

## Sustainability appraisal of the draft Leicester Local Plan

### Appendix A. Detailed appraisal of alternatives

#### 1. Spatial strategy

SA Objective	A. Develop all available sites at whatever density is necessary to accommodate all of the city's objectively assessed housing, employment and retail growth.	B. Protect all existing greenfield land and only build on available brownfield sites, exporting however much of the city's objectively assessed housing, employment and retail growth that cannot be met on brownfield sites.
1. Housing	++ This alternative is necessary to ensure that housing stock meets housing needs.	-- Would not ensure that housing stock meets needs
2. Health	+ Providing housing would support good health, and help to ensure that health services support housing	- Would not achieve this
3. Recreation, landscape	-- Providing this level of housing would significantly affect the landscape	0 Maintains current situation
4. Crime	Not relevant to this topic	
5. Diversity, inequality	+ Provision of housing helps to reduce deprivation; but this alternative has no control over type of housing, so not ++	- This alternative would meet some but not all requirements
6. Biodiversity	-- Likely to have significant negative effects on biodiversity	0 Maintains current situation
7. Heritage	-- Likely to have negative effect on heritage assets	0 Maintains current situation
8. Air, resources	-? Development of all available sites might be good use of existing land but would worsen air quality	0 Maintains current situation
9. Water	Depends on sites being developed: scoped out	
10. Climate change	Depends on design of development: scoped out	
11. Land use	++ Would involve building on all available sites, including brownfield sites	++ Would involving building on (only) available brownfield sites

<b>SA Objective</b>	A. Develop all available sites at whatever density is necessary to accommodate all of the city's objectively assessed housing, employment and retail growth.	B. Protect all existing greenfield land and only build on available brownfield sites, exporting however much of the city's objectively assessed housing, employment and retail growth that cannot be met on brownfield sites.
12. Transport	+ Puts all development close to each other, reducing the need to travel	- Exports some need for development to other local authorities; would increase travel between Leicester and adjacent local authorities
13. Waste	- Would result in construction waste	0 Minimal construction waste
14. Employment, economy	++ Meets employment needs	+ Supports employment needs
15. Vitality, viability	+ High density development would help to support vitality and viability	- Unlikely to support vitality and viability
16. Education, enterprise	+ Unlikely to improve educational achievement but will support employment	- Would not meet employment needs
<b>Mitigation</b>	Ensure robust protective policies  Master planning  Maximise developer contributions towards environmental remediation etc.	Discussions with adjacent authorities re. accepting overflow

**Preferred alternative (if known) and reason why:**

Neither alternative is preferred, as both have too many negative impacts. Combination of the two is preferred.

## 2. Provision of new land for employment development

SA Objective	A. Only provide new employment land within the City's boundary, ie consider some greenfield sites in the city for future employment needs. This option would therefore have to include using some land for employment instead of for future housing, open space, or other uses	B. Work jointly with the surrounding districts to provide some employment land immediately outside of the city boundary, but where it is still accessible by city firms and therefore	C. Work jointly with surrounding districts provide ALL further employment land outside of the city's boundary
1. Housing	-- Employment development would go on potential housing sites, reducing the land available for housing	+ Would allow some land to be used for housing (not all of it for employment)	++ Would meet housing need by allowing land for housing
2. Health	+ for all alternatives. The aim is to provide for adequate new employment land, which has (mental) health benefits		
3. Recreation, landscape	0 for all alternatives – no significant difference between them		
4. Crime	+ Accessible employment helps to reduce crime	0 No significant impact on crime	0 No significant impact on crime
5. Diversity, inequality	++ Employment land (and employment) provision will help to provide income and tackle deprivation	+ As for A., but benefit would be less clear	+ This alternative would still provide for employment land, but not so much in Leicester, so benefits less clear
6. Biodiversity	-/-- Employment sites could be built on biodiverse sites, with significant impacts	0 Would not significantly increase or decrease biodiversity	0 Would not significantly increase or decrease biodiversity
7. Heritage	- Employment sites are unlikely to maintain heritage dimension of buildings, with likely negative impact on heritage	0 Unlikely to have significant heritage impacts	0 Unlikely to have significant heritage impacts
8. Air, resources	-- Employment uses (because of the nature of their uses) tend to worsen traffic and air pollution	- Would involve more travelling for employment, worsening air quality	- Would involve more travelling for employment, worsening air quality
9. Water	? Unclear at this stage		
10. Climate change	+	-	- As for B.

