

Sustainability Appraisal

Section 7: Built and Natural Environment



Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE2- Option 1 Development which cannot be located in low flood risk areas (based on sequential test) should contribute towards mitigation of flood risk effects

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
Social Indicators										
Health	Health facilities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Death rates	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Healthy lifestyles	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Education	Improve Qualifications	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Crime and anti-social activities	Will reduce crime	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce fear of crime	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce noise and odours	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Poverty and social exclusion	Reduce poverty	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Access key services	Access key local services	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Accessibility of shopping facilities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Access child care	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Employment	Unemployment	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Job opportunities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve earnings	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Housing	Reduce homelessness	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Provide enough housing	No predicted effects	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Possible that some housing may not come forwards due to requirement to mitigate against any flood risk, but this is not expected to impact to any significant level (as only affecting development in higher flood risk area which would be expected to be minimum)
	Increase range and affordability	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce no of unfit homes	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Community participation	Satisfaction of neighbourhood	Improvements to be seen in the future.	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	Will be improved indirectly by ensuring that any future development that takes place in areas at higher risk of flooding will include mitigation measures
	Increase green space	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE2- Option 1 Development which cannot be located in low flood risk areas (based on sequential test) should contribute towards mitigation of flood risk effects

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
	Engagement in decision making	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Involvement in volunteer activities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve ethnic relations	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve access to cultural facilities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Summary of appraisal against social objectives		Although there is a risk that housing may not be delivered due to additional costs, this would essentially still be a benefit as any housing coming forwards would be in areas at lower risk from flooding. People's satisfaction with their own neighbourhoods should improve due to lower incidence and lower risk from flooding.								
Environmental Indicators										
Water and air quality	Quality of water	Potential (indirect) improvements if flooding occurred and contributions towards mitigation took place	0	0	0	+	+	?	+	Investment in mitigation measures will reduce the risk of flooding events which can cause contamination of water
	Quality of air	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To conserve soil resources and quality	Minimise loss of Greenfield land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Loss agricultural land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Soil quality	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Use of water and mineral resources	Sustainable use of minerals	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Sustainable use of water	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduce waste	Reduce household waste	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase recycling	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduce effects of traffic	Effect traffic volumes	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce need for local travel	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase car journeys	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE2- Option 1 Development which cannot be located in low flood risk areas (based on sequential test) should contribute towards mitigation of flood risk effects

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
Reduce contributions to climate change	Reducing energy consumption?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase proportion of energy needs met by renewable sources?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Vulnerability to climatic events	Minimise risk of flooding	Improvement	++	++	++	0	+	?	++	Ensuring contributions for mitigation measures means that risk of flooding to new development will be reduced where development takes place in higher risk areas.
	Risk damage from storms	Improved	+	++	++	0	?	?	++	Where development takes place in higher risk areas, having mitigation measures in place will ensure reduced risk from rain/wind/surges etc
Conserve and enhance biodiversity	Maintain designated sites Does the policy or proposal have a significant impact on European designated sites, when considered on its own or with other plans or proposals?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	In Babergh, some of the most important sites are also at flood risk or near to areas at higher flood risk so there could be some impacts but it would depend on the type of development
	Deliver targets of Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reverse decline in farmland birds	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Historical and archaeological importance	Protect designated historical sites	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Protect designated archaeological sites	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Protect designated geological sites	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Landscapes and townscapes	Reduce underused land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve landscape/townscape	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE2- Option 1 Development which cannot be located in low flood risk areas (based on sequential test) should contribute towards mitigation of flood risk effects

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
Summary of appraisal against environmental objectives		Environmental benefits will be seen where development is prevented through either not being able to provide mitigation to reduce risk (so development doesn't go ahead), or by reducing risk where development does proceed.								
Economic Indicators										
Economic growth	Improve business development	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Promote growth in key sectors	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Economic performance	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Rural diversification	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To revitalise town centres	Increase range of employment opportunities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Decrease vacant units in town centres?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Will it reduce commuting	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Improve accessibility to work	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce journey times between employment areas	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase freight transported	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase consumption of local goods	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Increase investment	Encourage indigenous business	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE2- Option 1 Development which cannot be located in low flood risk areas (based on sequential test) should contribute towards mitigation of flood risk effects

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
	Encourage inward investment	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Make land available for business development	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Summary appraisal against economic objectives No links to economic development

Conclusions: Ensuring that development in locations of higher flood risk provide mitigation will make development acceptable- any development resulting in a higher risk to development on site or elsewhere will not be allowed by higher policies- e.g. PPS25 etc. This option does not produce any negative effects.

