g. due to increased traffic generation and energy use in new dwellings). The scale of these effects will be most significant for the Government’s consultation figure option. Having said that, the occupation of more energy efficient buildings (with more efficient boilers, insulation, and possible low carbon energy generation) could mean that carbon production per occupant would be lower than for existing older housing stock. This could help mitigate some of the effects.

As highlighted under SA Objective 6, housing growth could help to maintain existing, and (potentially) stimulate investment in, public transport provision in the area which could help to minimise greenhouse gas emissions associated with car use.

It is recognised that Government intends to ban new petrol and diesel cars from 2040 which will have an effect on new car purchasing behaviour in advance of this date. However, through the plan period, the number of existing cars on the roads with internal combustion engines is expected to still far outweigh electric vehicles and so vehicle greenhouse gas emissions will be expected to be substantial. The scale of these effects will be most significant for the Government’s consultation figure option.
Overall, the growth under the preferred option and SHMA 2017 Update alternative have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective in the short, medium and long term. The Government’s consultation figure option has been assessed as having minor effects in the short and medium term and significant negative effects in the long term.

**Mitigation**
There may be opportunities to promote and encourage sustainable modes of transport alongside new development. Policies in the Local Plan should encourage their development.

**Assumptions**
None.

**Uncertainty**
The exact magnitude of effects will be dependent on the design and location of development at the individual site level (which is currently uncertain).

Housing growth may present opportunities to increase investment in transport infrastructure and renewable energy.

### 8. Conserve or enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna for accessible high quality and connected natural environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely Significant Effects</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No significant effects have been identified for the preferred option or 2017 SHMA Update reasonable alternative although significant effects are considered likely in the long term for the Government’s consultation figure option.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within a relatively small area (272 square kilometres), the York area boasts a range of sites with habitat and conservation value at international, national, regional and local levels of importance. These sites include ancient flood meadows, species-rich grasslands, lowland heath, woodlands and wetlands, which in turn are home to a variety of European protected species including bats, great crested newts, otters and other rare species such as the Tansy Beetle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing growth could have an adverse effect on biodiversity as a result of land take/habitat loss and disturbance during construction and increased recreational pressure once development is complete.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is likely that the levels of growth proposed in all the options will require development on greenfield sites with consequential effects on biodiversity and nature conservation. The preferred option and 2017 SHMA Update alternative figure have been assessed as having a negative effect on this objective, whilst due to the scale of the Government consultation figure option, there is potential for this option to have a significant effect in the long term.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the implementation of Local Plan policies related to biodiversity will mitigate some of the adverse effects (through avoidance and enhancement measures). In addition, the selection of sites, through the application of the Local Plan Site Selection Methodology identifies the need to protect environmental assets (including nature conservation).

The presence of designated European (and international) conservation sites in the City of York area will necessitate a Habitats Regulations Assessment in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. The findings of the assessment may require additional measures to be taken to avoid any adverse effects on the designated sites which will need to be reflected in Local Plan policies.

Residential development at the level presented in all three options may provide opportunities to enhance the existing, or incorporate new, green infrastructure. This could potentially have a positive or significantly positive effect on this objective by improving the quality and extent of habitats and by increasing the accessibility of both existing and prospective residents to such assets.

Overall, the preferred option and 2017 SHMA Update alternative have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective. However, there is the potential for significant negative effects to arise should development result in adverse effects on designated sites, although this is currently uncertain. Due to the additional scale of growth, the Government’s consultation figure option is likely to have significant effects in the long term, although there is some uncertainty as effects will be dependent on actual development locations and proximity to sensitive conservation sites.

**Mitigation**

Measures to retain and enhance features of biodiversity interest e.g. species rich grassland and hedgerows on development sites should be adopted. Local Plan policies should support improvements to the green infrastructure network and connecting biodiversity networks.

**Assumptions**

None of the development sites to be taken forward in the local plan will have an adverse effect on features of international importance.