<b>SA Objective</b>	A. Only provide new employment land within the City's boundary, ie consider some greenfield sites in the city for future employment needs. This option would therefore have to include using some land for employment instead of for future housing, open space, or other uses	B. Work jointly with the surrounding districts to provide some employment land immediately outside of the city boundary, but where it is still accessible by city firms and therefore	C. Work jointly with surrounding districts provide ALL further employment land outside of the city's boundary
	Travel associated with the new employment land would be within the city, reducing the need to travel	Would involve more travel, e.g. commuting of Leicester residents to the new employment sites	
11. Land use	+ Could lead to redevelopment of buildings within city	+ Would optimise the use of previously developed land, even though some of it would be outside the city	+ Would optimise the use of previously developed land, even though it would be outside the city
12. Transport	+? Unclear about what new transport infrastructure would be required. Accessibility to jobs might be better on the edge of the city than in the city centre	- Would involve some travel to and from the city centre for work	-/-- Would involve more travel to and from the city centre for work
13. Waste	Not relevant		
14. Employment, economy	++ All of the alternatives meet the city's employment needs		
15. Vitality, viability	++ Helps to improve the vitality and viability	+ Partly improves vitality and viability	- Would involve employment uses being outside the city, so reducing the vitality and viability of the city centre
16. Education, enterprise	+ All of the alternatives meet the city's employment needs		
<b>Mitigation</b>			

**Preferred alternative (if known) and reason why:**

The main problem with A is that it would prevent Leicester from meeting its housing need. The plan needs to have a balanced requirement for housing and employment. If too much employment is provided outside Leicester, residents from Leicester will travel out of the city for employment, making transport impacts worse. The preferred solution is for people to live and work in the city: B is most likely to achieve this.

### 3. Protection of existing designated employment land and buildings

SA Objective	A. Allow ANY employment land or building to be lost (ie reused or redeveloped) for any non-employment use	B. Allow redevelopment or reuse for non-employment uses on only the poorest quality employment land which is no longer fit for purpose	C. Retain all current stock of designated employment land and buildings and to not allow any to be reused for non-employment uses (except for permitted development rights)
1. Housing	++ Would help to provide maximum amount of new housing	0 Provides for some new housing; similar to what is currently happening	- Very protectionist approach that would constrain development for housing
2. Health	+/- New housing would help to improve health, although loss of employment could affect mental health / deprivation	0 Limited additional housing would not lead to significant changes in health	0 No additional new housing, but also no loss of employment land, would not lead to significant changes in health
3. Recreation, landscape	? Depends on design etc.		
4. Crime	Not relevant		
5. Diversity, inequality	- Loss of employment land would go counter to reducing inequality	+ Opportunity to improve buildings, reduce deprivation	+ Opportunity to improve buildings, reduce deprivation
6. Biodiversity	0 The alternatives are about existing employment land – which is not likely to have significant biodiversity benefits - not new development sites.		
7. Heritage	- Could affect employment land that has heritage value	- Could affect employment land that has heritage value	0/- Could affect viability of employment land that has heritage value
8. Air, resources	No link as the alternatives are around existing employment sites, and air quality impacts of change of use will depend on location, type of development etc.		
9. Water	+ Redevelopment offers the opportunity to reduce flood risk	? Link between quality of employment land and flooding is unclear	0 No change from current status
10. Climate change	+ Opportunity to replace existing development with more energy efficient, modern development	+ As A.	0 No change from current status
11. Land use	+ All alternatives involve maintenance or redevelopment of existing brownfield sites		
12. Transport	?		

SA Objective	A. Allow ANY employment land or building to be lost (ie reused or redeveloped) for any non-employment use	B. Allow redevelopment or reuse for non-employment uses on only the poorest quality employment land which is no longer fit for purpose	C. Retain all current stock of designated employment land and buildings and to not allow any to be reused for non-employment uses (except for permitted development rights)
	Impacts depend on the type of non-employment use, location etc.		
13. Waste	- Construction waste	- Construction waste	0 Would not increase construction waste
14. Employment, economy	- Loss of some employment land	+ Improves the quality of employment space	0 Maintains current employment opportunities
15. Vitality, viability	- Development would be less planned; could lead to e.g. housing without supporting infrastructure / centres	? Depends on which land is no longer fit for purpose	0 No change from existing
16. Education, enterprise	- Loss of employment land, and associated opportunities for enterprise, innovation etc.	0/- Some loss of employment land	0 No change from existing
<b>Mitigation: suggested fine-tuning, rewording, ways of reducing negative impacts</b>		Consider rewording the existing policy to take into account the resurgence in textile industry and other changes. Greater flexibility than currently would allow a better response to economic changes.	