Score	++ Major positive	+ Minor positive	- Minor negative	- - Major negative	0 Neutral effect	? Uncertain effect
Number	2	2	0	0	58	0

Recommendations: A significant control on development is set out at national level relating to flood risk management and mitigation. However, for development that could go ahead in areas of higher flood risk, this option is more appropriate than not requiring contributions to mitigation- unless the alternative is not to allow development in higher risk areas (through the sequential test)

Key to Appraisal of Effects

Will the policy make a positive or negative contribution to the appraisal objective?

++ Major positive + Minor positive - Minor negative - - Major negative 0 Neutral effect ? Uncertain effect

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE2- Option 2 Development which cannot be located in low flood risk areas (based on sequential test) does not need to contribute towards mitigation of flood risk effects

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
Social Indicators										
Health	Health facilities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Death rates	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Healthy lifestyles	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Education	Improve Qualifications	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Will reduce crime	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Crime and anti-social activities	Reduce fear of crime	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce noise and odours	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce poverty	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Poverty and social exclusion	Access key local services	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Accessibility of shopping facilities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Access child care	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Employment	Unemployment	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Job opportunities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Housing	Improve earnings	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce homelessness	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Provide enough housing	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase range and affordability	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce no of unfit homes	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE2- Option 2 Development which cannot be located in low flood risk areas (based on sequential test) does not need to contribute towards mitigation of flood risk effects

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
Community participation	Satisfaction of neighbourhood	Possible negative effects	0	?	?	-	-	-	-	Satisfaction may be reduced by the fact that development which cannot be located in lower risk areas, if allowed to take place, may result in higher risk
	Increase green space	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Engagement in decision making	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Involvement in volunteer activities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve ethnic relations	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve access to cultural facilities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Summary of appraisal against social objectives	If development in higher risk areas is still allowed to be built, with no mitigation contributions, there is a chance that risk may be increased and therefore that satisfaction with the neighbourhood may reduce.									
Environmental Indicators										
Water and air quality	Quality of water		0	0	0	-	-	?	-	If there is increased flood risk with no requirement for mitigation contributions, there is a greater flood risk and that water could be contaminated.
	Quality of air	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To conserve soil resources and quality	Minimise loss of Greenfield land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Loss agricultural land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Soil quality	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Use of water and mineral resources	Sustainable use of minerals	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Sustainable use of water	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduce waste	Reduce household waste	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase recycling	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE2- Option 2 Development which cannot be located in low flood risk areas (based on sequential test) does not need to contribute towards mitigation of flood risk effects

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
Reduce effects of traffic	Effect traffic volumes	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce need for local travel	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase car journeys	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduce contributions to climate change	Reducing energy consumption?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase proportion of energy needs met by renewable sources?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Vulnerability to climatic events	Minimise risk of flooding	Negative	-	--	--	-	--	?	--	Although limited development can take place in higher flood risk areas, if it goes ahead with no requirement to contribute to mitigation there could be a higher risk of that and local development being damaged by floods.
	Risk damage from storms	Negative	-	--	--	0	-	?	--	If there is no requirement for contributions to mitigation, development could also be more at risk to damage through rain, wind and sea surges experienced during storms.
Conserve and enhance biodiversity	Maintain designated sites Does the policy or proposal have a significant impact on European designated sites, when considered on its own or with other plans or proposals?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Deliver targets of Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan	No direct link								

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE2- Option 2 Development which cannot be located in low flood risk areas (based on sequential test) does not need to contribute towards mitigation of flood risk effects

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
	Reverse decline in farmland birds	No direct link								
Historical and archaeological importance	Protect designated historical sites	No direct link								
	Protect designated archaeological sites	No direct link								
	Protect designated geological sites	No direct link								
Landscapes and townscapes	Reduce underused land	No direct link								
	Improve landscape/ townscape	No direct link								

Summary of appraisal against environmental objectives | If development goes ahead in areas at higher risk from flooding with no compulsory contributions to mitigation, there is an increased risk of flooding and associated damage.