**Uncertainty**

The effects of development on biodiversity which will be dependent to an extent on the location of development, the nature of detailed proposals and the outcome of site specific investigation, which at this stage are uncertain.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Housing Figure</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Housing Figure – 867 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td>Alternative Housing Figure in SHMA 2017 Update – 953 dpa 2017-2033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>Use land resources efficiently and safeguard their quality.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Short Term | - | - | - | **Likely Significant Effects**  
No significant effects have been identified for the preferred housing growth option or the SHMA 2017 Update alternative option. However, significant effects have been identified in the medium and long term for the Government’s consultation figure.  
Whilst effects against this objective are largely dependent on the location of development, which at this stage is uncertain, it is expected that all three options will necessitate the need for some development on greenfield sites. This likely requirement has therefore been assessed as having a negative effect on this objective.  
The NPPF says that planning should “encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value”. The Council should encourage developers to consider whether there is previously developed land available in suitable locations for new development, rather than locating development on undeveloped land.  
Overall, the housing growth proposed under the preferred option and SHMA 2017 Update alternative are considered to have minor negative effects on this objective. However, the Government’s consultation housing need figure option is assessed as having significant negative effects in the medium and long term with the cumulative increase in housing over this period, and the consequent greater loss of greenfield land. However, this could be mitigated to some extent through the prioritisation of brownfield sites and higher development densities.** |
| Medium Term | - | - | **--** | |
| Long Term | - | - | **--** | |

**Assumptions**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Housing Figure</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Housing Figure – 867 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td>It is assumed that development sites would avoid development on best and most versatile land and encourage development on previously developed land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Housing Figure in SHMA 2017 Update – 953 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government’s consultation housing need figure for CYC - 1,070 dpa 2016-2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Likely Significant Effects No significant effects have been identified for all three options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The increase in local population is expected to increase the demand on water resources, which has the potential for a negative effect on water quality. Yorkshire Water’s Water Resources Management Plan 2014 has assessed the demand and supply of water for the forthcoming 25 years until 2039/40. The demand forecast model has inbuilt assumptions regarding the projected population, household formation, the projected effects of climate change, leakage, implemented water efficiency measures and assumed new homes in accordance with the Code for Sustainable Homes (the requirements of which are now contained within Requirement G2 and Regulations 36 and 37 of the Building Regulations 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Improve water efficiency and quality.

York lies within the Grid SWZ zone within Yorkshire Water’s area, which identifies a deficit between supply and demand from 2018/19 is 2.67Ml/d, increasing to 108.65Ml/d by 2039/40. A range of solutions are proposed to ultimately meet the forecast supply demand deficit in the Grid SWZ as well as development of existing or new assets. The options selected include leakage reduction, use of an existing river abstraction licence, three groundwater schemes and customer water efficiency. As the plan period stretches out, there is less certainty with regard to the mix of measures to be used and they are also likely to be revised in the next WRMP, to be adopted in 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Housing Figure</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Housing Figure – 867 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td>Alternative Housing Figure in SHMA 2017 Update – 953 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td>Government's consultation housing need figure for CYC - 1,070 dpa 2016-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the housing growth identified under both the preferred option and SHMA 2017 Update reasonable alternative have been assessed as having a minor negative effect against this objective.

The Government’s consultation housing need figure option has been assessed as having minor negative effects – although in the long term there is some uncertainty relating to the extent of these effects (which may well be greater). The extent of the negative effects is dependent on the implementation of efficiency measures.

**Mitigation**
Customer water efficiency measures which could be incorporated on the development include water metering, water harvesting and the regulation of tap and shower flows.

Implementation of efficiency measures has the potential to result in a reduction of per capita in water consumption, however the uptake of these measures is not yet known. The Local Plan should incorporate policies that seek standards within new development that address water efficiency.

**Assumptions**
None.

**Uncertainty**
The extent to which the uptake of efficiency measures may lessen the negative effects in the long term.

---

11. Reduce waste generation and increase level of reuse and recycling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Likely Significant Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>No significant effects are anticipated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing growth will result in resource use, particularly during the construction of new dwellings. Residential development will generate construction waste, although it is anticipated that a
### SA Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Housing Figure</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Housing Figure – 867 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Housing Figure in SHMA 2017 Update – 953 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government’s consultation housing need figure for CYC – 1,070 dpa 2016-2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Medium Term

- -

- -

- -

#### Long Term

- -

- -

- -

#### Medium Term

-? -?

