

REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL

*making
a
difference*

www.redditchbc.gov.uk



Sustainability Appraisal for the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy

21 January 11 - 4 March 11

Core Strategy Development Plan Document - Sustainability Appraisal (January 2011)

<u>Contents Page</u>	<u>Page</u>
Non-Technical Summary	4
1. Introduction	6
2. Core Strategy DPD Appropriate Assessment Screening Matrix	8
Appropriate Assessment	8
3. Background to the DPD	12
4. Sustainability Appraisal Stages and Tasks.....	13
The Five Stages of the Sustainability Appraisal Process:.....	13
5. Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	14
Draft Strategic Objectives of the Local Development Framework.....	15
Testing objectives	15
Table 1 - Matrix testing the compatibility of the sustainability appraisal objectives and the draft DPD objectives and assessing the cumulative effects of the DPD Objectives	17
Cumulative Effects	19
Cumulative impacts from the matrix testing the compatibility of the SA Objectives and the draft DPD Objectives.....	19
Compatibility of DPD Objectives	22
Table 2 - Matrix Testing the Compatibility of DPD Objectives	22
Inconsistencies/Conflicts between DPD Objectives	23
6. Strategic Issues for Assessment	24
Comparison of significant effects of the options	24
Prediction of effects	24
7. Proposed Mitigation Measures.....	25
Table 3 - Proposed mitigation measures	26
8. Proposals for monitoring.....	33
Table 6 - Sustainability Appraisal Objectives, Indicators, Comparators / Targets and Quantified Data	34
9. Statements	55
Statement of the Likely Significant Effects of the Proposal	55
Statement on the Difference the Process has made.....	55
Difficulties in collecting data and limitations of the data	56
10. Conclusion	57
Appendix A - Options Appraisal	58
1. Redditch's Development Strategy	59
Issue/Question - Where should future development be concentrated in Redditch Borough?	59
5. Creating Safe and Secure Environments	63
6. The Conflict between the Environment and Climate Change Adaptation	70
7. Proportion of Renewable Energy in New Developments	78
8. Standards of Development	81
9. Sustaining Redditch Borough's Rural Area	85
10. Coalescence of Settlements.....	89
14. Tall Buildings.....	91
15. Location of Employment	93
15b. Location of Employment	98
16. Existing Employment Areas	101
17. Diversification of the economy (previously: High Technology Corridor (HTC) and Economic Growth)	105

18. Redditch Town Centre	108
19. District Centres	119
20. Health Facilities	125
21. Leisure and Tourism	131
22. Open Space	136
23. Previously Developed Land	140
24. Development on Back Gardens	144
25. Housing Density	147
28. Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	152
29. Getting Around in Redditch Borough	156
29b. Getting Around in Redditch Borough	162
29c. Getting Around in Redditch Borough	166
29d. Getting Around in Redditch Borough	171
Appraisal of additional effects	176
Historic Environment	176
Redditch Distinctiveness	180
Town Centre Strategy	182
Office Development	184
Flood Risk and Water Management	188
Settlement Hierarchy	190
Landscape Character	192
Pollution	194
Trees	196
Natural Environment Policy	198
Appendix B - SA Assessment of Large and Strategic Sites	200
Appendix C - SA Assessment of WYG Options (Stage 1)	233
White Young Green Options – Report 2	240
SA Assessment of WYG Options (Stage 2)	241
Appendix D - Prediction of Core Strategy effects	261
Appendix E - SA of Joint Consultation Development Options	277

Location of SEA requirements in the SA Report

Information required to deal with the aspects of a Sustainability Appraisal (as set out in Annex 1 of the SEA Directive 2001/42/EC)	Relevant Sections in the SA
a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes	Scoping Report (Stage A1); Stage B1: Testing the Core Strategy DPD Objectives against the Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Page 14)
b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme	Scoping Report (Stage A2); Stage B2: Developing the DPD Options, Stage B3: Predicting the effects of the DPD and Stage B4: Evaluating the effects of the DPD (Page 24, Appendix C and Appendix E)
c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be	Scoping Report (Stage A2);

significantly affected	Stage B2: Developing the DPD Options, Stage B3: Predicting the effects of the DPD and Stage B4: Evaluating the effects of the DPD (Page 24, Appendix C and Appendix E, Table 6)
d) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC	Scoping Reports (Stage A2, A3); Appropriate Assessment Screening Matrix (Page 8)
e) The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the DPD and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation	Scoping Reports (Stage A1)
f) The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as: biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors	Scoping Reports (Stage A3); Stage B3, Stage B4, Effects of Options on SA Objectives Tables (Page 24, Page 55, Appendix A, Appendix C, Appendix D)
g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme	Stage B5 Mitigation Measures (Table 3 - Page 26)
h) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information	Statements (Page 55); Effects of Options on SA Objectives (Appendix A, Appendix B); Effects of options on DPD Objectives (Appendix A, Appendix B)
i) A description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Article 10/Regulation 17	Stage B6 - Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Core Strategy DPD (Page 33, Table 6)
j) A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings	Non-Technical summary (Page 4)

Non-Technical Summary

Introduction

This is a non-technical summary of a refresh to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report accompanying the Core Strategy DPD. The main report expands upon the contents of this non-technical summary.

This SA Report has been prepared alongside the Borough of Redditch's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) Revised Draft of November 2010. Consultation has already taken place on a Scoping Report, an Issues and Options Document and a Preferred Draft Core Strategy and revised development strategy with accompanying SA Reports at each of these stages, as well as an SA Refresh of March 2009 on Development Options around Redditch.

The purpose of a SA is to ensure that sustainability principles are incorporated into the DPD, and it demonstrates why the Borough Council's preferred options have been chosen. During the Core Strategy production lots of changes have impacted on how Redditch prepares the Core Strategy and when the policy approaches need to change the Borough Council needs to assess what effects these changes will bring.

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) requires Local Planning Authorities to carry out a SA of the documents which make up their Local Development Framework (LDF). The Core Strategy will be the first DPD to be adopted as part of the Borough of Redditch LDF, therefore a SA is needed.

The Scoping Report for the LDF was published for consultation with the designated environmental bodies of Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency and other bodies with economic and social responsibilities between 1 October 2007 and 5 November 2007. Comments received were considered and, in response, any relevant amendments to the Scoping Report were made, and have influenced the production of this SA. The Scoping Report contains many of the requirements of the SEA Directive and the SA Report contains the remaining requirements. The final LDF Scoping Report is available to view on Redditch Borough Council's website www.redditch.whub.org.uk.

Sustainability Appraisal Framework

The SA Framework was formulated during Stage A of the SA process (Scoping Report). The SA Framework includes a set of 18 SA Objectives which can be used to help achieve the sustainability of the LDF as a benchmark for assessing options. These SA objectives can be measured by using targets and indicators to see if any Local Development Document (LDD), or any aspects of a LDD are achieving what has been predicted. Each objective has a set of decision making criteria setting out how each objective can be achieved and indicators to answer the questions posed by the decision making criteria. The SA Framework can be seen in Table 6.

Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy DPD

The SA Framework was a sound basis for appraising the different options set out in the Core Strategy Issues and Options document and ultimately justifying the policy approaches in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy. The Issues and Options document issues were determined after reviewing the plans, policies and programmes and baseline information in the Scoping Report, through ongoing informal consultation and through evidence gathering. Each issue in the Issues and Options document had a set of alternative options intended as possible solutions to these questions. Each of these options was assessed in the SA Report to give an indication of the sustainability of the different Options to ensure that the Preferred Draft Core Strategy and its revised version are as sustainable as possible. The SA assessment of options at this stage is detailed in Appendix A.

This SA identifies the likely social, economic and environmental effects associated with implementation of the Core Strategy DPD when considering different options. The SA Report also identifies a number of likely effects associated with each option and the likelihood and scale of these effects as well as likely effects related to a revised development strategy. Mitigation measures have also been proposed that maximise any predicted beneficial effects of the proposed options or approaches and that minimise any predicted adverse effects.

The requirements of the SEA Directive have been incorporated into this SA where appropriate and a table highlighting the location (or locations) of these requirements is provided as part of this SA contents page. The SA incorporates the requirements for SEA as set by the SEA Directive.

Implementation and Monitoring

Once the Borough Council adopts the Core Strategy DPD, its effects will continue to be assessed against sustainability indicators, to measure how well the DPD has contributed to sustainability (as well as monitoring the indicators for the Core Strategy). The data collected will form the baseline to which future effects are compared and the results will help inform the preparation of future LDDs or revisions to existing LDF policies. The policies to be developed in the DPD will be monitored through the Borough Council's Annual Monitoring Report, which oversees the Borough of Redditch LDF.