Economic Indicators

Economic growth	Improve business development	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Promote growth in key sectors	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Economic performance	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Rural diversification	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To revitalise town centres	Increase range of employment opportunities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Decrease vacant units in town centres?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE2- Option 2 Development which cannot be located in low flood risk areas (based on sequential test) does not need to contribute towards mitigation of flood risk effects

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Will it reduce commuting	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Improve accessibility to work	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce journey times between employment areas	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase freight transported	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase consumption of local goods	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Increase investment	Encourage indigenous business	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Encourage inward investment	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Make land available for business development	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Summary appraisal against economic objectives | No links with economic development

Conclusions:

No positive effects as a result of this policy

Score	++ Major positive	+ Minor positive	- Minor negative	-- Major negative	0 Neutral effect	? Uncertain effect
	0	0	2	2	58	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE2- Option 2 Development which cannot be located in low flood risk areas (based on sequential test) does not need to contribute towards mitigation of flood risk effects

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects							Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	

Recommendations: If this policy is selected, the alternative to providing mitigation contributions is that development should not be allowed at all. If it is determined that it is not appropriate to require contribution to mitigation for development, then the other best alternative would be that development is not allowed in higher risk areas at all unless it can be proved that it will not adversely affect flood risk at the site or elsewhere- similar to controls in national policy.

Key to Appraisal of Effects

Will the policy make a positive or negative contribution to the appraisal objective?

++ Major positive + Minor positive - Minor negative -- Major negative 0 Neutral effect ? Uncertain effect

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE3 Flood issues: options are all similar and details relate only to length into future that climate change predictions should consider. As a result, no benefit will be gained by carrying out SA on each option

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
Social Indicators										
Health	Health facilities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Death rates	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Healthy lifestyles	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Education	Improve Qualifications	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Crime and anti-social activities	Will reduce crime	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce fear of crime	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce noise and odours	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Poverty and social exclusion	Reduce poverty	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Access key services	Access key local services	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Accessibility of shopping facilities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Access child care	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Employment	Unemployment	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Job opportunities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve earnings	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Housing	Reduce homelessness	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Provide enough housing	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase range and affordability	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce no of unfit homes	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE3 Flood issues: options are all similar and details relate only to length into future that climate change predictions should consider. As a result, no benefit will be gained by carrying out SA on each option

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
Community participation	Satisfaction of neighbourhood	Improvement	++	++	++	0	0	0	++	Considering climate change in development decisions will ensure minimal future risk to development (new and existing) which will in turn increase satisfaction
	Increase green space	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Engagement in decision making	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Involvement in volunteer activities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve ethnic relations	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve access to cultural facilities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Summary of appraisal against social objectives			As this is a very specific policy option there are limited social objectives affected but generally satisfaction will improve by minimising the risks now and in the future from flooding.							
Environmental Indicators										
Water and air quality	Quality of water	Improvement	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	Considering changes in the future will reduce the risk to the water supply from floods and potential side effects including contamination.
	Quality of air	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To conserve soil resources and quality	Minimise loss of Greenfield land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Loss agricultural land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Soil quality	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Use of water and mineral resources	Sustainable use of minerals	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Sustainable use of water	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduce waste	Reduce household waste	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase recycling	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE3 Flood issues: options are all similar and details relate only to length into future that climate change predictions should consider. As a result, no benefit will be gained by carrying out SA on each option

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
Reduce effects of traffic	Effect traffic volumes	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce need for local travel	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase car journeys	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduce contributions to climate change	Reducing energy consumption?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase proportion of energy needs met by renewable sources?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Vulnerability to climatic events	Minimise risk of flooding	Significant improvement	+	++	++	++	++	?	++	By considering future changes, existing and new development will be protected from increased risk of flooding in the future (through climate change)
	Risk damage from storms	Significant improvement	+	++	++	++	++	?	++	Climate change is likely to increase the frequency and severity of storms and so considering the effects of climate change in the future for developments will help reduce the risk.
Conserve and enhance biodiversity	Maintain designated sites Does the policy or proposal have a significant impact on European designated sites, when considered on its own or with other plans or proposals?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Deliver targets of Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reverse decline in farmland birds	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE3 Flood issues: options are all similar and details relate only to length into future that climate change predictions should consider. As a result, no benefit will be gained by carrying out SA on each option