**Preferred alternative (if known) and reason why:** B is current policy. B with a bit more flexibility is the preferred alternative.

#### 4. Housing need

SA Objective	A. Housing need based on standard methodology – 1,712 dpa	B. HEDNA identified target of dpa up to 2036 – 1680 dpa	C. Core Strategy target 1,280 dpa	D. Less than 1,280 dpa, reflecting current delivery
1. Housing	++ Would ensure that housing needs are met	+ Would ensure that most of housing needs are met	-- Would lead to significant shortfall in housing	-- Would lead to significant shortfall in housing
2. Health	+ Housing is a key component of good health: this alternative would maximise this	+ This alternative would improve people's health by providing for most of housing needs	- Significant shortfall in housing would affect people's health	- Significant shortfall in housing would affect people's health
3. Recreation, landscape	- Would negatively change the townscape, for instance by requiring tall buildings, development on existing green areas etc.	- As for A.	0 Broadly maintains current situation	0 Maintains current situation
4. Crime	? Impact depends on design, implementation, factors outside planning remit			
5. Diversity, inequality	++ Would fulfil local housing needs, reducing deprivation	++ As A.	- Would make deprivation worse	-- Would make deprivation significantly worse
6. Biodiversity	-/-- Significant negative impact on biodiversity	-/-- As A.	- Would still involve considerable development, at least some of which is likely to affect biodiversity	- This alternative would still involve some development, which is likely to affect biodiversity
7. Heritage	- All new housing will have some impact on heritage			
8. Air, resources	-? Development of large number of sites might be good use of existing land but would worsen air quality	-? As A.	? Impact depends on location, design etc. of development	? As C.
9. Water	-? Would involve development in the floodplain	-? As A.	? Impact depends on location, design etc. of development	? As C.
10. Climate change	-/--?	-/--?	-?	-?

SA Objective	A. Housing need based on standard methodology – 1,712 dpa	B. HEDNA identified target of dpa up to 2036 – 1680 dpa	C. Core Strategy target 1,280 dpa	D. Less than 1,280 dpa, reflecting current delivery
	Large quantities of new housing will increase energy use, generate more vehicle movements etc.	As A.	This alternative would lead to less new housing, but it would still increase energy use, generate more vehicle movements etc.	As C.
11. Land use	? Depends on the location of future development			
12. Transport	+ More housing provided in the city would provide more opportunities for co-location, access by walking/cycling/public transport etc.	+ As A.	- Would involve exporting housing growth to adjacent local authorities, with implications for travel	- As C/
13. Waste	- Construction waste in the short term; municipal waste in the longer term. Decreasing waste quantities from alternatives A to D			
14. Employment, economy	-- Such a high housing figure would be at the expense of employment development	-- As A.	0 Allows for some employment development	0 As C.
15. Vitality, viability	++/- Would support the vitality of city centres, although it could affect the delivery of jobs	++/- As A.	0 Continues current scenario	0 As C.
16. Education, enterprise	Not directly relevant			
<b>Mitigation: suggested fine-tuning, rewording, ways of reducing negative impacts</b>	Tall buildings strategy/policy, design guidance, heritage policies  Green roofs, landscape design, biodiversity offsetting including offsite  Prioritise development on brownfield land, dependent on other constraints (e.g. heritage)			Set a minimum housing target (allows more development)  Consider how to getting infrastructure without more housing

**Preferred alternative (if known) and reason why:** None at the moment

## 5. City centre sites and sites around transport hubs / design and heritage

Scoped out because not relevant to these alternatives: SA objectives 2, 4, 6, 8, 14, 16