-? -?

-? -?

#### 12. Improve Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Housing Figure</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Housing Figure – 867 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Housing Figure in SHMA 2017 Update – 953 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government’s consultation housing need figure for CYC – 1,070 dpa 2016-2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Short Term

-? -?

-? -?

-? -?

#### Medium Term

-? -?

-? -?

-? -?

### Assumptions

None

### Uncertainty

None

### Likely Significant Effects

Housing growth will result in increased emissions to air both during construction (e.g. due to emissions from HGV movements and plant) and once development is complete (e.g. due to increased traffic generation).

Development in accordance with the spatial strategy is likely to see a strong emphasis upon housing delivery within and around the main urban area and close to existing public transport links and main centres, reducing the requirement to travel by private car.

### Mitigation

The performance of the selected housing figure will benefit from ensuring that recycling facilities are included in the design to ensure any waste created once the development is in operation is minimised.

Local Plan policies should encourage the use of recycled and secondary materials in new developments and promote the reuse of construction and demolition wastes.
### SA Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Term</th>
<th>Preferred Housing Figure – 867 dpa 2017-2033</th>
<th>Alternative Housing Figure in SHMA 2017 Update – 953 dpa 2017-2033</th>
<th>Government’s consultation housing need figure for CYC - 1,070 dpa 2016-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in York.</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary on effects of each option

The levels of growth proposed under both the preferred housing option and SHMA 2017 Update alternative have been assessed as having a negative effect, albeit with some uncertainty concerning the magnitude and significance of the effects due to the uncertainties over development locations.

The Government’s consultation housing growth option is also considered likely to have similar effects. However, the effects may be greater in line with the scale of housing dependent the locations chosen for development.

**Mitigation**

The effects of the proposed housing growth under the figures outlined could be mitigated by the application of other Local Plan policies that seek to reduce congestion and support investment in public transport.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainty**

The exact magnitude of effects will be dependent on the location of development at the individual site level which is currently uncertain.

**Likely Significant Effects**

No significant effects have been identified.

Parts of York are identified as being at significant risk of fluvial flooding and so there is the potential for negative effects to occur associated with flood risk. However, until the quantum of development is agreed and location of new development is known, the effects are considered to be uncertain.

It is considered that any adverse effects will be mitigated through the implementation of NPPF compliant Local Plan policies related to flood risk and sustainable drainage. The selection of sites, through the application of the Local Plan Site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Housing Figure</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Housing Figure – 867 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td>Alternative Housing Figure in SHMA 2017 Update – 953 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td>Government’s consultation housing need figure for CYC - 1,070 dpa 2016-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection Methodology identifies avoiding areas of high flood risk (greenfield sites in flood zone 3a) as Criteria 3.

Overall the effect of all three options are considered to be negative / uncertain.

**Mitigation**
As set out above, site selection will be informed by the Local Plan Site Selection Methodology and application of Policies related to flood risk and sustainable urban drainage.

**Assumptions**
None

**Uncertainty**
None

14. Conserve or enhance York’s historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.

| Short Term | - | - | - |
| Medium Term | - | - | - |
| Long Term | - | - | - |

**Likely Significant Effects**
No significant effects have been identified.

The historic environment of the City of York is of international, national, regional and local significance. York’s wealth of historic assets include: York Minster; over 2000 listed buildings; 22 scheduled monuments including the City Walls, York Castle, Clifford’s Tower and St Mary’s Abbey; four Registered historic parks and gardens, which include the Museum Gardens and Rowntree Park; and a large number of designated conservation areas.

Housing growth could have an adverse effect on cultural heritage assets as a result of the direct loss of assets during construction or due to impacts on their setting during construction and once development has been completed. There may also be opportunities for housing growth to enhance the settings of heritage assets as well as access to them.