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
Historical and archaeological importance	Protect designated historical sites	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Protect designated archaeological sites	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Protect designated geological sites	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Landscapes and townscapes	Reduce underused land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve landscape/townscape	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Summary of appraisal against environmental objectives		Climate change will bring increasing severity of adverse weather conditions and increased flood risk so it is sensible to consider the extent to which this will change in the future.								
Economic Indicators										
Economic growth	Improve business development	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Promote growth in key sectors	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Economic performance	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Rural diversification	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To revitalise town centres	Increase range of employment opportunities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Decrease vacant units in town centres?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE3 Flood issues: options are all similar and details relate only to length into future that climate change predictions should consider. As a result, no benefit will be gained by carrying out SA on each option

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Will it reduce commuting	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Improve accessibility to work	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce journey times between employment areas	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase freight transported	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase consumption of local goods	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Increase investment	Encourage indigenous business	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Encourage inward investment	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Make land available for business development	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Summary appraisal against economic objectives No economic links

Conclusions: It is sensible to consider future impacts of climate change as this will affect future development

Score	++ Major positive	+ Minor positive	- Minor negative	-- Major negative	0 Neutral effect	? Uncertain effect
	3	1	0	0	58	0

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE3 Flood issues: options are all similar and details relate only to length into future that climate change predictions should consider. As a result, no benefit will be gained by carrying out SA on each option

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects							Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	

Recommendations:

Should definitely include considerations of climate change- the length of time to consider should be as far as is reasonably possible.

Key to Appraisal of Effects

Will the policy make a positive or negative contribution to the appraisal objective?

++ Major positive + Minor positive - Minor negative -- Major negative 0 Neutral effect ? Uncertain effect

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 1 Development should be located away from sources of air pollution and encouraged in locations which minimise the use of the car

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
Social Indicators										
Health	Health facilities	No direct link	+	++	++	-	0	0	++	Encouraging development in locations which minimises the use of the car will include locations with good access to GPs so could have beneficial effects for this indicator.
	Death rates	Possible improvement	0	+	+	+	?	?	+	Minimising the exposure to air pollution and locating development where there is less need to use the car could result in healthier lifestyles and therefore lower death rates.
	Healthy lifestyles	Improvement	+	++	++	+	?	?	++	The improvements are due to the location of development in areas which will reduce the need of the use of the car and improve healthy lifestyles. Also, reduced exposure to pollutants will improve health (e.g. reduce respiratory complaints) and could result in improved healthy lifestyles
Education	Improve Qualifications	Minimal impact	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	Potential for improved access to opportunities through locating development in accessible locations but only expected to be minimal change to "business as usual"
Crime and anti-social activities	Will reduce crime	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce fear of crime	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce noise and odours	Possible improvement	0	+	+	+	+	?	+	By minimising exposure of development to air pollution, and preventing it from worsening due to location of new development, there may well be fewer complaints due to improved air quality
Poverty and social exclusion	Reduce poverty	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Access key services	Access key local services	Possible improvements	++	++	++	+	+	0	++	Possible improvement in new development by locating new development in accessible locations to minimise use of car
	Accessibility of shopping facilities	Improvement due to location of new development	++	++	++	+	+	0	++	Possible improvement in new development by locating new development in accessible locations to minimise use of car
	Access child care	No change expected	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	There are potential positive impacts by locating development in sustainable locations but expected to be smaller for childcare access than for shopping

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 1 Development should be located away from sources of air pollution and encouraged in locations which minimise the use of the car

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:	
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating		
Employment	Unemployment	No significant link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Potential for small improvements in accessibility through locating new development in locations to minimise car but this will be expressed in other policies.	
	Job opportunities	No link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Improve earnings	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Housing	Reduce homelessness	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Provide enough housing	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Increase range and affordability	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Reduce no of unfit homes	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Community participation	Satisfaction of neighbourhood	Improvement	+	++	++	+	++	+	++		
	Increase green space	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Engagement in decision making	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Involvement in volunteer activities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Improve ethnic relations	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Improve access to cultural facilities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Summary of appraisal against social objectives		Many of the social objectives are improved by locating development in places which result in lower use of the car. The air pollution reduction will also improve health and social quality by reducing the exposure to air pollution (and therefore reducing the risk of the resulting health/environmental impacts). This is a two fold process- improvements will be seen by both keeping development away from sources of air pollution and by minimising the use of the car there will be less additional pollution added.									
Environmental Indicators											
Water and air quality	Quality of water	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 1 Development should be located away from sources of air pollution and encouraged in locations which minimise the use of the car