SA Objective	A. high density, taking into account landscape, heritage etc. constraints: be flexible on design, densities and heights (e.g. in conservation areas)	B. Medium density
1. Housing	++ will strongly contribute towards meeting housing need within city	+ will meet some of the city housing need
3. Recreation, landscape	++ will ensure protection of the city's assets	+ will achieve objective but may have a less protective approach to assets such as heritage assets
5. Diversity, deprivation	+ new housing has the opportunity to support this objective	+
7. Heritage	++ heritage and landscape taken into consideration as part of design, master planning and design	++ heritage and landscape taken into consideration as part of design, master planning, and design.
9. Water	? would be dependent on site	? would be dependent on site
10. Climate change	+ new buildings potentially more efficient, dependent on scheme delivery	? Depends on sites and locations, and design.
11. Land use	++ Encourage more optimum use of land	+ Encourage more optimum use of land
12. Transport	? Depends on location and existing transport infrastructure	? Depends on location and existing transport infrastructure
13. Waste	-/? Increases in waste/difficult quantify recycling ect.	-/? Increases in waste/difficult quantify recycling ect.
15. Vitality, viability	?/+ Dependent on delivery, but higher density results in higher population which is likely to support vitality of centres. Dependent on employment density being met with increasing housing density as well.	?/+ Dependent on delivery, but higher density results in higher population which is likely to support vitality of centres. Dependent on employment density being met with increasing housing density as well.
<b>Mitigation</b>	Have strong sustainability, design and master planning policies.	

**Preferred alternative (if known) and reason why:**

## 6. Open space provision

Scoped out because not relevant to these alternatives: SA objectives 4, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16

SA Objective	A. Retain open space provision at current recommended levels (2.88ha/1,000 people – current open space provision is about 6% greater than this but future population will increase) and seek to even-out provision across the city: increase open space in areas of deficiency and reduce open space in areas of surplus.	B. Reduce open space provision to a lower level and do not seek to improve any areas that are still deficient (even with this lower standard). Sites for release in areas of surplus then modelled at high, medium and low density.
1. Housing	- Some housing can be provided by maintaining current levels of open space provision in those areas of surplus, but only a relatively small proportion of housing can be provided, and will need to export more to the districts.	+ More land is released for housing, allowing greater housing need to be met within the city, and less exported.
2. Health	0/+/- Retaining open space provision standard does not change opportunities compared to existing situation. Increasing open space will improve health in areas of deficiency. Reducing open space in areas of surplus will reduce opportunities to improve health.	-- Will result in less open space across the city, and no improvement in areas of deficiency, fails to improve health and increase health inequalities.
3. Recreation, landscape	0/+/- Loss of open space would impact opportunities for/ on heritage, culture and townscape . Potential impact on heritage open spaces, and use of open spaces for cultural and recreational activities, and loss of green spaces in existing urban areas.	-- Greater loss of open space would impact opportunities for/ on heritage, culture and townscape. Greater potential impact on heritage open spaces, and use of open spaces for cultural and recreational activities, and loss of green spaces in existing urban areas.
5. Diversity, deprivation	0/+/- 0 Retaining existing open space provision results in no change. + parks and open space are forms of community facilities and opportunities for social cohesion increasing quantity of open space in areas of deficiency results in increase in social capital - Loss of open space in areas of surplus would reduce social capital across the communities	-- Would result in the loss of open space and no improvement of poor quality open space, resulting in less social capital.
6. Biodiversity	+/- Increasing open spaces results in increase in biodiversity Reducing open space in areas of surplus results in reduced biodiversity levels.	-- Would result in loss of open space and no improvement of open space, resulting in lower levels of biodiversity.
7. Heritage	? Dependent on if site has heritage value.	? Dependent on if site has heritage value.
8. Air, natural resources	-	--