The levels of housing need to be accommodated in all three options are likely to have an adverse effect on local landscape and townscape character, although the magnitude of effects...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Housing Figure</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Housing Figure – 867 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td>Alternative Housing Figure in SHMA 2017 Update – 953 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td>Government’s consultation housing need figure for CYC – 1,070 dpa 2016-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

would be likely to be reduced through the application of the Local Plan Site Selection Methodology which identifies the need to protect environmental assess (including historic character and setting) and the implementation of other plan policies related to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

The level of effects associated with the preferred option and SHMA 2017 Update alternative housing figures are likely to be similar to one another; although this will depend upon the selection of individual sites. The effects of the Government’s consultation figure option are also likely to be similar. However, as a basic principle, the magnitude of effect is likely to be increased commensurate with the higher scale of growth under the SHMA 2017 Update alternative (953 dpa) figure (compared to the preferred option) and the even higher level of growth associated with the Government's consultation housing need figure (1,070 dpa).

This effect is dependent on the specific approach to meeting the identified need through polices and proposals.

**Mitigation**
Local Plan policies should ensure that historic environment is conserved and enhanced in accordance with the NPPF.

**Assumptions**
It is assumed that the development sites in the Local Plan will be subject to a Heritage Impact Appraisal to assess whether the sites and policies of the Local Plan will conserve and enhance the special characteristics of the city.

**Uncertainty**
None

15. Project and enhance York’s natural and built landscape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Likely Significant Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant effects have been identified.
### SA Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Housing Figure</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Housing Figure – 867 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Housing Figure in SHMA 2017 Update – 953 dpa 2017-2033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government’s consultation housing need figure for CYC – 1,070 dpa 2016-2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The landscape includes a range of features of natural, historical, and cultural significance that contribute to the special qualities of the City of York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Housing growth could have an adverse effect on landscape character associated with the need to direct some development (under all housing figures) onto greenfield sites. Development may also affect townscape and the visual amenity of residential and recreational receptors both in the short term during construction and once development is complete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Housing growth may also present opportunities to improve townscape which could have a long term positive effect on this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The preferred housing growth option and SHMA 2017 Update alternative figures have been appraised as having a minor negative effect against this objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The Government’s consultation figure could have greater effects than the preferred 867dpa and 853dpa reasonable alternative figures due to the higher level of growth required to meet the identified need. In a similar way to the assessment against SA Objective 14, the general principle may be applied that the greater the number of houses the greater the effect on the landscape. However, this effect is dependent on the specific approach to meeting the identified need through policies and proposals within the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mitigation It is considered that adverse effects should be mitigated through the application of Local Plan policies related to the protection of the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Assumptions None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Uncertainty None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Table N.2 Preferred Employment Growth Figure and reasonable alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Employment Growth Options</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Option: Baseline Scenario – 10,500 new jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Option: ELR Option 1 – Higher Migration and Faster UK Recovery – 15,400 new jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Option: ELR Option 2 – Re-profiled sector growth – 650 jobs per annum between 2017 and 2038 (around 13,650 over the period)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. To meet the diverse housing needs of the population in a sustainable way.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects**

No significant effects have been identified.

The implementation of the preferred employment growth and both alternative options will assist in creating significant employment opportunities to support sustainable economic growth in York.

Given the aims of the York Economic Strategy, delivering the level of jobs proposed in the preferred employment growth option and both alternatives is likely to contribute to an increase in prosperity within the City of York area. This could both increase demand for new homes and increase people’s chances of owning their own home or advancing on the property ladder.

Overall, the preferred employment growth option and alternatives have been assessed as having minor positive effects on this objective.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

Phasing of delivery of a mixed types of housing is aligned with the increase in employment opportunities created by the provision of employment land.

**Uncertainty**

None.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Employment Growth Options</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Option: Baseline Scenario – 10,500 new jobs</td>
<td>Prefered Option: ELR Option 2 – Re-profiled sector growth – 650 jobs per annum between 2017 and 2038 (around 13,650 over the period)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Improve the health and wellbeing of York’s population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++/−</td>
<td>++/−</td>
<td>++/−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects**

No significant effects have been identified.