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
	Quality of air		+	++	++	+	0	++	++	By the theory behind the option, there will be a significant improvement- lower exposure for developments by locating away from sources of pollution and reducing use of car and resultant emissions.
To conserve soil resources and quality	Minimise loss of Greenfield land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Loss agricultural land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Soil quality	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Use of water and mineral resources	Sustainable use of minerals	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Sustainable use of water	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduce waste	Reduce household waste	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase recycling	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduce effects of traffic	Effect traffic volumes	Improvement expected	++	++	++	0	0	0	++	By locating development in places which reduce the need to use the car, there will be a positive impact on traffic volumes.
	Reduce need for local travel	Significant improvement	+	++	++	?+	++	?	++	By ensuring accessible development locations, there should be a lower need to make local journeys in the car.
	Increase car journeys	Potential improvement	+	+	+	+	++	?	+	By locating development in places which minimise the need of the car, more journeys should take place using sustainable methods.
Reduce contributions to climate change	Reducing energy consumption?	Improvement expected	++	++	++	0	0	0	++	By reducing the need to travel by car and using sustainable methods of travel there is a reduced fuel demand
	Increase proportion of energy needs met by renewable sources?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Vulnerability to climatic events	Minimise risk of flooding	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 1 Development should be located away from sources of air pollution and encouraged in locations which minimise the use of the car

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
	Risk damage from storms	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Conserve and enhance biodiversity	Maintain designated sites Does the policy or proposal have a significant impact on European designated sites, when considered on its own or with other plans or proposals?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Deliver targets of Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reverse decline in farmland birds	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Historical and archaeological importance	Protect designated historical sites	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Protect designated archaeological sites	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Protect designated geological sites	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Landscapes and townscapes	Reduce underused land	Possible indirect negative	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	Sites near pollution sources may be suitable for development in other ways but may not be considered due to their location
	Improve landscape/ townscape	Potential positive	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	Development away from sources of pollution will ensure both natural and built environment cleaner
Summary of appraisal against environmental objectives		Most of the advantages are related to the location of development enabling sustainable methods of transport and reducing need to travel at all, as well as the resultant lower use of fuel and energy and the associated improvements to air quality and environment								

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 1 Development should be located away from sources of air pollution and encouraged in locations which minimise the use of the car

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:	
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating		
Economic Indicators											
Economic growth	Improve business development	Some positive some negative	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Will have positive impact on “greener” businesses but potential negative on polluting industries.
	Promote growth in key sectors	No direct link	0	+	+	+	+	0	+	Likely to promote investment in “clean/green” industry-particularly for the most accessible locations.	
	Economic performance	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Rural diversification	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
To revitalise town centres	Increase range of employment opportunities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	Decrease vacant units in town centres?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Potential for improvement by supporting development in locations which will reduce the need for the private car but likely to be limited.	
To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Will it reduce commuting	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Improve accessibility to work	Could be positive and negative for some sectors	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	By locating development in places where there is minimised use of personal car accessibility should be improved, however it could be harder to access “pollutant” industries so care will be needed when defining what level of pollution constitutes a source of pollution.	
	Reduce journey times between employment areas	Potentially mixed outcomes	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Could decrease for some but equally could increase for other, more “polluting” employment.	
	Increase freight transported	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 1 Development should be located away from sources of air pollution and encouraged in locations which minimise the use of the car

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
	Increase consumption of local goods	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Increase investment	Encourage indigenous business	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Encourage inward investment	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Make land available for business development	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Summary appraisal against economic objectives Some positive and some negative- generally negative for those sectors which are deemed to be polluting, and positive for those greener, more environmentally friendly industries.

Conclusions:
Benefits arise in many places where the benefits stem from the location of development in sustainable, accessible locations to reduce the need of the car and away from sources of pollution. This is beneficial for health and environment in new development, but existing development which is a source of pollution or near a source of pollution could potentially become less accessible and therefore suffer from the related problems this will introduce. Emphasis on the sustainable location will be reflected throughout the document.