1. Introduction

1.1 This Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report refresh includes Stage B and Stage C in the Sustainability Appraisal process of assessing the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD); however it has been refreshed to include Stage D2(i) of the SA process of appraising significant changes.

1.2 Stage A of the process involved the preparation of the Scoping Report which has informed this SA Report refresh. The Scoping Report was subject to consultation with the statutory consultation bodies of Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency and with other relevant consultees with social or economic responsibilities including:

- Advantage West Midlands
- Bromsgrove District Council
- Feckenham Parish Council
- Government Office of the West Midlands
- Malvern District Council
- Sport England
- Stratford-on-Avon District Council
- West Mercia Constabulary
- Wyre Forest District Council
- Worcester City Council
- Worcestershire County Council
- Wychavon District Council

1.3 Local Development Documents (LDDs) are spatial plans which need to be subjected to Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), under the European Union SEA Directive (2001/42/EC), and Sustainability Appraisal, in accordance with the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, Section 19 (5). This SA has had regard to the former ODPM (now DCLG) documents 'A Practical Guide to the SEA Directive: Practical Guidance on Applying European Directive 2001/42/EC on the Assessment of the Effects of Certain Plans and Programmes on the Environment 2005' and 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks: Guidance for Regional Planning Bodies and Local Planning Authorities' (2005).

1.4 This SA Report deals with the requirements of both the SEA Directive Regulations and the SA Regulations in the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The Directive requires that reference to Regulations in the SA Report should be clearly displayed. Therefore a table within the contents page to this SA Report sets out the location (or locations) of the relevant information within this document.

1.5 The SA aims to ensure that consideration has been given to which of the Core Strategy options are the most sustainable in order to deal with the spatial planning issues. The SA also aims to ensure that whatever emerges as the best option, that this is as sustainable as possible and is the

best approach when considering all reasonable alternatives in line with guidance contained in Planning Policy Statement 12 Local Spatial Plans and the requirements of the SEA Directive. This will help to inform the Published Core Strategy DPD which is anticipated to be the next stage of the preparation process of the Core Strategy following the consultation on the revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy. It has been possible to suggest measures to mitigate against any predicted adverse effects of any options and this is displayed in Section 7 of this SA Report refresh.

2. Core Strategy DPD Appropriate Assessment Screening Matrix

2.1 Appropriate Assessment (AA) is required under the European Directive 92/43/EEC on the 'conservation of natural habitats and wild flora and fauna' for plans that may have an impact on European (Natura 2000) Sites. These sites include Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) designated for species and habitats and Special Protected Areas (SPAs) designated for birds. AA is the assessment of the impacts of implementing a plan or policy on relevant Natura 2000 sites. Its purpose is to consider the impacts of a land-use plan against the conservation objectives of the site and to ascertain whether it would adversely affect the integrity of the site.

2.2 There are no Natura 2000 sites located in Redditch Borough. The closest is Bredon Hill, a Special Area of Conservation located in Wychavon District. Due to the distance of the SAC from the area covered by the DPD, it was considered unlikely that the implementation of the DPD would have a significant effect on the SAC. However, as a precautionary measure, the Appropriate Assessment Screening Matrix (based on European Commission Guidance, 2001) was applied to the DPD and SAC to determine their relationship.

2.3 The initial assessment concluded that the Core Strategy DPD is not likely to have a significant effect on the SAC; and as such no further assessment would be required. Following consideration of new matters which have been assessed as part of this SA, there are no options, policies or objectives which alter the position that there would be no effects.

Appropriate Assessment

Brief description of the Plan
<p>The Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) will form part of the Redditch Borough Local Development Framework (LDF). The Core Strategy will cover the entire administrative area of Redditch Borough but there may be limited cross-boundary development opportunities for housing or employment in neighbouring Bromsgrove and Stratford on Avon Districts.</p> <p>The draft strategic objectives of the LDF in the revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a

balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;

6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.

Brief description of the Natura 2000 site

Bredon Hill SAC covers an area of 359.86ha. It rises out of the Severn Vale in south-east Worcestershire, 4km south-east of Evesham. It is effectively an outlying part of the Cotswold escarpment, which lies close to the east, and is formed of the same Jurassic (205-142 million years ago) rocks. The main mass of Bredon Hill is formed by clays and silts deposited in shallow sea, which are overlain by the iron-rich sandy limestone of the Marlstone Rock. The top of the hill is formed by the shallow marine sands and limestones of the Middle Jurassic Inferior Oolite. A zone of large, fossil landslips can be seen on the southern slope of Bredon Hill, north of Kemerton. These have occurred at the junction between the Inferior Oolite and the underlying clays of the Lias. The clays form an impenetrable barrier to water, which seeps naturally through the porous limestone above, forming a natural spring-line around the southern flanks of Bredon Hill. Species resident on this site include the Violet click beetle (*Limoniscus violaceus*). It is a very important site for fauna associated with decaying timber on ancient trees, including many Red Data Book and Nationally Scarce invertebrate species.

Assessment Criteria

Describe the individual elements of the project (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects) likely to give rise to impacts on the Natura 2000 site

The DPD is not likely to give rise to impacts (either alone or in combination with other plans and projects) on the Natura 2000 site. None of the individual objectives, options or policies (including alternatives for flexibility) are likely to impact on the Natura 2000 site.

Describe any likely direct, indirect or secondary impacts of the project (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects) on the Natura 2000 site by virtue of size and scale, land take, distance from Natura 2000 site or key features of the site, resource requirements (e.g. water abstraction, etc), emissions (disposal to land / water / air), excavation requirements, transportation requirements, duration of construction, operation, decommissioning, etc and other.

<p>Plan area: The DPD applies to the whole of Redditch Borough. However, this Sustainability Appraisal and Screening Matrix take into account the possibility of limited development adjacent to Redditch for housing or employment in neighbouring Bromsgrove and Stratford Districts.</p> <p>Plan implementation period: It is anticipated that the DPD will be adopted in 2012 and will cover the period up until 2026.</p> <p>Size, scale, land-take: Not applicable as the DPD does not allocate land. Coverage of the Core Strategy amounts to the extent of the Redditch Borough Council Local Authority boundary only.</p> <p>Distance from Natura 2000 site: Not applicable as the DPD does not allocate land, however the Redditch Borough boundary is over 20 kilometres from the SAC.</p> <p>Physical changes resulting from the plan: The DPD will not result in any physical changes that will impact on the SAC.</p> <p>Resource requirements: The DPD will not result in resource requirements that will impact on the SAC.</p> <p>Emissions and waste: The Sustainability Appraisal that accompanies the DPD has an objective to deal with waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy. The Core Strategy does not go into detail on waste related matters and does encourage waste minimisation and allows scope for waste treatment facilities if required.</p> <p>Excavation requirements: The DPD does not require excavation work.</p> <p>Transportation requirements: The DPD has an objective 'To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;' and will require the provision of necessary transport infrastructure to support the implementation of its development strategy. No impacts are envisaged on the Natura 2000 site.</p> <p>Duration of construction, operation, decommissioning: Not applicable.</p> <p>Impacts resulting from the plans objectives: The DPD and its objectives will not result in any impacts upon the Natura 2000 site.</p>
<p>Describe any likely changes to the site arising as a result of reduction of habitat area, disturbance to key species, habitat or species fragmentation, reduction in species density, changes in key indicators of conservation value (e.g. water quality, etc) and climate change.</p>
<p>Reduction of habitat area: There will be no physical reduction or changes of habitat area of the SAC resulting from the DPD.</p> <p>Disturbance to key species: The DPD will not result in disturbance to key species.</p> <p>Habitat or species fragmentation: The DPD will not result in habitat or species fragmentation.</p> <p>Reduction in species density: The DPD will not result in a reduction in species density.</p> <p>Changes in key indicators of conservation value (e.g. water quality, etc): No changes are expected in key indicators of conservation value as a result of implementation of the DPD.</p> <p>Climate change: An objective of the DPD is 'to reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of, and adapt to climate change'. No negative effects are likely from the DPD.</p>
<p>Describe any likely impacts on the Natura 2000 site as a whole in terms of interference with the key relationships that define the structure and function of the site.</p>
<p>No likely impacts on the SAC site (as a whole in terms of interference with the key relationships that define the function or structure of the site) have been identified resulting from the DPD.</p>
<p>Provide indicators of significance as a result of the identification of effects set out above in terms of loss, fragmentation, disruption, disturbance and change to key elements of the site (e.g. water quality, etc).</p>

Not applicable as the DPD will not impact on the SAC.
Describe from the above those elements of the plan, or combination of elements, where the above impacts are likely to be significant or where the scale or magnitude of impacts are not known.
Not applicable as the DPD will not impact on the SAC.