Employment growth may generate minor, temporary adverse effects on health in the short term during construction (e.g. as a result of emissions to air from HGV movements and plant machinery). In the longer term, economic development could also adversely affect health due to, for example, emissions from operational uses or increased traffic. The significance of effect will be dependent upon the nature and scale of economic activity and its location in relation to sensitive receptors.

The implementation of the preferred option or the alternatives would help to increase the amount of employment land across York and create significant employment opportunities and help to provide the conditions for sustained economic growth. There is strong evidence showing that work is generally good for physical and mental health and well-being.

Worklessness is associated with poorer physical and mental health and well-being. Full time work generally provides adequate income, essential for material well-being and full participation in today’s society. Options which increase employment opportunities are therefore also considered as having minor positive effects.

Overall, the preferred employment growth option and alternative options have been assessed as having mixed minor positive and negative effects on this objective.

**Mitigation**

None

**Assumptions**

None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Employment Growth Options</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Option: Baseline Scenario – 10,500 new jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Option: ELR Option 1 – Higher Migration and Faster UK Recovery – 15,400 new jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Option: ELR Option 2 – Re-profiled sector growth – 650 jobs per annum between 2017 and 2038 (around 13,650 over the period)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Uncertainty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>None</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Employment Growth Options</td>
<td>Commentary on effects of each option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Improve education, skills development and training for an effective workforce.</td>
<td>Alternative Option: Baseline Scenario – 10,500 new jobs</td>
<td>Likely Significant Effects&lt;br&gt;Job provision under the alternative baseline scenario and higher growth options will create training opportunities for employees and, potentially residents (e.g. through apprenticeship schemes). These options may also support the development of the City’s educational institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Option: ELR Option 1 – Higher Migration and Faster UK Recovery – 15,400 new jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Option: ELR Option 2 – Re- profiled sector growth – 650 jobs per annum between 2017 and 2038 (around 13,650 over the period)</td>
<td>The preferred option would also be expected to create opportunities for training, however given the focus upon supporting a higher skilled workforce this option would be expected to maximise opportunities to complement or support the City’s educational institutions. This is likely to help deliver a flexible and highly skilled workforce for the future of the City. The preferred employment growth option has therefore been assessed as having a significant positive effect on this objective. Overall, the alternative employment growth options have been assessed as having minor positive effects on this objective short, medium and long term. The preferred option has been assessed as having significant positive effects in the medium and long term. Mitigation&lt;br&gt;None. Assumptions&lt;br&gt;None. Uncertainty&lt;br&gt;None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Employment Growth Options</td>
<td>Commentary on effects of each option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Create jobs and deliver growth of a sustainable, low carbon and inclusive economy</td>
<td>Alternative Option: Baseline Scenario – 10,500 new jobs</td>
<td>Likely Significant Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Option: ELR Option 1 – Higher Migration and Faster UK Recovery – 15,400 new jobs</td>
<td>The preferred option would deliver an estimated 13,650 new jobs between 2017 and 2038. This will promote economic growth (both in the short term during construction and once development is complete), attracting inward investment and enabling the growth of indigenous businesses through associated employment land supply. Over the long term, the preferred option is considered to result in significant positive effects in light of it being in accordance with the economic priorities of the Council to drive up the skills of the workforce and encourage growth in businesses which use higher skilled staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Option: ELR Option 2 – Reprofiled sector growth – 650 jobs per annum between 2017 and 2038 (around 13, 650 over the period)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall this alternative option has been assessed as having a significant positive effect in the medium and long term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall, the baseline alternative employment growth option has been assessed as having minor positive effects on this objective. The ELR Option 1 alternative has been assessed as having significant positive effects in the medium and long term whilst the preferred option is considered to have significant positive effects in the long term and minor positive effects in the short and medium term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market) and the recruitment policies of prospective employers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Employment Growth Options</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Option: Baseline Scenario – 10,500 new jobs</td>
<td>Preferred Option: ELR Option 2 – Re-profiled sector growth – 650 jobs per annum between 2017 and 2038 (around 13,650 over the period)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Option: ELR Option 1 – Higher Migration and Faster UK Recovery – 19,400 new jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Help deliver equality and access to all</td>
<td><strong>Short Term</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Medium Term</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Long Term</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Reduce the need to travel and deliver a sustainable integrated transport network</td>
<td><strong>Short Term</strong></td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects**

No significant effects have been identified for the preferred option or alternatives.