<b>SA Objective</b>	A. Retain open space provision at current recommended levels (2.88ha/1,000 people – current open space provision is about 6% greater than this but future population will increase) and seek to even-out provision across the city: increase open space in areas of deficiency and reduce open space in areas of surplus.	B. Reduce open space provision to a lower level and do not seek to improve any areas that are still deficient (even with this lower standard). Sites for release in areas of surplus then modelled at high, medium and low density.
	Would result in the loss of open spaces resulting in the loss of natural resources	Would result in the loss of open spaces resulting in the loss of natural resources
9. Water	0/? Loss of open spaces does not directly result in flood alleviation/ is site dependent on contribution of open space to flooding.	0/? Loss of open spaces does not directly result in flood alleviation/ is site dependent on contribution of open space to flooding.
11. Land use	- Loss of open space, results in loss of greenfield land.	-- Greater loss of open space, results in greater loss of greenfield land.
14. Employment, economy	- Some employment can be provided by maintaining current levels of open space provision in those areas of surplus, but only a relatively a small proportion of employment can be provided, and will need to export more to the districts.	+ More land is released for employment, allowing greater employment need to be met within the city, and less exported.
<b>Mitigation</b>	In areas of surplus only remove poorest quality open space and improve quality of existing open spaces  Improve biodiversity levels for those open spaces that are retained and maximise biodiversity for new open spaces provided	Considerably enhance quality of remaining open spaces, and improve the versatility of multiple use open spaces e.g. flooding, biodiversity, and play.
	Select sites which have no/lower heritage value, not of high cultural or recreational value, and sites of lower landscape value. To maximise positive impacts, have developer contributions enhancing sites of heritage, cultural and recreational, landscape and townscape values  Secure contributions to increasing quality of open spaces which have crime/fear of crime issues. Policies to improve designing out crime. Prioritise releasing open space with worst crime and fear of crime issues.	

**Preferred alternative (if known) and reason why:** Option A as overall it has less negative impact.

## 7. Open Space, Sports and Recreation / Green Wedges

Scoped out because not relevant to these alternatives: SA objectives 4, 12, 13, 15, 16

SA Objective	A. Allow any publicly accessible OSSR or Green Wedge land/buildings to be lost (i.e. reused or redeveloped) for non-OSSR/Green Wedge use.	B. Allow redevelopment or reuse for publicly accessible OSSR/Green Wedge land on only the poorest quality and which is no longer fit for purpose.	C. Retain all current stock of publicly accessible OSSR/Green Wedge land and do not allow any to be reused for OSSR uses.
1. Housing	++ This alternative would maximise the amount of land available for housing development	+ This alternative would allow for some development of land for housing	- This alternative would prevent the development of new housing on OSSR/GW sites, not allowing housing needs to be met
2. Health	-- Although housing helps to support good health, so does green space. A major loss of green space in Leicester would have a significant detrimental impact on health	- The loss of green space would negatively affect health	0 No change from present
3. Recreation, landscape	-- This alternative would lead to the loss of significant areas of green space, negatively affecting the landscape and townscape, and reducing outdoor recreational opportunities	- As A., but less negative impact since less green space would be removed	0 No change from present
5. Diversity, deprivation	- Would have significant effect on social capital and increase deprivation	- As A	0 Would maintain the number of parks and other green areas
6. Biodiversity	-- Significant effect on biodiversity from loss of green spaces	- Lesser but still significant effect on biodiversity from the loss of some green spaces	0 Maintains current situation
7. Heritage	--? Some parks are historic, and some provide settings for heritage assets. Their loss could have a significant heritage impact	-? Lesser but still significant effect on heritage from the loss of some green spaces	0 Maintains current situation
8. Air, natural resources	-? Depends on the site. However treed parks helps to reduce air pollution, so	-? As A	0 Maintains current situation

<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>A. Allow any publicly accessible OSSR or Green Wedge land/buildings to be lost (i.e. reused or redeveloped) for non-OSSR/Green Wedge use.</b>	<b>B. Allow redevelopment or reuse for publicly accessible OSSR/Green Wedge land on only the poorest quality and which is no longer fit for purpose.</b>	<b>C. Retain all current stock of publicly accessible OSSR/Green Wedge land and do not allow any to be reused for OSSR uses.</b>
	development on these sites would worsen air quality		
9. Water	-? Loss of parks would reduce flood alleviation, depending on location of park	-? As A	0 Maintains current situation
10. Climate change	-? Open spaces provide some carbon fixing and flood alleviation, reduce the heat island effect, provide some shade. Their loss would have a negative climate change impacts	-? As A	0 Maintains current situation
11. Land use	-- This alternative could lead to development on green areas which are not previously developed land	- Could lead to development on some green areas	++ Retaining green spaces forces development to go onto brownfield sites
14. Employment, economy	++ Would allow for employment sites to be developed on green areas, maximising employment opportunities	+ Would allow for employment sites to be developed on some green areas, increasing employment opportunities	- Would restrict employment opportunities
<b>Mitigation</b>	Improving the condition of existing/retained open spaces		

**Preferred alternative (if known) and reason why:**

The city's high requirements for housing and employment land means that B is the preferred option even though C looks more sustainable. Maximising the use of brownfield sites is important as a mitigation measure for B, but it is known that there are not enough brownfield sites to accommodate housing and employment. Improving the condition of existing/retained open spaces would help to mitigate the impacts of B, e.g. improving biodiversity, draining playing pitches that currently get flooded.