3. Background to the DPD

3.1 The Core Strategy DPD began its preparation in June 2007 with the commencement of the LDF Scoping Report and other evidence gathering. In an effort to frontload the process of preparation, consultation bodies and the wider community were involved through informal consultation in the refinement of aspects of the Issues and Options Document and helped to formulate the Issues. Consultation was also undertaken at an early stage through a series of topic based citizen and stakeholder panels, neighbourhood group meetings etc.

3.2 The issues for the Issues and Options document were subject to consultation alongside a draft SA Report between 9 May 2008 and 20 June 2008. Old Regulation 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 required consultation on an Issues and Options Document, which proposed the key Issues for Redditch Borough and options to resolve those issues, as well as a draft Vision and Objectives.

3.3 The SA Report and comments received during consultation on Issues and Options helped to formulate the Preferred Draft Core Strategy which was subject to an ongoing consultation between 31st October 2008 - 8th May 2009. The Preferred Draft Core Strategy presented the Borough Council's most appropriate policy option after consideration of the context and all implications, in order to resolve the key planning issues in Redditch Borough.


3.4 The West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy was tested at an independent examination and the Panel Report was received in September 2009. The Panel Report makes a recommendation that Redditch Borough should aim to provide for 7,000 new dwellings (an increase on the Preferred Option target of 6,600 dwellings) in the period up until 2026. This includes a breakdown of 4,000 to be provided within the Borough, and therefore within the remit of the Redditch Core Strategy and also 3,000 dwellings within the District of Bromsgrove adjacent to Redditch's boundaries. Although the residential development target is only recommended to include an additional 400 dwellings, the implications of increasing the Redditch related target of around 4,000 from the Redditch Borough Council evidenced capacity of 2,243 dwellings presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy meant that the preferred development strategy needed to be changed. Redditch Borough Council consulted on development options including a change to Redditch's development strategy in February - March 2010.

3.5 Following the general election and change of Government in May 2010, the Government announced the intention to abolish the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy along with all other RSSs. Redditch Borough Council is to be given the option to determine its own evidenced development targets which is partly the subject of the revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy. The impacts of the locally generated housing targets and other development targets where appropriate have been assessed in this Sustainability Appraisal.

4. Sustainability Appraisal Stages and Tasks

4.1 This SA Report includes Stage B and Stage C of the SA process, however Stage D is completed as part of consultation on the SA Report, specifically Stage D2(i) for appraising significant changes. The whole SA process is described in the flow diagram below.

The Five Stages of the Sustainability Appraisal Process:



Stage B1: Testing the Core Strategy DPD Objectives against the Sustainability Appraisal Framework

5. Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

5.1 Outlined below are the 18 objectives which constitute the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives. These objectives are taken from the SA Framework which was developed and refined through consultation on the LDF Scoping Report.

5.2 Following these are the 12 draft objectives developed for the Core Strategy DPD which will apply to Redditch Borough's LDF, formulated in conjunction with the public and other stakeholders during informal and formal consultation on Issues and Options and consultation on the Preferred Draft Core Strategy. The SA Objectives are used to test the draft objectives for the Core Strategy DPD. The findings can be found in a matrix at Table 2.

1. To manage waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy: reduce, reuse, recycle, compost, recovery, disposal;
2. Reduce causes of and adapt to the impacts of climate change;
3. To reduce the need to travel and move towards more sustainable travel patterns;
4. Develop a knowledge-driven economy, with the appropriate employment land, infrastructure and skills base whilst ensuring all share the benefits urban and rural;
5. To provide opportunities for communities to participate in and contribute to decisions that affect their neighbourhood and quality of life, encouraging pride and social responsibility in the local community;
6. Promote and support the development of new technologies, of high value and low impact, especially resource efficient technologies and environmental technology initiatives;
7. Protect and improve the quality of water, soil and air and water resources;
8. Ensure development does not occur in high-risk flood prone areas and does not adversely contribute to fluvial flood risks or contribute to surface water flooding in all other areas;
9. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres and the quality of, and equitable access to, local services and facilities, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio - economic status or educational attainment;
10. Safeguard and strengthen landscape and townscape character and quality;
11. To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity;
12. To improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health;
13. Provide decent affordable housing for all, of all the right quality and tenure for local needs, in clean, safe and pleasant local environments;
14. To raise the skills levels and qualifications of the workforce;
15. Reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour;
16. Conserve and enhance the architectural, cultural and archaeological heritage and seek well-designed, resource efficient, high quality built environment in new development proposals;
17. Ensure efficient use of land through safeguarding of mineral reserves, the best and most versatile agricultural lands, land of Green Belt value, maximising use of previously

developed land and reuse of vacant buildings, where this is not detrimental to open space and biodiversity interest;

18. Promote resource efficiency and energy generated from renewable energy and low carbon sources.

Draft Strategic Objectives of the Local Development Framework

1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.

Testing objectives

5.3 The draft objectives have been checked against the SA Objectives. This has enabled conflicts between objectives to be identified and the draft DPD Objectives have been adjusted to make them as consistent as possible with the aims of sustainability. Comments received during Issues and Options consultation and consultation on the draft SA, as well as the Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation have informed changes to the SA Objectives and DPD Objectives and this

matrix has been updated to take into account any recommended changes to the Objectives made since these consultations. Changes to the objectives were also needed in response to the latest changes in Government and the flexibility for Redditch Borough Council to evidence its own development targets.

5.4 The sustainability matrix below is a tool for testing the SA Objectives against the draft objectives for the Core Strategy. This analysis is helpful to prioritise which of the objectives are more important to achieve. The matrix consists of a marking system, where a colour represents the level of conflict or compatibility.

- For objectives that are deemed to be 'Positively compatible' – Draft DPD objectives support the sustainability appraisal objectives;
- For objectives that are deemed to be 'Potentially positive' – Draft DPD objectives may be sustainable and support sustainability appraisal objectives with mitigation measures;
- For objectives that are deemed to be 'Neutral' – Draft DPD objectives have a balance of negative and positive outcomes;
- For objectives that are deemed to have 'Possible conflict' – Draft DPD objectives conflict with sustainability appraisal objectives. The draft DPD objective needs to propose mitigating measures or a preferential objective needs to be selected; and
- For objectives that are deemed to have 'No relationship/Unsure' – Either there is no identifiable relationship or information is not available to appraise the objective.

5.5 At the bottom of Table 2, the secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects of each draft DPD objective have been described and the final column of the table describes the effects of the SA Objectives. The secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects are scored by adding or subtracting the scores for each draft DPD objective and SA Objective and recording the total score. The scoring to evaluate the effects is detailed in the key to accompany Table 2 below.






Key		
Positively compatible		+2
Potentially positive		+1
Neutral		0
Possible conflict		-1 / -2 (dependant on its severity)
No relationship/Unsure		0
MM	Mitigation measures applied	

Table 1 - Matrix testing the compatibility of the sustainability appraisal objectives and the draft DPD objectives and assessing the cumulative effects of the DPD Objectives

Objectives	1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with National standards;	3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Borough's landscape and Redditch's other distinctive features;	5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility, maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities, including Abbey Stadium;	7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at former New Town District Centres;	8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk	12. To ensure that there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning	Cumulative effects of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives (Core Strategy preferred draft October 2008 plus Development Options consultation February 2010)	Cumulative effects of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives (Core Strategy Preferred draft November 2010)	+/-
1. To manage waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy: reduce, reuse, recycle, compost, recovery, disposal;									MM				+ 9 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 8 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	-1
2. Reduce causes of and adapt to the impacts of climate change;													+ 15 = The SA objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	+ 11 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	-4
3. To reduce the need to travel and move towards more sustainable travel patterns;									MM	MM			+ 9 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 15 = The SA objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	+6
4. Develop a knowledge-driven economy, with the appropriate employment land, infrastructure and skills base whilst ensuring all share the benefits urban and rural;													+ 4 = The SA objective has a predicted small positive cumulative effect	+ 5 = The SA objective has a predicted small positive cumulative effect	+1
5. To provide opportunities for communities to participate in and contribute to decisions that affect their neighbourhood and quality of life, encouraging pride and social responsibility in the local community;													+ 5 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 3 = The SA objective has a predicted small positive cumulative effect	-2
6. Promote and support the development of new technologies, of high value and low impact, especially resource efficient technologies and environmental technology initiatives;													+ 6 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 5 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	-1
7. Protect and improve the quality of water, soil and air and water resources;									MM (-2)	MM (-2)			+ 8 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 4 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	-4
8. Ensure development does not occur in high-risk flood prone areas and does not adversely contribute to fluvial flood risks or contribute to surface water flooding in all other areas;													+ 4 = The SA objective has a predicted small positive cumulative effect	+ 9 = The SA objective has a predicted small positive cumulative effect	+5
9. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres and the quality of, and equitable access to, local services and facilities, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio - economic status or educational attainment;						MM							+ 12 = The SA objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	+ 12 = The SA objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	+1
10. Safeguard and strengthen landscape and townscape character and quality;			MM (-1)										+ 10 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 8 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	-2
11. To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity;	MM												+ 11 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 8 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	-3