All three options would assist in addressing deprivation in the City. However, the extent to which new employment opportunities benefit these areas will depend to an extent on the type of jobs created and the skills present in the local labour market.

The Local Plan Site Selection Methodology identifies the need to locate development with sustainable access to facilities and service and to ensure sustainable access for transport.

Overall, the preferred option and alternatives have been assessed as having minor positive effects on this objective.

**Mitigation**

None.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainty**

The location of employment sites relative to areas of deprivation.

**Likely Significant Effects**

No significant effects have been identified.

Focusing development in accordance with the Council’s spatial strategy would have positive effects on the objective as it would significantly encourage people to live in the town centres where
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Employment Growth Options</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Option: Baseline Scenario – 10,500 new jobs</td>
<td>Services and facilities are more accessible thereby reducing the need to travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Option: ELR Option 1 – Higher Migration and Faster UK Recovery – 15,400 new jobs</td>
<td>In the short term (during construction) and once development is complete there is likely to be an increase in transport movements and associated congestion. The scale of change proposed under the preferred and alternative options will inevitably generate an increase in vehicles and vehicle movements above the existing baseline. Economic development may also present opportunities to increase investment in transport infrastructure and could help balance housing and employment provision, reducing net commuting. Overall, the preferred employment growth option and alternatives have been assessed as having minor positive and negative effects on this objective. Mitigation Measures should be put into effect to ensure consistency with the requirements of paragraph 17 of the NPPF which identifies as a core principle of planning the active management of patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are, or can be made, sustainable. Assumptions None. Uncertainty None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Option: ELR Option 2 – Re-profiled sector growth – 650 jobs per annum between 2017 and 2038 (around 13,650 over the period)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>+/−</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>+/−</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions None. Uncertainty None.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Employment Growth Options</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. To minimise greenhouse gases that cause climate change and deliver a managed response to its effects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>Medium Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Employment Growth Options</td>
<td>Commentary on effects of each option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Conserve or enhance green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna for accessible high quality and connected natural environment</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects**

No significant effects have been identified.

Within a relatively small area (272 square kilometres), the York area boasts a range of sites with habitat and conservation value at international, national, regional and local levels of importance. These sites include ancient flood meadows, species-rich grasslands, lowland heath, woodlands and wetlands, which in turn are home to a variety of European protected species including bats, great crested newts, otters and other rare species such as the Tansy Beetle.

The development of new employment land could have adverse impacts on green infrastructure, biodiversity, geodiversity, flora and fauna without appropriate safeguards or mitigation plans. Similarly new tourism or retail development could also have adverse effects on local biodiversity depending on its location and proximity to conservation sites.

Development could have an adverse effect on biodiversity as a result of land take/habitat loss and disturbance during construction and increased recreational pressure once development is complete. It is also likely that all scenarios will require development on greenfield sites (as well as brownfield sites which may have high bio-diversity value).

It is considered that any adverse effects will be mitigated through the implementation of NPPF compliant policies related to biodiversity. The selection of sites, through the application of the Local Plan Site Selection Methodology identifies the need to protect environmental assets (including nature conservation).