## 8. Space standard

Scoped out because not relevant to these alternatives: SA objectives 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 12-15

SA Objective	A. Apply the nationally described space standards to all new dwellings including conversions/change of use.	B. Selectively apply the nationally described space standards to all new dwellings including conversions/change of use in a spatial area (e.g. inner wards) and/or development type (e.g. excluding built to rent developments or studios)	C. Do not apply nationally described space standards
1. Housing	+/- Would ensure that the quality of the housing stock is good, but viability issues may limit the amount of housing provided (but if the nationally described standard has a negative impact on viability it can't be put in the plan)	+/0 Good for housing quality but unlikely to affect quantity of housing	- Likely to have a negative impact on housing quality; potential for future slums. Evidence suggests that quality/size is already decreasing.
2. Health	+ Would improve health because poor living standard has impact on health	+/0 Would improve health for those dwellings that have space standards	-? Possible negative health effects from slum-type conditions
5. Diversity, deprivation	+ Would help to tackle inequality, and cater for the needs of deprived groups	+/0 As A., but to a lesser degree	0 Similar to current situation
8. Air, natural resources	0 Negligible negative impact from increase in size of dwellings using more resources		0 Similar to current situation
10. Climate change	0 Negligible impact from increase in size of dwellings		0 Similar to current situation
11. Land use	- Would constrain the redevelopment of buildings	-/0 Would constrain the redevelopment of some buildings	0 Would not act as a constraint
16. Education, enterprise	0 No significant effect. Possible minor improvements in ability to study, but limited.		0 Similar to current situation
<b>Mitigation</b>			

**Preferred alternative (if known) and reason why:** B is preferred alternative. There is probably not enough evidence for wholesale application of A, but B would allow for some improvements in housing quality and is more viable.

## 9. Affordable housing

Scoped out because not relevant to these alternatives: SA objectives: 3, 4, 6-15

SA Objective	A. Current approach to affordable housing (for sites $\geq 15$ dwellings or 0.5ha, 15% in Strategic Regeneration Area, 30% in SE of city and Ashton Green, 20% elsewhere in the city)	B. Increase the percentage of affordable homes expected from larger development sites, subject to viability	C. Expect smaller sites to also provide affordable housing (e.g. <5 units or <0.25ha), subject to viability
1. Housing	-? The current approach affects the viability of many developments, and therefore impacts on delivery of affordable homes	+? Increasing the proportion of affordable homes on large development sites would add to future housing stock, but making this subject to viability requirements makes delivery uncertain	+? Extending the requirement for affordable homes to smaller developments would add to future housing stock, but making this subject to viability requirements makes delivery uncertain.
2. Health	+? Indirectly affordable housing improves health, but delivery is uncertain due to viability		
5. Diversity, deprivation	+? Indirectly affordable housing reduces deprivation, but delivery is uncertain due to viability		
16. Education, innovation	+ Improves ability to study and find work.		
<b>Mitigation</b>			

**Preferred alternative (if known) and reason why:** B + C, subject to viability

## 10. Shopping centres: mix of uses

Scoped out because not relevant to these alternatives: SA objectives 1, 6, 8-10, 13, 14

SA Objective	A. Allow a greater mix of uses in shopping centres e.g. community and health facilities that would support shopping provision	B. Do not allow a greater mix of use (current approach)
2. Health	+ Would improve access to GP facilities and other facilities that improve health	0 No change
3. Recreation, landscape	+ Could improve recreational, community and leisure provision in shopping centres; possibly some improved enjoyment of heritage in shopping centres	0 No change
4. Crime	+ Would increase the vitality of shopping areas, reducing crime	0 No change
5. Diversity, deprivation	+ Would help to ensure that local shopping centres remain open and vibrant, supporting social capital and community facilities	0 No change
7. Heritage	+? Occasional opportunities to conserve heritage assets in shopping areas	0 No change
11. Land use	+ Helps to use and reuse shopping areas	0 No change
12. Transport	+ Helps to ensure that facilities are accessible by walking/cycling / public transport	0 No change
15. Vitality, viability	++ Helps to support the vitality of shopping centres	0 No change
16. Education, innovation	+? Could allow for small training centres in shopping areas	0 No change
<b>Mitigation</b>		

### Preferred alternative (if known) and reason why:

A is preferred option. Hot food take-aways may need to be restricted because they are closed for most of the day (open only in the evening) and this affects the vitality of the area. Also there are public health arguments against lots of fast food take-aways. So consider restricting the number of take-aways. Also restrict the proportion of betting shops due to public health concerns.