Objectives	1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with National standards;	3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Borough's landscape and Redditch's other distinctive features;	5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility, maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities, including Abbey Stadium;	7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at former New Town District Centres;	8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk	12. To ensure that there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning	Cumulative effects of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives (Core Strategy preferred draft October 2008 plus Development Options consultation February 2010)	Cumulative effects of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives (Core Strategy Preferred draft November 2010)	+/-
12. To improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health;													+ 10 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 13 = The SA objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	+3
13. Provide decent affordable housing for all that is cheap to run, of all the right quality and tenure for local needs, in clean, safe and pleasant local environments;	MM (-1)	MM	MM (-1)	MM	MM								+ 4 = The SA objective has a predicted small positive cumulative effect	+ 4 = The SA objective has a predicted small positive cumulative effect	0
14. To raise the skills levels and qualifications of the workforce;													+ 6 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 4 = The SA objective has a predicted small positive cumulative effect	-2
15. Reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour;													+ 3 = The SA objective has a predicted small positive cumulative effect	+ 3 = The SA objective has a predicted small positive cumulative effect	0
16. Conserve and enhance the architectural, cultural and archaeological heritage and seek well-designed, resource efficient, high quality built environment in new development proposals;													+ 12 = The SA objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	+ 12 = The SA objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	0
17. Ensure efficient use of land through safeguarding of mineral reserves, the best and most versatile agricultural lands, land of Green Belt value, maximising use of previously developed land and reuse of vacant buildings, where this is not detrimental to open space and biodiversity interest;									MM (-1)	MM (-1)			+3 = The SA objective has a predicted small positive cumulative effect	+ 7 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+5
18. Promote resource efficiency and energy generated from renewable energy and low carbon sources.													+ 13 = The SA objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	+ 11 = The SA objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+2
Cumulative effects of Core Strategy DPD Objectives (Core Strategy preferred draft October 2008 plus Development Options consultation February 2010)	+ 15 = The DPD objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	+ 11 = The DPD objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 18 = The DPD objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	+ 10 = The DPD objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 10 = The DPD objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 10 = The DPD objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 11 = The DPD objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 13 = The DPD objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	+ 6 = The DPD objective has a small predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 9 = The DPD objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 16 = The DPD objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	n/a new objective			
Cumulative effects of Core Strategy DPD Objectives (Core Strategy Preferred draft December 2010)	+ 20 = The DPD objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	+ 11 = The DPD objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 14 = The DPD objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	+ 9 = The DPD objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 10 = The DPD objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 10 = The DPD objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 13 = The DPD objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	+ 13 = The DPD objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	+ 8 = The DPD objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 12 = The DPD objective has a predicted significant positive cumulative effect	+ 18 = The DPD objective has a predicted positive cumulative effect	+ 6 = The DPD objective has a small predicted positive cumulative effect			
	+5	-	-4	-1	-	-	+2	-	+2	+3	+2	n/a			

Cumulative Effects

5.6 The SEA Directive requires that consideration is given to any possible resulting secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects. One of the advantages of carrying out a SA is that the combined effects of different measures can be more effectively identified. Definitions of these effects include:

- Secondary / indirect effects: effects which are not a direct result of the DPD but occur away from the original effect or as a result of a complex pathway;
- Cumulative effects: these arise where several developments each have an insignificant effect but together have a significant effect; and
- Synergistic effects: the effects interact to produce a total effect greater than the sum of the individual effects. Synergistic effects often happen as habitats, resources or human communities get close to capacity.

Cumulative impacts from the matrix testing the compatibility of the SA Objectives and the draft DPD Objectives

5.7 The SA Objectives and draft DPD objectives matrix shows that there are no predicted negative cumulative effects of any of the DPD objectives on sustainability. The combined effects of the DPD objectives are largely positive. Since the latest alterations to the wording of the DPD objectives, and more significantly the changes to the policy approaches between the Preferred Draft Core Strategy of October 2008 and the revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy of January 2011; some of the overall cumulative effects have changed. Notably, the SA Objectives to minimise the need to travel and efficient use of land have understandably were predicted to have an overall less positive effect on sustainability than because of the implications of the greater development requirements and the potential locations to accommodate these requirements. Also the potential for large scale renewables or positive effects on affordability of housing for example, will reduce given that the larger scale greenfield sites would not be preferred.

5.8 In some individual instances, there are predicted to be possible conflicts between a draft DPD objective and a SA objective being implemented. Also there are instances where a positive effect is predicted so long as appropriate mitigation measures are in place. A commentary is provided below on the nature of the conflict and how the conflict can be resolved.

5.9 The draft **DPD Objective 1** is predicted to have a **positively compatible** effect when combined with **SA Objective 11**. This is predicted because there is the potential for open space to have high biodiversity value and this can be enhanced. Only with appropriate mitigation measures can a potentially positive score be achieved.

5.10 The draft **DPD Objective 1** is predicted to have a **possible conflict** with **SA Objective 13**. This is predicted because there is the potential for open space to be developed for housing development. The effects have been scored as -1 in this case because the likelihood of requiring open spaces for development is not high. The impacts of this effect can be reduced with appropriate mitigation measures.

5.11 The draft **DPD Objectives 2 and 3** are predicted to have a **potentially positive** effect and a **possible conflict** when combined with **SA Objective 13**. This is predicted because there is potential to reduce reliance on non-renewable energy sources by encouraging appropriate design and construction of residential dwellings. Only with appropriate mitigation measures can a potentially positive score be achieved.

5.12 The draft **DPD Objective 3** has been predicted to have a possible conflict with **SA Objective 10**. This has been predicted because in some cases there is a possibility of measures to minimise the impacts of climate change to have negative effects on the landscape and townscape quality. The effects have been scored -1 in this case because with appropriate mitigation measures this conflict can be resolved.

5.13 The draft **DPD Objective 4** has been predicted to have a **neutral effect** with **SA Objective 13**. Although there are stringent measures in place in planning policy to ensure the protection and restoration of the historic environment, some residential proposals have the potential to harm these features. The scale of housing required in Redditch had increased necessitating a refreshed SA prediction for these combined effects, however the effects are not likely to be significant and with appropriate mitigation measures there should be no negative effects.

5.14 The draft **DPD Objective 5** has been predicted to have a **potentially positive** effect when combined with **SA Objective 13**. This is predicted because development can be located where there is more potential to reduce the need to travel. Redditch's urban area is prioritised as the focus for development. Although the increased housing requirements for Redditch necessitated large greenfield sites to be released within the Borough and in neighbouring Bromsgrove District, the nature of Redditch being a small self contained urban area means that there are no likely negative effects. However, only with appropriate mitigation measures can a potentially positive score be achieved.

5.15 The draft **DPD Objective 6** has been predicted to have a **significantly positive** effect when combined with **SA Objective 3**. This has been predicted because Redditch tourism and cultural assets are within the Town Centre and also at the northern part of the urban area, and the Arrow Valley County Park which is well integrated into the town and is accessible by a range of modes of transport including sustainable transport. With appropriate mitigation measures the positive effects can be enhanced.

5.16 The draft **DPD Objective 6** has been predicted to have a **significantly positive** effect when combined with **SA Objective 9**. This has been predicted because there are opportunities to enhance the visitor economy, cultural and leisure opportunities and this would need to be ensured through promotion of the Town Centre as the most accessible location. Only with appropriate mitigation measures can a potentially positive score be achieved.

5.17 The draft **DPD Objective 9** has been predicted to have a **potentially positive effect** when combined with **SA Objective 1**. This has been predicted because there is the potential to encourage all new residential dwellings to incorporate sustainable waste management facilities. Only with appropriate mitigation measures can a potentially positive score be achieved.

5.18 The draft **DPD Objectives 9 and 10** has been predicted to have a **significantly positive effect** and a **potentially positive effect** when combined with **SA Objective 3**. This has been predicted because the delivery of homes should be located where it would be most sustainable, where the need to travel is reduced and the need for major infrastructure requirements is reduced. Although there was an increase in development requirements for Redditch, the nature of the urban area being small means that there is not likely to a negative effect. However, only with appropriate mitigation measures can these positive scores be achieved.