Score	++ Major positive	+ Minor positive	- Minor negative	- - Major negative	0 Neutral effect	? Uncertain effect
	9	6	1	0	43	3

Recommendations:
The definition and “acceptable” levels of pollution would need to be carefully defined if this policy is used. The steer towards accessible sustainable locations will also be reflected in other policies.

Key to Appraisal of Effects

Will the policy make a positive or negative contribution to the appraisal objective?

++ Major positive + Minor positive - Minor negative - - Major negative 0 Neutral effect ? Uncertain effect

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 2 Development should only be allowed in areas where pollution is an issue where mitigation measures are put in place

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Notes
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
Health	Health facilities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Death rates	No direct impact, although will not get worse	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	By following this option, the situation would not get worse.
	Healthy lifestyles	Improvement	+	+	+	+	?	?	+	Likely to result in overall improvement for areas that do get developed
Education	Improve Qualifications	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Crime and anti-social activities	Will reduce crime	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce fear of crime	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce noise and odours	Possible improvement	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	May also help area wider than just that in which the development takes place and so potentially will improve overall situation
Poverty and social exclusion	Reduce poverty	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Access key services	Access key local services	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Accessibility of shopping facilities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Access child care	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Employment	Unemployment	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Job opportunities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve earnings	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Housing	Reduce homelessness	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Provide enough housing	Potential negative impact	-	-	-	-	?	?	-	If mitigation measures are required, it may mean that housing, particularly smaller developments, does not come forwards
	Increase range and affordability	Potential negative impact	-	-	-	-	?	?	-	As above, increased costs may result in affordable/lower cost housing not coming forwards

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 2 Development should only be allowed in areas where pollution is an issue where mitigation measures are put in place

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Notes
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
	Reduce no of unfit homes	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Community participation	Satisfaction of neighbourhood	Possible improvement (particularly in areas where pollution is an issue)	+	+	+	+	?	?	+	Due to mitigation and prevention of development where it is no in place, people may be more satisfied
	Increase green space	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Engagement in decision making	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Involvement in volunteer activities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve ethnic relations	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve access to cultural facilities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Summary of appraisal against social objectives		Improvements will be seen in areas where there is a problem and development goes ahead. There could be a risk that the increased costs will result in less development coming forwards, and the situation will therefore not improve. There are relatively restricted impacts on social objectives as the option relates solely to air quality and pollution.								
Environmental Indicators										
Water and air quality	Quality of water	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Quality of air		+	++	++	+	0	0	++	By the theory behind the option, there will be a significant improvement- particularly where there is an issue with air quality
To conserve soil resources and quality	Minimise loss of Greenfield land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Loss agricultural land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Soil quality	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Use of water and mineral resources	Sustainable use of minerals	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 2 Development should only be allowed in areas where pollution is an issue where mitigation measures are put in place

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Notes
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
	Sustainable use of water	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduce waste	Reduce household waste	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase recycling	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduce effects of traffic	Effect traffic volumes	Likely to improve	0	+?	+?	+	+	+	+	Requiring air quality to improve (and refusing permission where development would make it worse) would be likely to encourage measures to be introduced that would reduce the need to travel, particularly using the personal car, and improving availability/accessibility of public transport.
	Reduce need for local travel		0	0	0	+	+	+	+	
	Increase car journeys by sustainable methods	Potential improvement	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	
Reduce contributions to climate change	Reducing energy consumption?	Potential improvement	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	Reduce the need to travel by car and therefore reducing energy requirements.
	Increase proportion of energy needs met by renewable sources?	No direct link	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	BY requiring energy that is not polluting- alternatives may be used.
Vulnerability to climatic events	Minimise risk of flooding	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Risk damage from storms	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Conserve and enhance biodiversity	Maintain designated sites Does the policy or proposal have a significant impact on European designated sites, when considered on its own or with other plans or proposals?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 2 Development should only be allowed in areas where pollution is an issue where mitigation measures are put in place

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Notes
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
	Deliver targets of Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reverse decline in farmland birds	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Historical and archaeological importance	Protect designated historical sites	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Protect designated archaeological sites	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Protect designated geological sites	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Landscapes and townscapes	Reduce underused land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve landscape/ townscape	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Summary of appraisal against environmental objectives			Overall encouragement of reducing pollutants and preventing development where it would adversely effect the air quality and mitigation measures are not in place would generally provide benefits to the environment							
Economic Indicators										
Economic growth	Improve business development	+ & -	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	There may be an adverse impact on the growth of industries/sectors with related emissions/pollutants. Conversely, there could be opportunities for those that embrace greener technologies.
	Promote growth in key sectors	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Economic performance	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Rural diversification	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To revitalise town centres	Increase range of employment opportunities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 2 Development should only be allowed in areas where pollution is an issue where mitigation measures are put in place