## 11. Transport infrastructure

Scoped out because not relevant to these alternatives: SA objectives 3-5, 7, 9, 11, 13-16

SA Objective	A. Reuse & repurpose roads for sustainable public transport (buses, rapid mass transit & rail), increase the provision of walking & cycling lanes & facilities and encourage sustainable transport	B. Balance opportunities for improvements to the highway network with opportunities to increase sustainable transport
1. Housing	- Not allowing new roads may not enable maximum house building	0 Current situation
2. Health	+ Promotes more exercise through sustainable transport	0 Current situation
6. Biodiversity	+ No new roads	0/- Impacts on biodiversity depends where the road is built
8. Air, natural resources	+	? Depends on the number and location of roads
10. Climate change	+ more emphasis on bus and walking	-? More road, more transport
12. Transport	++ this is the purpose of the option	-? Current situation
<b>Mitigation</b>		

**Preferred alternative (if known) and reason why:** Option A is the preferred option as it is more sustainable but It may have a negative impact on Housing delivery if new roads are needed.

## 12. Parking standards

Scoped out because not relevant to these alternatives: SA objectives 3, 5-6, 9, 11, 13, 16

SA Objective	A. Set car parking standards for new development based on usage information and council objectives to promote sustainable transport (current LP situation)	B. Let the market decide parking requirements for car parking within new development
1. Housing	- Would likely lead to the delivery of some larger houses	+ Would encourage a range of house types.
2. Health	0 Currently promotes sustainable transport/ no change in levels of exercise.	- Detrimental impact on health. All car based and no sustainability.
4. Crime	0	? Perception on safety if greater provision of parking for private transport
7. Heritage	0	- Bringing a heritage asset back into use may need more parking than is practical to provide.
8. Air, natural resources	+ Standards could take air quality in consideration	- No restrictions. Greater use of cars. Increased air pollution.
10. Climate change	0	- More energy use in cars
12. Transport	++ This is the sole purpose of option A	- Increased congestion increase travel by private car increased air pollution
14. Employment, economy	-? In the City there is generally enough alternative sustainable options from the car not to be a negative influence	+ No constraints for developers.
15. Vitality, viability	0 No indication that lack of parking is causing an issue	- It enables more use of the car and less sustainable transport.
<b>Mitigation</b>	Standards could take air quality into consideration	

**Preferred alternative (if known) and reason why:** Option A taking a more restrictive approach encourages more sustainable transport options. Parking standards may be an issue for housing provision. Policy will need to ensure the right balance and consultation with house builders.

### 13. City centre: Retail uses

Scoped out because not relevant to these alternatives: SA objectives 2, 4, 6. The impact on SA objectives 7-9 would depend on the scheme, and so cannot be assessed here.

SA Objective	A. Focus major retail development in the Central Shopping Core	B. Allocate land for further expansion of retail development outside the central shopping core but within the City Centre.	C. Expand the boundary of the Central shopping core.
1. Housing	- Will prioritise retail over housing.	+ If not retail in centre, possibility of residential instead	? Dependent on where boundary expands
3. Recreation, landscape	+ Enables opportunities to value city's heritage and participation in cultural and recreational activities in city centre		
5. Diversity, deprivation	+ Can increase opportunities for growth in social capital		
10. Climate change	?/- Dependent on scheme. Can potentially encourage more car use to use increased floor space in retail.		
11. Land use	N/A	+? Overall positive, but depends on location and extent of shopping centre	? depends on location and extent of shopping centre
12. Transport	++ In sustainable location	+? In sustainable location, but may increase scale of shopping core, which may encourage more transport by car.	? Increasing size of central shopping core could encourage more people to use car to get to expanded central area.
13. Waste	? Will likely increase waste, but may provide opportunities to recycle waste materials.		
14. Employment, economy	++ Provides more jobs		
15. Vitality, viability	++ Encourages greater retail use and activity within city centre.	+ Providing more retail/expand boundary could result in less demand for existing retail within the centre	
16. Education, enterprise	++ More retail provides greater opportunities for start-ups/ entrepreneurial skills/initiatives.		
<b>Mitigation</b>	Mitigation would be to have mixed residential and retail use.		