5.19 The draft **DPD Objectives 9 and 10** has been predicted to have **possible conflicts** with **SA Objective 7**. This was predicted because the need to meet the requirements set through the WMRSS in Redditch Borough would have a negative effect on the environment, especially because large proportions of development would have been needed to be built on greenfield land. The effects have been scored -2 in this case because of the high potential for effects however with appropriate mitigation measures this conflict can be minimised.

5.20 The draft **DPD Objectives 9 and 10** has been predicted to have **possible conflicts** with **SA Objective 17**. This is because the need to meet the requirements set through the WMRSS in Redditch Borough was predicted to have a negative effect on the environment, especially because some development will have been needed to be built on greenfield land and Green Belt land,. The effects have been scored -1 in this case because of the high potential for effects with appropriate mitigation measures this conflict can be minimised.

Compatibility of DPD Objectives

5.21 The purpose of this matrix is to assess each of the DPD Objectives against one another. There are inconsistencies or conflicts between objectives and this process has highlighted these (as a ✖) as well as the objectives that are compatible with one another (as a ✓). Where there is no relationship between objectives a – is indicated. The matrix has been changed to take into account the latest changes to the draft DPD Objectives.

Table 2 - Matrix Testing the Compatibility of DPD Objectives

1													
2	✓												
3	✓	✓											
4	✓	✓	✓										
5	-	✓	✓	✓									
6	✓	-	-	✓	✓								
7	✓	-	-	✓	-	✓							
8	✓	-	-	✓	✓	✓	✓						
9	✓	✓	✓	✖	✓	-	✓	✓					
10	✓	✓	✓	✖	✓	-	✓	✓	✖				
11	✓	-	-	✓	-	✓	-	✓	✓	✓			
12	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	-	-	-		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	

Inconsistencies/Conflicts between DPD Objectives

5.22 DPD Objective 4 versus DPD Objective 9 - A conflict has been identified here between the objective to protect, promote and enhance the quality of the Borough's landscape and Redditch Boroughs distinctive features and the objective to have sufficient homes meeting needs. This conflict has been identified because the construction of housing has the potential to result in a negative effect on the environment. To ensure this conflict is not realised, mitigation measures can resolve this potential conflict and there is no need to prioritise any objectives.

5.23 DPD Objective 4 versus DPD Objective 10 – A conflict has been identified here between the objective to protect, promote and enhance the quality of the Borough's landscape and Redditch Boroughs distinctive features and the objective to have a strong economic base and sufficient employment land. This conflict has been identified because the construction of employment land has the potential to result in a negative effect on the environment. To ensure this conflict is not realised, mitigation measures can resolve this potential conflict and there is no need to prioritise any objectives.

5.24 DPD Objective 9 versus DPD Objective 10 – A conflict has been identified here between the objective to have sufficient homes to meet needs and the objective to have a strong economic base and sufficient employment land. This conflict has been identified because there are two competing land uses; housing and employment, vying to be located in the most sustainable locations within a Borough with constrained land supply. However in the West Midlands region, the SA process undertaken as part of the RSS Phase Two Revision suggests that the compatibility between an objective to accommodate a sufficient number of homes and an objective to modernise the Regions economy and ensure opportunities for growth are linked to meeting needs and reducing social exclusion, has been determined to be 'neutral' therefore no indication of priority is provided here. Because of the need to balance the amount of housing and employment, neither objective needs to be prioritised.

5.25 DPD Objective 9 versus DPD Objective 11 - A conflict has been identified here between the objective to have sufficient homes meeting needs and to protect and enhance water, air and soil because water, air and soil can be affected by the construction of residential and other related development. Mitigation measures can resolve this potential conflict therefore there is no need to prioritise one objective over another.

5.26 DPD Objective 10 versus DPD Objective 13 - A conflict has been identified here between having a strong economic base and sufficient employment land and to protect and enhance water, air and soil because water, air and soil can be affected by the construction of employment land and its development. Mitigation measures can resolve this potential conflict therefore there is no need to prioritise one objective over another.

Stage B2: Developing the DPD Options, Stage B3: Predicting the effects of the DPD and Stage B4: Evaluating the Effects of the DPD

6. Strategic Issues for Assessment

6.1 A key requirement of the SA is to consider reasonable alternative options as part of the assessment process. As a minimum, the Borough Council is required to consider the effects of having no options, essentially doing-nothing which is termed 'business as usual'. This option has included in the SA where appropriate. Other options presented should therefore theoretically set out to improve the situation which would exist if there were no DPD.

6.2 The development and appraisal of options is an on-going iterative process where new options arising as a result of consultation have been assessed and new options emerging as the evidence base progresses have also been factored in.

Comparison of significant effects of the options

6.3 One of the purposes of an SA Report is to predict the effects of the DPD in social, environmental and economic terms. Potential effects will need to be quantified where possible, or a subjective judgement needs to be made. Prediction of the effects in this SA will involve:

- Identifying the changes to the sustainability baseline which are predicted to arise from the options or approaches for the DPD; and
- Describing these changes where possible in terms of their magnitude, their geographical scale, the time period over which they will occur, whether they are permanent or temporary, positive or negative, probable or improbable, frequent or rare, and whether or not there are cumulative and/or synergistic effects.

Prediction of effects

6.4 Overall the revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy has many positive effects predicted on sustainability, however in order to assess the extent to which sustainability would be achieved, the table at Appendix D - Prediction of Core Strategy Effects provides an overall assessment of the revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy against the SA Framework.

6.5 Prediction of the effects at Issues and Options stage is included at Appendix A. Other effects have been predicted such as the effects of implementing the potential large and strategic sites in Redditch (Appendix B); the effects of various development options in and around Redditch Borough to accommodate development requirements at Appendix C focussing on the WYG Stage 1 options and prediction of the effects of the implementation (or not) of joint consultation development options from February 2010 is included at Appendix E.

Stage B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects

7. Proposed Mitigation Measures

7.1 The table below identifies the key positive and negative effects found when checking the compatibility between the draft DPD objectives and the SA Objectives. Mitigation measures are also included where potential negative or positive effects have been identified from the analysis of the Options against SA Objectives and DPD Objectives (Stages B2, B3 and B4). There are appropriate mitigation measures proposed to ensure that compatibility between objectives, or achievement of a specific outcome is maximised. There are recommendations to mitigate against the predicted significant adverse effects and to improve positive effects where they have been identified. These measures are recommendations on how to improve the sustainability of the Core Strategy DPD.

Table 3 - Proposed mitigation measures

Negative / Neutral / Positive Effects	Proposed Mitigation
Draft DPD Objective 1 "To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a GI network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity" versus SA Objective 11 "To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity". The matrix at Table 1 predicted that these objectives were positively compatible.	The positive effect predicted can only be achieved if biodiversity is enhanced within areas of existing and future open space. A suitable policy approach can be developed in the Core Strategy unless National Planning Guidance can be relied upon to provide sufficient detail to guide decision making on planning applications.
Draft DPD Objective 1 "To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a GI network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity" versus SA Objective 13 "Provide decent affordable housing for all that is cheap to run, of the right quality and tenure for local needs, in clean, safe and pleasant local environments". The matrix at Table 1 predicted that there would be possible conflict between these two objectives.	The need for Redditch to maintain its high standards of open space must be weighed against the need to accommodate development. The Core Strategy does not propose allocations of sites, therefore this is not possible to achieve within a Core Strategy policy but is considered when developing the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment annually.
Draft DPD Objectives 2 "To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with National Standards" and 3 "To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change" versus SA Objective 13 "Provide decent affordable housing for all that is cheap to run, of the right quality and tenure for local needs, in clean, safe and pleasant local environments". The matrix at Table 1 predicted that there would be a slight positive effect for both of these DPD objectives.	The slight positive effect predicted for both of these DPD Objectives can only be achieved if the Core Strategy promotes the need for a target for the production of energy from renewable sources and ensures that the design and construction of dwellings is promoted to be in line with national requirements. A suitable policy approach should be developed in the Core Strategy to reflect these requirements.
Draft DPD Objective 4 "To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Borough's landscape and Redditch's other distinctive features" versus SA Objective 13 "Provide decent affordable housing for all that is cheap to run, of all the right quality and tenure for local needs, in clean, safe and pleasant local environments". The matrix at Table 1 predicted that there would be a neutral effect	A positive outcome can be achieved for these objectives against each other through the implementation of the Natural Environment Policy