Economic development at the level of the options presented may provide opportunities to enhance the existing, or incorporate new, green infrastructure. This could potentially have a positive or significantly positive effect on this objective by improving the quality and extent of habitats and by increasing the accessibility of both.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Employment Growth Options</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Option: Baseline Scenario – 10,500 new jobs</td>
<td>Alternative Option: ELR Option 1 – Higher Migration and Faster UK Recovery – 15,400 new jobs</td>
<td>The presence of Nature Conservation Sites of International importance will necessitate a Habitats Regulations Assessment in accordance with the European Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Flora and Fauna (the ‘Habitats Directive’) (Amendment) Regulations 2010. Overall, the preferred growth option and alternatives have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective. However, there is the potential for significant negative effects to arise should development result in adverse effects on designated sites, although this is currently uncertain until such time as individual site appraisals have been carried out. <strong>Mitigation</strong> Measures to retain and enhance features of biodiversity interest e.g. species rich grassland and hedgerows on development sites should be adopted in the Local Plan policies. <strong>Assumptions</strong> None of the development sites to be taken forward in the local plan will have an adverse effect on features of international importance. <strong>Uncertainty</strong> The effects of development on biodiversity which will be dependent to an extent on the location of development, the nature of detailed proposals and the outcome of site specific investigation, which at this stage are uncertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA Objective</td>
<td>Employment Growth Options</td>
<td>Commentary on effects of each option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Option: ELR Option 2 – Re-profiled sector growth – 650 jobs per annum between 2017 and 2038 (around 13,650 over the period)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Use land resources efficiently and safeguard their quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
<th>Likely Significant Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>As per the housing growth assessment, the effects against this objective are largely dependent on the location of development, which at this stage is uncertain. It is expected that there is likely to be a need to accommodate some development on greenfield sites under each option, which have therefore been assessed as having a negative effect on this objective. The level of growth forecast for the alternative ELR Option 1 and the emphasis upon the growth within wholesale and retail is considered likely to place additional stress upon the delivery of greenfield sites. Accordingly, and due to the likely quantum of development forecast, significant adverse effects are anticipated in the long term. The NPPF says that planning should “encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value”. The Council should encourage developers to consider whether there is previously developed land available in suitable locations for new development, rather than locating development on undeveloped land. Overall, the preferred growth option and baseline growth alternative are considered to have minor negative effects on this objective. Alternative ELR Option 1 has been assessed as having significant negative effects in the long term. Mitigation Local Plan policies should encourage the use of previously developed land and the co-location of uses. Assumptions It is assumed that development sites under all options would avoid development on best and most versatile land and encouraging development on previously developed land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions

It is assumed that development sites under all options would avoid development on best and most versatile land and encouraging development on previously developed land.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Employment Growth Options</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likely Significant Effects</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic growth will result in increased water consumption both during construction and in the longer term once development is complete.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative ELR Option 1 would result in increased water consumption to support economic growth. Water consumption under this option would be expected to be greater than under the alternative baseline option or the preferred option, however the adverse effects on this objective would not be expected to be significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall, the preferred option and alternative options have been assessed as having a minor negative effect against this objective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Local Plan policies should seek water efficiency measures through, for example, the requirement for employment development to meet BREAM ‘excellent’ standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Improve water efficiency and quality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Employment Growth Options</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. Reduce waste generation and increase level of reuse and recycling.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects**  
No significant effects are anticipated.  
Economic growth will result in resource use, particularly during the construction of new premises. The operation of new premises will also lead to an increase in waste generation which is inconsistent with this objective. However, the implementation of other NPPF compliant local plan policies (such as 2014 Publication Draft Local Plan Policy WM1) would help to mitigate the generation of waste.  
Overall, the preferred employment growth option and alternatives have been assessed as having a minor negative effect on this objective.  

**Mitigation**  
The performance of the preferred employment growth option will benefit from ensuring that recycling facilities are included in the design to ensure any waste created once the development is in operation is minimised.  
Local Plan policies should encourage the use of recycled and secondary materials in new developments and promote the reuse of construction and demolition wastes.  

**Assumptions**  
None  

**Uncertainty**  
None

27. Improve Air Quality  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
<th>Long Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/?</td>
<td>/?</td>
<td>/?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects**  
No significant effects have been identified.  
Economic development will result in increased emissions to air both during construction (e.g. due to emissions from HGV...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Employment Growth Options</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Option: Baseline Scenario – 10,500 new jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Option: ELR Option 1 – Higher Migration and Faster UK Recovery – 15,400 new jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred Option: ELR Option 2 – Re-profiled sector growth – 650 jobs per annum between 2017 and 2038 (around 13,650 over the period)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Term</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term</td>
<td>-/?</td>
<td>-/?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation**

The effects of the preferred employment growth option could be mitigated by the application of other Local Plan policies that seek to reduce congestion and support investment in public transport.

**Assumptions**

None.