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Notes
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
	Decrease vacant units in town centres?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Will it reduce commuting	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve accessibility to work	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce journey times between employment areas	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase freight transported	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Likely to encourage sustainable movement of freight but unclear whether this would be significant.
	Increase consumption of local goods	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Increase investment	Encourage indigenous business	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Encourage inward investment	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Make land available for business development	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Summary appraisal against economic objectives | Limited effects- and those present depend on what type of business and whether it is able to be run in a “green” fashion.

Conclusions:

There are relatively limited effects as this option is fairly narrow- relating only to air quality and pollution.

There will be positive effects for new development and the surrounding areas, but potentially negative effects for existing development, particularly those with pollution below the threshold for “requiring attention” what ever that is set at (e.g. using national standards).

Score	++ Major positive	+ Minor positive	- Minor negative	- - Major negative	0 Neutral effect	? Uncertain effect
	3	6	2	0	50	1

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 2 Development should only be allowed in areas where pollution is an issue where mitigation measures are put in place

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects							Notes
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	

Recommendations:

The levels above which to apply the requirement to provide contributions would have to be set (e.g. higher than national). Consideration would have to be given to levels of contributions.

Key to Appraisal of Effects

Will the policy make a positive or negative contribution to the appraisal objective?

++ Major positive + Minor positive - Minor negative -- Major negative 0 Neutral effect ? Uncertain effect

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 3 A specific policy should be developed to increase the air quality management to try to improve air quality in the district										
Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
Social Indicators										
Health	Health facilities	No direct link	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	A policy would be likely to encourage development located in accessible locations, and support improved public transport which would help access to health facilities.
	Death rates	Potential positive	0	+	+	+	+	0	+	A policy would aim to improve air quality for all members of community- potentially reducing respiratory problems as well as encouraging more active lifestyles generally
	Healthy lifestyles	Improvement	++	++	++	+	+	+	++	As one method of improving air quality, emphasis on methods of transport other than the car would be concentrated on- leading to lower exposures to the pollutants related to ti and also increased proportion of journeys possible by walking/cycling and public transport.
Education	Improve Qualifications	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Crime and anti-social activities	Will reduce crime	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce fear of crime	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reduce noise and odours	Should improve	++	++	++	+	?	?	++	A policy reducing air pollution will likely have the knock on effect of reducing odours
Poverty and social exclusion	Reduce poverty	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Access key services	Access key local services	Potential improvements	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	Although indirect, any policy will encourage minimal use of cars and therefore improved access to services and facilities through walking/public transport.
	Accessibility of shopping facilities	Potential improvements	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 3 A specific policy should be developed to increase the air quality management to try to improve air quality in the district

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
	Access child care	Potential improvements	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	
Employment	Unemployment	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Job opportunities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve earnings	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Housing	Reduce homelessness	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Provide enough housing	Possible worsening of situation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	There is a risk that housing will be more tightly constrained in terms of associated pollutants, and also require higher costs for mitigation so some may not come forwards
	Increase range and affordability	Potentially get worse	-	-	-	?	?	?	-	With higher costs (as above), particularly affordable or low cost housing may not come forwards.
	Reduce no of unfit homes	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Community participation	Satisfaction of neighbourhood	Improvement	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	Likely to improve, particularly for areas where there is a problem already as these would be a priority for an air quality management policy.
	Increase green space	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Engagement in decision making	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Involvement in volunteer activities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve ethnic relations	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve access to cultural facilities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Summary of appraisal against social objectives		There would be an improvement in terms of access to services and facilities by encouraging development in locations which reduces the need to use a car. The potential increase in cost to cover mitigation could result in lower development levels coming forwards.								