Negative / Neutral / Positive Effects	Proposed Mitigation
between these two objectives.	
Draft DPD Objective 5 “To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility, maintaining the road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel” versus SA Objective 13 “Provide decent affordable housing for all that is cheap to run, of the right quality and tenure for local needs, in clean, safe and pleasant local environments”. The matrix at Table 1 predicted that there would be a potential slight positive effect.	The achievement of a positive sustainability outcome is achievable through the Settlement Hierarchy Policy, which directs development to the Borough’s most sustainable locations where sustainable travel options should be greater; and through the High Quality and Safe Design Policy which positively encourages greater accessibility, connectivity and permeability, aiding sustainable modes of movement.
Draft DPD Objective 6 “To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch’s cultural and leisure opportunities” versus SA Objective 9 “To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres and the quality of, and equitable access to, local services and facilities, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio-economic status or educational attainment”. The matrix at Table 1 predicted that there would be a potential significant positive effect.	In order to ensure that DPD Objective 6 is achieved, the Town Centre must be promoted as a cultural and tourist opportunity and also its vitality and viability must be ensured through the Core Strategy. A suitable policy approach should be developed in the Core Strategy to reflect this.
Draft DPD Objective 9 “To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites” versus SA Objective 1 “To manage waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy: reduce, reuse, recycle, compost, recovery, disposal”. The matrix at Table 1 predicted that there would be a potential slight positive effect.	The achievement of a positive sustainability outcome is only achievable if sustainable waste management is encouraged within new housing developments. A suitable policy approach can be developed in the Core Strategy to reflect this.
Draft DPD Objective 9 “To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites” versus SA Objective 3 “To reduce the need to travel and move towards more sustainable travel patterns”. The matrix at Table 1 predicted that there would be a potential slight positive effect by achieving these objectives.	In order to mitigate the effects of any possibility of conflicting objectives, the Core Strategy must ensure that a strong Development Strategy is in place which ensures housing developments are built in the most sustainable places. A suitable policy approach for the Development Strategy should be developed in the Core Strategy to reflect this.
Draft DPD Objective 9 “To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites” versus SA Objective 7 “Protect and improve the quality of	In order to mitigate the effects of these possibly conflicting objectives, the Core Strategy must ensure that there are appropriate standards to which all developments must meet

Negative / Neutral / Positive Effects	Proposed Mitigation
water, soil and air and water resources". The matrix at Table 1 predicted that there would be possible conflict between these two objectives.	with regards to the protection of water, soils and air and that measures are encouraged which improve these as part of any development. A suitable policy approach can be developed in the Core Strategy unless National/Regional Planning Policy can be relied upon.
Draft DPD Objective 9 "To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites" versus SA Objective 17 "Ensure efficient use of land through safeguarding of mineral reserves, the best and most versatile agricultural lands, land of Green Belt value, maximising use of previously developed land and reuse of vacant buildings, where this is not detrimental to open space and biodiversity interest". The matrix at Table 1 predicted that there would be possible conflict between these two objectives.	In order for Objective 9 to be met, i.e. in order to achieve development of sufficient numbers of dwellings, there may be negative effects on SA Objective 17. However, the Development Strategy can minimise these effects through the efficient use of land. A suitable policy approach for the Development Strategy should be developed in the Core Strategy to reflect this.
Draft DPD Objective 10 "To have a strong, attractive and diverse economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels" versus SA Objective 3 "To reduce the need to travel and move towards more sustainable travel patterns". The matrix at Table 1 predicted that there would be a potential slight positive effect by achieving these two objectives.	In order to mitigate the effects of these possibly conflicting objectives, the Core Strategy must ensure that a strong Development Strategy and Spatial Strategy is in place which ensures housing developments are built in the most sustainable places where the need to travel can be reduced and where sustainable modes of travel are more readily available. A suitable policy approach for the Development Strategy should be developed in the Core Strategy to reflect this.
Draft DPD Objective 10 "To have a strong, attractive and diverse economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels" versus SA Objective 7 "Protect and improve the quality of water, soil and air and water resources". The matrix at Table 1 predicted that there would be possible conflict between these two objectives.	In order to mitigate the effects of these possibly conflicting objectives, the Core Strategy must ensure that there are appropriate standards to which all developments must meet with regards to the protection of water, soils and air and that measures are encouraged which improve these as part of any development. A suitable policy approach can be

Negative / Neutral / Positive Effects	Proposed Mitigation
	developed in the Core Strategy to reflect this unless National/Regional Planning Policy can be relied upon.
Draft DPD Objective 10 “To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels” versus SA Objective 17 “Ensure efficient use of land through safeguarding of mineral reserves, the best and most versatile agricultural lands, land of Green Belt value, maximising use of previously developed land and reuse of vacant buildings, where this is not detrimental to open space and biodiversity interest”. The matrix at Table 1 predicted that there would be possible conflict between these two objectives.	In order for Objective 10 to be met, i.e. in order to achieve development of sufficient economic development, there may be effects on SA Objective 17. However, the Development Strategy can minimise these effects through the efficient use of land. A suitable policy approach for the Development Strategy should be developed in the Core Strategy.
Issue 18b Redditch Town Centre – All options versus SA Objective 15 “Reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour”.	If SA Objective 15 is to be achieved, if either Option is to be implemented the Core Strategy would need to include a policy on creating a safe and secure environment.
Options 1 - 4, 9 - 20 of the WYG Stage 1 Study would generally be deemed to be unsustainable because parts of the site are remote from sustainable transportation. As such development would increase traffic congestion, require additional major road infrastructure, may increase unsustainable journeys to the West Midlands MUA areas meaning that there would be conflict with SA Objective 3.	If these options were preferred, additional sustainable transportation facilities would be required to reduce the need of a private motor vehicle as the priority mode of transport. Suitable policy provision for encouraging walking, cycling and public transport should be included in the Core Strategy in order to minimise the predicted adverse effects.
Options 1 - 4 of the WYG Stage 1 Study would have a significant conflict with SA Objective 7 due to its impact on water and the sites being located to the west of the Ridgeway. However, all option sites would have a negative / positive effect in respect to SA Objective 7.	To achieve a positive outcome, sustainable management of foul drainage would need to be encouraged. A suitable policy approach for the Development Strategy should be developed in the Core Strategy in order to minimise the predicted adverse effects.
Options 1 - 3, 5 - 8, 11, 13 – 16 and 18 of the WYG Stage 1 Study would conflict with SA Objective 8 and have negative sustainability implications due to the potential sensitivity to flood risk.	If these options were preferred suitable mitigation measures would be required, and the location and design of potential housing would need to be carefully considered, maximising the efficient use of the land, with the possibility of locating

Negative / Neutral / Positive Effects	Proposed Mitigation
	open space provision within potential flood risk areas. A suitable policy approach should be developed in the Core Strategy unless National or Regional Planning Policy can be relied upon.
Options 1 - 3, 9, 11, 16 - 20 of the WYG Stage 1 Study would conflict with SA Objective 9 as parts of the option sites are considered to be remote or have limited access to existing services and facilities of Redditch Town Centre and / or District Centres.	The Town Centre should be promoted as a cultural and tourist opportunity with its vitality and viability ensured through the Core Strategy. The vitality and viability of District Centres, and any additional District Centres that may be required for additional housing development, should also be ensured through the Core Strategy. A suitable policy approach should be included in the Core Strategy.
Options 1 - 7, 9 - 20 of the WYG Stage 1 Study would significantly conflict with SA Objective 10 due to the potential to negatively affect the local landscape character and / or townscape character of the area.	In order to mitigate the effects of these possibly conflicting objectives, the Core Strategy must ensure that there are appropriate standards to which all development must meet with regards to residential design and efficient use of land, and that measures are encouraged to minimise the impact on the landscape / townscape with additional planting. A suitable policy approach can be included in the Core Strategy.
Option 7 of the WYG Stage 1 Study would conflict with SA Objective 11 due to the potential to irrevocably harm the biodiversity of Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Wildlife Sites (SWS). There would also be potential impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity of option site 11.	Locations for cross boundary growth on Greenfield sites may include areas of biodiversity that would require mitigation measures to ensure continued protection. If these options were preferred to achieve development of sufficient numbers of dwellings, the Development Strategy can minimise these effects through the efficient use of land. A suitable policy approach for the Development Strategy should be developed in the Core Strategy.
Options 3, 7, 10, 15 and 16 of the WYG Stage 1 Study would conflict with SA	If these options were preferred to achieve development of