**Uncertainty**

- /?
## SA Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Growth Options</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Option: Baseline Scenario – 10,500 new jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Option: ELR Option 1 – Higher Migration and Faster UK Recovery – 15,400 new jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Option: ELR Option 2 – Re-profiled sector growth – 650 jobs per annum between 2017 and 2038 (around 13,650 over the period)</td>
<td>The exact magnitude of effects will be dependent on the location of development at the individual site level which is currently uncertain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SA Objective

Employment Growth Options

|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

### 28. Minimise flood risk and reduce the impact of flooding to people and property in York.

#### Short Term

- /?

#### Medium Term

- /?

#### Long Term

- /?

**Likely Significant Effects**

No significant effects have been identified.

Parts of York are identified as being at significant risk of fluvial flooding. New economic development could have an adverse impact on flood risk and increase the risks of flooding to people and property if inappropriately sited or if no mitigation is secured. However, until the quantum of development is agreed and location of new development is known effects are considered to be uncertain.

However it is considered that any adverse effects will be mitigated through the implementation of NPPF compliant Local Plan policies related to flood risk and sustainable urban drainage. The selection of sites, through the application of the Local Plan Site Selection Methodology identifies avoiding areas of high flood risk (greenfield sites in flood zone 3a) as Criteria 3.

Overall, the effect of the preferred employment growth option and alternatives are assessed as having a negative effect on this objective although this is currently uncertain.

**Mitigation**

As set out above, site selection will be informed by the Local Plan Site Selection Methodology and application of Policies related to flood risk and sustainable urban drainage.

**Assumptions**

None

**Uncertainty**

None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA Objective</th>
<th>Employment Growth Options</th>
<th>Commentary on effects of each option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>29. Conserve or enhance York’s historic environment, cultural heritage, character and setting.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Likely Significant Effects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short Term</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Term</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Term</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects**

No significant effects have been identified.

Economic growth associated with the preferred and alternative options could have an adverse effect on cultural heritage assets as a result of the direct loss of assets during construction or due to impacts on their setting during construction and once development has been completed.

The levels of growth provided for under the different options is likely to have an adverse effect on local landscape and townscape character, although the magnitude of effects would be likely to be reduced through the application of the Local Plan Site Selection Methodology which identifies the need to protect environmental assets (including historic character and setting) and the implementation of other plan policies related to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

The level of effects associated with the different options are likely to be similar to one another; however under Option 1, faster levels of growth may be promoted within the tourism and leisure sectors (as well as other sectors). This may present opportunities to enhance cultural heritage assets and their settings although this is also considered to be uncertain at this stage.

Overall, the preferred option and alternative options have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective.

**Mitigation**

Local Plan policies should ensure that historic environment is conserved and enhanced in accordance with the NPPF.

**Assumptions**

It is assumed that the identified development sites will be subject to a Heritage Impact Appraisal to assess whether the sites and policies of the Local Plan will conserve and enhance the special characteristics of the city.
### SA Objective

#### Employment Growth Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Option: Baseline Scenario – 10,500 new jobs</th>
<th>Alternative Option: ELR Option 1 – Higher Migration and Faster UK Recovery – 19,400 new jobs</th>
<th>Preferred Option: ELR Option 2 – Re-profiled sector growth – 650 jobs per annum between 2017 and 2038 (around 13,650 over the period)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 30. Project and enhance York’s natural and built landscape. |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Short Term | - | - | - |
| Medium Term | - | - | - |
| Long Term | - | - | - |

#### Commentary on effects of each option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertainty</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Likely Significant Effects**

No significant effects have been identified.

The landscape includes a range of features of natural, historical, and cultural significance that contribute to the special qualities of the City of York.

Economic growth could have an adverse effect on landscape character associated with the need to direct some development (under all options) onto greenfield sites.

Development may also affect townscape and the visual amenity of residential and recreational receptors both in the short term during construction and once development is complete.

The preferred option and alternatives have been appraised as having a minor negative effect against this objective.

**Mitigation**

It is considered that adverse effects should be mitigated through the application of Local Plan policies related to the protection of the landscape.

**Assumptions**

None

**Uncertainty**

None