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 3 A specific policy should be developed to increase the air quality management to try to improve air quality in the district

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
Environmental Indicators										
Water and air quality	Quality of water	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Quality of air	Improvement	++	++	++	++	++	?	++	By definition, a policy relating to improving air quality would aim to do it if implemented
To conserve soil resources and quality	Minimise loss of Greenfield land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Loss agricultural land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Soil quality	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Use of water and mineral resources	Sustainable use of minerals	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Sustainable use of water	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduce waste	Reduce household waste	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase recycling	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Reduce effects of traffic	Effect traffic volumes	Improvement	+	++	++	+	+	0	++	A policy would seek to reduce traffic to reduce emissions and improve air quality, particularly in problem areas
	Reduce need for local travel	Significant improvement	++	++	++	+	+	?	++	A policy would seek to reduce the need to use cars by ensuring available services and facilities locally
	Increase car journeys	Significant improvement	++	++	++	+	+	?	++	
Reduce contributions to climate change	Reducing energy consumption?	Improvement indirectly	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	An aim of a policy would include reducing energy consumption (e.g. fuels) therefore reducing associated emissions and pollutants

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 3 A specific policy should be developed to increase the air quality management to try to improve air quality in the district

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
	Increase proportion of energy needs met by renewable sources?	Indirect improvement	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	A policy could seek to use a cleaner alternative to providing energy- e.g. renewables.
Vulnerability to climatic events	Minimise risk of flooding	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Risk damage from storms	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Conserve and enhance biodiversity	Maintain designated sites Does the policy or proposal have a significant impact on European designated sites, when considered on its own or with other plans or proposals?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Development around sites of importance is tightly controlled already.
	Deliver targets of Suffolk Biodiversity Action Plan	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Reverse decline in farmland birds	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Historical and archaeological importance	Protect designated historical sites	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 3 A specific policy should be developed to increase the air quality management to try to improve air quality in the district										
Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
	Protect designated archaeological sites	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Protect designated geological sites	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Landscapes and townscapes	Reduce underused land	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Improve landscape/ townscape	Potential for improvement	0	+	+	0	?	?	+	By improving the air quality, the natural and built environments will see improvement.
Summary of appraisal against environmental objectives			Generally a policy aiming to improve the air quality will be beneficial for the environment							
Economic Indicators										
Economic growth	Improve business development	Could be positive or negative	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Depending on the type of business/industry- traditional industries or businesses may suffer if they are classified as being a “pollutant”, but conversely, those businesses embracing “greener” methods may well thrive
	Promote growth in key sectors	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Economic performance	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Rural diversification	No direct link	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	A policy such as this could prove detrimental to rural diversification as development could be considered to be contrary to sustainability aims.
To revitalise town centres	Increase range of employment opportunities	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 3 A specific policy should be developed to increase the air quality management to try to improve air quality in the district

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
	Decrease vacant units in town centres?	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Will it reduce commuting	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
To encourage efficient patterns of movement in support of economic growth	Improve accessibility to work	Potential improvement	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	A policy would likely encourage locating development in places where there is minimised use of personal car-so accessibility should be improved
	Reduce journey times between employment areas	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Increase freight transported	No direct link	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	Any policy would aim to promote movement of freight by sustainable methods to reduce pollutants associated with lorries etc
	Increase consumption of local goods	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Increase investment	Encourage indigenous business	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Core Strategy Issues and Options: NBE4- Option 3 A specific policy should be developed to increase the air quality management to try to improve air quality in the district

Sustainability Objective	Sub Objective	Predicted Effects								Justification for assessment noting:
		Nature of Effect (quantify where possible)	Short Term	Med term	Long term	Secondary	Cumulative	Synergy	Rating	
	Encourage inward investment	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Make land available for business development	No direct link	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Summary appraisal against economic objectives

Would need a supporting policy specifically on rural diversification to support rural economic growth. Policies would promote sustainable economic development but not specifically impact on most of these indicators as it would primarily be about air quality.

Conclusions:
It is difficult at this stage to give a definite appraisal of the effects of a policy as there are no specific details but mostly the effects would be positive.

Score	++ Major positive	+ Minor positive	- Minor negative	- - Major negative	0 Neutral effect	? Uncertain effect
	6	11	3	0	41	1

Recommendations:
Could be linked with renewable energy policy or overall sustainable development/location policies.

Key to Appraisal of Effects

Will the policy make a positive or negative contribution to the appraisal objective?

++ Major positive + Minor positive - Minor negative - - Major negative 0 Neutral effect ? Uncertain effect