Negative / Neutral / Positive Effects	Proposed Mitigation
Objective 16 due to potential to harm heritage assets. Option sites would have an impact on the setting and character of Grade I and II listed buildings as well as Scheduled Ancient Monuments.	sufficient numbers of dwellings, mitigation measures would be required to ensure continued protection of listed buildings and Ancient Monuments. The Development Strategy can minimise these effects through the efficient use of land and location of development. A suitable policy approach for the Development Strategy should be included in the Core Strategy.
Options 1 - 20 of the WYG Stage 1 Study would conflict with SA Objective 17 as most of the potential sites would be Greenfield, Green Belt designated land, and development of such land would have a detrimental impact on the openness of this land, but also would have negative sustainability implications. Some option sites would include the development of important sub regional open space areas as well as large woodland plantations.	In order to mitigate the effects of conflicting with this objective, the Core Strategy must ensure that there are appropriate standards to which all development must meet with regards to residential design and efficient use of land, and that measures are encouraged to minimise the impact on the landscape / townscape with additional planting. A suitable policy approach can be included in the Core Strategy.
Option 1 and 2 of Issue 15 'Location of Employment' conflict with SA Objectives 6, 10, 12 and 16. These options are not the most preferential; however it is proposed that they should be considered to be taken forward.	In order to mitigate the effects of conflicting with these objectives, the Core Strategy must ensure a range of other factors are taken into account, and that the sole requirement of locating new employment development should not just be locating adjacent to residential areas.
Option 10 of Issue 21 'Leisure and Tourism' scores positively for DPD Objective 1, providing mitigation measures are in place.	In order to mitigate the effects of Option 10 the Core Strategy policy must implement the option in full and 'ensure there is no undue pressure on designated areas' and therefore mitigation measures will be in place.
Option 5 of Issue 'Historic Environment' requires mitigation measures to ensure no negative effects on SA objective 16.	In order to mitigate the effects of Option 5 the Core Strategy should ensure that wider conservation issues are considered alongside conservation-led regeneration potential.
Option 4 of Issue 'Historic Environment' requires mitigation measures to ensure a	In order to mitigate the effects of Option 4 the Core Strategy

Negative / Neutral / Positive Effects	Proposed Mitigation
positive score against DPD Objective 1.	should implement the option in full and therefore ensure that conservation issues are not compromised when considering the potential to improve energy efficiency.

Stage B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Core Strategy DPD

8. Proposals for monitoring

8.1 A key element of the SA process is establishing how the significant sustainability effects of implementing the DPD will be monitored. Some potential indicators and targets have been developed within the LDF Scoping Report and are detailed in the table below. These indicators are a starting point for developing the DPD and sustainability monitoring programme which will include more indicators measuring the progress of the Core Strategy DPD Objectives.

8.2 Once the DPD is adopted, its significant effects will be assessed based on the monitoring of the sustainability indicators. This will help to measure how well the DPD contributes to sustainable development and informs any future review of plans and policies. Through this process, the significant effects predicted in this SA will be monitored via the Annual Monitoring Report. The SEA Directive requires that the significant environmental effects of implementing the DPD should be monitored in order to identify unforeseen adverse effects, and to be able to undertake appropriate remedial action.

8.3 Data for the indicators should be collected annually in line with the Annual Monitoring Report to monitor whether the DPD has made a positive contribution to sustainable development. Some of the indicators will not be available annually. Monitoring of the Core Strategy DPD will eventually be linked to monitoring the remainder of the documents in the LDF.

8.4 The table below presents the Sustainability Appraisal Framework. First of all it displays the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives against each of which is a set of decision-making criteria. The decision-making criteria set out the ways in which each objective should be achieved. The indicators have then been developed to answer the questions posed by the decision-making criteria. By measuring these indicators we can determine if the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives are being achieved (through targets). The table then displays the quantified data that is available for each indicator; however there are some data gaps. A column is also presented of the historical trends and this may show the likely direction or future trends for that indicator.

Table 6 - Sustainability Appraisal Objectives, Indicators, Comparators / Targets and Quantified Data

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
To manage waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy: reduce, reuse, recycle, compost, recovery, disposal	Are opportunities to increase recycling incorporated into the LDF?	Number of LDF policies aiming to increase recycling	None	3 – Local Plan No.3 policies B(BE).28, B(BE).29 and B(BE).19
	Will it reduce the production of waste and manage waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy?	Total waste arising: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • %/Amount of waste gone to landfill • %/Amount of waste recycled • %/Amount of waste incinerated or sent to waste energy plants 	Recycle 30% of domestic waste by 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of household waste recycled: 20.30% (2006/7) • Percentage of household waste incinerated: 57% (2006/7) • Percentage household waste landfilled/sent to waste energy plants: 43% (2006/7)
		Volume of household waste collected	None	Kilograms of household waste collected (2006/7) = 406kg
		Percentage of the population satisfied with household waste recycling	None	Percentage fairly or very satisfied 2006/7 = 70.9%
	Are opportunities to increase the amount of	Number of LDF policies aiming to increase recycling	None	3 – Local Plan No.3 policies B(BE).28, B(BE).29, B(BE).19

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
	construction and demolition waste that is reused incorporated into the LDF?			
Reduce causes of and adapt to the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases?	CO2 emissions by sector	<p>Industry: Reduce CO2 emissions by 2.4 Mt (18%) by 2010 and an additional 4.3 Mt (32%) by 2020</p> <p>Commercial and Public Sector: Reduce emissions by 2.0 Mt (36%) by 2010 and an additional 1.5 Mt (26%) by 2020</p> <p>Domestic: reduce emissions by 2.4 Mt (19%) by 2010, and an additional 3.7 Mt (29%) by 2020</p> <p>Transport: stabilise emissions by 2010 and reduce by 0.7 Mt (7%) by 2020</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic CO2 emissions (KT CO2) = 179 (2007) • Domestic CO2 emissions (KT CO2) = 180 (2005) • Industrial & Commercial CO2 emissions (KT CO2) = 313 (2007) • Industrial & Commercial CO2 emissions (KT CO2) = 260 (2005) • Road Transport CO2 emissions (KT CO2) = 103 (2007) • Land-use change CO2 emissions (KT CO2) = 2 (2007)
	Does it promote patterns of spatial development that are adaptable to and suitable for predicted changes in climate?	Countywide/Borough-wide CO2 emissions	None	<p>Total CO2 emissions for Redditch Borough (KT CO2) = 597 (2007)</p> <p>Total CO2 emissions for Worcestershire County = 5281 (2004)</p>
		Average SAP rating of new housing	None	No data available
	Are opportunities to promote measures to mitigate causes of	Number of LDF policies promoting measure to mitigate the causes of	None	None in Local Plan No.3

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
	climate change in the LDF?	climate change		
To reduce the need to travel and move towards more sustainable travel patterns	Will it reduce the need to travel?	Percentage of households without a car/van	None	21% (2001)
		Percentage of new developments within existing urban areas and settlement boundaries	Target = 99%	2006/7 = 99.78%
		Percentage of households with 2 or more cars	None	29% (2001)
		Number of applications approved featuring multimodal access arrangements in their design	None	No data available
		Average commuting distance	None	2001 Census data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works mainly at or from home = 3,100 • Less than 2km = 8,942 • 2km to less than 5km = 11,309 • 5km to less than 10km = 3,381 • 10km to less than 20km = 6,013 • 20km to less than 30km = 4,190 • 30km to less than 40km = 623 • 40km to less than 60km = 311 • 60km and over = 824 • No fixed place of work = 1,488 • Working outside the UK = 66 • Working at offshore installation = 11

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
	Will it provide opportunities to increase sustainable modes of travel?	Methods of travel to work (Employed aged 16-74 living in the Borough)	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainly work at home = 3100 (7.7%) Tube, metro, light rail, tram = 16 (0.0%) Train 474 (1.2%) Bus, Minibus or Coach = 3064 (7.6%) Motorcycle, scooter, moped = 379 (0.9%) Driving a car or van = 25,865 (64.2%) Passenger in a car or van = 3149 (7.8%) Taxi = 119 (0.3%) Bicycle = 729 (1.8%) On foot = 3258 (8.1%) Other = 105 (0.3%)
		Percentage of housing developments within 1000m of a means of public transport (e.g. railway station, bus stop)	<p>Target = 99%</p> <p>10% growth in bus patronage by 2010</p> <p>50% growth in rail passengers 2000-2015</p> <p>Increase rail share of market by 10% by 2010</p>	<p>No data available</p> <p>Redditch bus patronage (2006/2007) = +8.5%</p> <p>Regional rail travel has been growing by approximately 8.2% per annum since 2006</p> <p>Between 2004/ 5 and 2005/6 there was a 6.16% growth in use</p> <p>The Rail share of the market for Journeys to Work in Redditch (from the 2001 census) is approximately 1%</p>
	Does it focus	Number and percentage of	None	No data available