**Preferred alternative (if known) and reason why:** B is preferred alternative. Allows a range of opportunities for employment, encourages innovation and for people to enjoy the city centre.

#### 14. City centre: Leisure uses

Scoped out because not relevant to these alternatives: SA objectives 4, 11, 16. The impact on SA objectives 6 and 7 would depend on the scheme, and so cannot be assessed here.

SA Objective	A. Concentrate major leisure uses in the city centre	B. Allow some major leisure uses outside of the city centre
1. Housing	-? Potential results in less housing in the centre	0 Unlikely to affect housing supply/delivery
2. Health	+ Increased leisure uses contributes to improved health	++ Increased leisure outside city centre improves health and reduces health inequalities
3. Recreation, landscape	++ Increased leisure increases opportunities for cultural and recreational activities	
5. Diversity, deprivation	+ increased leisure increases opportunities to support growth of social capital.	++ increased leisure increases opportunities to support growth of social capital across city.
8. Air, natural resources	-? Dependent on scheme. Major leisure may involve increased driving, resulting in higher concentration of air pollution.	+? Dependent on scheme. Spreading leisure uses throughout city would spread car use and associated air pollution across city (i.e. less concentrated air pollution)
9. Water	-? may result in development in high flood risk areas	+? Opportunity to have leisure uses in lower flood risk areas.
10. Climate change	+? opportunities to integrate more energy efficient in new buildings.	
12. Transport	+ Uses existing infrastructure	- Outside of city centre may result in people using less sustainable forms of transport
13. Waste	0 Could have some impact from construction waste but unlikely to be significant	
14. Employment, economy	+ Could create some jobs and diverse employment opportunities	
15. Vitality, viability	++ Increases diversity of uses in city centre resulting in supporting vitality	-? May take away from vitality of city centre, but depends on location. If located in other local centres then may have positive impact on vitality
<b>Mitigation</b>		

**Preferred alternative (if known) and reason why:** B is preferred option

## 15. Shopping centres: location

Scoped out because not relevant to these alternatives: SA objectives 6, 9, 16

SA Objective	A. Strengthen just a few local shopping centres by focusing new development in them and enhance the special character of centres such as Belgrave Road.	B. Support all local shopping centres	C. Develop new centres for planned residential areas
1. Housing	0 will not impact residential supply	0 will not reduce supply of housing	? depends on extent and location of new centres
2. Health	+ Local centres could provide health services		
3. Recreation, landscape	+ Increased opportunity to participate in cultural and recreational activities		0? Retail does not necessarily relate to protecting city's landscape, but could encourage participation in cultural and recreational activities
4. Crime	N/A		-? New centres catering for new residential areas have overtly resulted in higher crime/perception of crime
5. Diversity, deprivation	++ Support development and growth of social capital across communities		0? development may not result in increased social capital.
7. Heritage	? Depends on scheme		N/A
8. Air, natural resources	? Only supports some centres	+ Supports all centre and thus encourage sustainable forms of transport to local centres	? Dependent on implementation and location
10. Climate change	? Potential to encourage unnecessary car trips but will depend on delivery	+	? Potential to encourage unnecessary car trips but will depend on delivery
11. Land use	++	++	- Will likely use greenfield land.
12. Transport	+ But will enhance only a few centres	++ Will enhance all centres	? Will depend on delivery
13. Waste	N/A	N/A	?

<b>SA Objective</b>	A. Strengthen just a few local shopping centres by focusing new development in them and enhance the special character of centres such as Belgrave Road.	B. Support all local shopping centres	C. Develop new centres for planned residential areas
			will involve new development which could increase construction waste.
14. Employment, economy	++	++	? will be depend on implementation – could undermine other centres.
15. Vitality, viability	++	++	- Would potentially undermine other centres.
<b>Mitigation:</b>			

**Preferred alternative (if known) and reason why:** B. Support all local shopping centres.