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
	development in existing centres, and make use of existing infrastructure to reduce the need to travel?	applications permitted which extend/improve walking routes		
		Number and percentage of applications permitted which extend/improve cycling routes	None	No data available
		Number of railway stations in Redditch	1 – Redditch	1 – Redditch
		Motorways accessible within a 5 mile radius of the Town Centre	1 – M42	1 – M42
		Percentage of new developments within the existing urban area and settlement boundaries	Target = 99%	2006/7 = 99.78%
		Amount of new residential development within 30 minutes drive time of a GP, hospital, primary school and secondary school, employment and a major retail centre	Target = 99%	262 dwellings (100%)
Develop a knowledge driven economy, with the appropriate infrastructure and skills base whilst ensuring all share the benefits urban and rural	Will it contribute towards urban and rural regeneration?	Amount of new residential development within 30 minutes drive time of a GP, hospital, primary school and secondary school, employment and a major retail centre	Target = 99%	262 dwellings (100%)

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
		Number of VAT registered businesses within the Borough	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total stock of VAT registered business (2007) = 2,455 250 VAT registrations in 2004
		Economically active (percentage) of the working age population	None	80.1% (2009) 83.4% (Jan – Dec 2006)
		Percentage of the Borough's population of working age claiming benefits	None	4.90% Claiming Job seekers allowance (October 2009) 13.6% (Feb 2007)
	Will it provide opportunities for businesses to develop and enhance their competitiveness?	Survival rates for VAT registered businesses in the Borough (surviving six months and twelve months)	To raise GVA per capita above the national average	Six month survival = 97% (2004) Twelve month survival = 91% (2003)
	Will it support the shopping hierarchy?	Percentage of new retail developments located in the Town Centre	None	No data available
	Will it help to improve skills levels in the workforce?	Percentage of working age population with at least one level five qualification	50% of young people moving into higher education by 2010	68.7% With levels 1,2,3,4 and other qualification (not known) (2001)
	Will it support tourism?	Amount of money generated from tourism	None	£31 million
		Number of visitors to Redditch Borough	None	800,000 visitors to Redditch Borough (2004)
To provide opportunities for communities to participate in and contribute to decisions that affect their neighbourhood and quality of life, encouraging pride	Do proposals incorporate consultation with the local communities?	Number of SPDs/DPD not in conformity with the SCI	Target = 0	SPDs/DPDs not in conformity with the SCI = 0

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
and social responsibility in the local community				
		Number of consultation opportunities made available in accordance with the SCI	Target = Minimum requirements	In 2005/6 = 6 (During the Auxerre Avenue SPD Consultation periods)
	Does it promote wider community engagement and civic responsibility?	Number of consultation opportunities provided in addition to the statutory requirements in the SCI	None	No data available
		Number of consultation responses received	None	No data available
		Number of consultation responses received from local residents	None	No data available
Promote and support the development of new technologies, of high value and low impact, especially resource efficient technologies and environmental technology initiatives	Does it encourage innovative and environmentally friendly technologies?	Amount of floorspace developed for employment by type B1a, B1b, B1c, B2, B8	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B1a = 399m2 • B1b = None • B1c = None • B2 = 14,320m2 • B8 = 3829m2
		Percentage of working age population with at least a level 3 qualification (level 3 and 4 only, excludes 'other qualification, not known')	50% of young people moving into higher education by 2010	20.3% (2001)
		Number of people employed in Redditch Borough in this sector	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional occupations in Science and Technology (2001) = 1,395

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Associate professional and technical occupations in Science and Technology (2001) = 778
		Borough wide CO2 emissions	None	Total CO2 emissions for Redditch Borough (KT CO2) = 597 (2007)
	Does it promote and support the development of new technologies, of high value and low impact?	Employment land available by type	None	28.82 Hectares (not broken down by type)
		Amount of employment land lost to residential development	None	1.11 Hectares or 11100m2
Protect and improve the quality of water, soil and air and water resources	Will it provide opportunities to improve or maintain water quality?	Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on either flood risk or water quality grounds	None	0
	Will it improve or maintain air quality?	Number and location of AQMA in the Borough	Target = 0	0 AQMAs
	Will it provide opportunities to improve or maintain soil quality?	Percentage of new housing and employment on Previously Developed Land	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing on PDL = 87.4% (2006/7) Employment on PDL = 16.2% (2006/7)
		Percentage of new developments incorporating rainwater harvesting/water efficiency measures	None	No data available
	Will it provide opportunities to improve or maintain water resource?	Number of developments with a percentage of domestic water use in operation provided for by	None	No data available

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
		rain water collection and / or grey water recycling systems		
Ensure development does not occur in high-risk flood prone areas and does not adversely contribute to fluvial flood risks or contribute to surface water flooding in all other areas	Does it protect the floodplain from inappropriate development?	Number of new allocated developments located in the floodplain	None	N/A - No new developments allocated through the LDF
		Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on either flood risk or water quality grounds	None	0
		Number/percentage of new (residential and commercial) development in flood zone 3 and flood zone 2	None	Data not available
	Does it take account of all types of flooding?	Number of applications approved in areas prone to non-fluvial flooding	None	No data available
	Are opportunities to reduce the risk of flooding in existing developed areas in the LDF?	Number of flooding policies in the LDF	None	0
	Does it promote Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems where	Percentage of new developments incorporating SUDS	None	No data available

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
	appropriate?			
To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres and the quality of and equitable access to, local services and facilities, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio-economic status or educational attainment	Will proposals enhance the provision of local services and facilities?	Amount of new residential development within 30 minutes drive time of a GP, hospital, primary school and secondary school, employment and a major retail centre	Target = 99%	262 dwellings (100%)
		Percentage of new developments within the existing urban area and settlement boundaries	Target = 99%	2006/7 = 99.78%
		Amount of completed office development	None	120m2
		Amount of completed retail development	None	0m2
		Number of first schools	None	23
		Number of middle schools	None	7
		Number of high schools	None	4
		Number of further education colleges	None	1
		Number of community centres	None	12
		Number of libraries	None	3 - Redditch library, Woodrow Library and mobile library
	Will it contribute to rural service provision across	Rural villages with key services (There are two rural	1 – Astwood Bank	1 – Astwood Bank

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
	the Borough?	villages in Redditch Borough: Astwood Bank and Feckenham)		
	Will it enhance accessibility to services by public transport?	Amount of completed leisure development in the Town Centre	None	0m2
		Amount of completed office development in the Town Centre	None	120m2
		Amount of completed retail development in the Town Centre	None	0m2
Safeguard and strengthen landscape and townscape character and quality	Will it safeguard and strengthen landscape and townscape character and quality?	Number of applications refused/amended/conditioned because of impact on character or local distinctiveness	None	No data available
To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Will it help to safeguard the Borough's biodiversity and geodiversity?	Change in areas of biodiversity importance including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change in areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value including sites of international, national, regional or sub-regional significance 	PSA Targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting PSA Target = 100% Favourable = 50% Unfavourable Recovering = 50% Unfavourable No Change = 0% Unfavourable Declining = 0% Part Destroyed/ Destroyed = 0.00%
		Number of applications refused/amended/conditioned because of potential adverse impact on natural environment features or wildlife	None	No data available

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
		Percentage of the Borough that is open space, Green Belt or Open Countryside	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Countryside = 10.1% • Green Belt = 33.7% • Open Space = 16.4% • Total percentage of the Borough that is open space, Green Belt or Open Countryside = 60.2%
	Will it protect sites and habitats designated for nature conservation?	Change in areas of biodiversity importance including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in priority habitats and species (by type) 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.35 Ha of scrubland lost to housing development • Increase of reedbed habitat • Increase of lowland hay meadows • Increase of lowland heath • Pool restoration and de-silting • Over 1 km of hedge-laying • Orchard planting • Discovery of rare heathland habitat in Wirehill Wood • New confirmed findings of Slow Worms • New confirmed findings of White Clawed Cray-fish
		Condition of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) habitats	PSA Targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting Public Service Agreement target = 100% • Favourable condition = 50% • Unfavourable recovering condition = 50% • Unfavourable no change = 0% • Unfavourable declining = 0% • Destroyed/part destroyed = 0%
		Number of sites designated for nature conservation lost	None	N/A – No new developments allocated though the LDF

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
		to new development		
		Percentage of water courses exceeding water framework directive standards for water quality	None	No data available
		Number of developments where existing wildlife corridors are protected or new ones created to link habitats within a site or link to habitats outside the development	None	No data available
	Will it help to achieve targets set out in the Biodiversity and Geodiversity Action Plans?	Achievement of BAP Targets	BAP Targets	No data available
To improve the health and well being of the population and reduce inequalities in health	Will it improve access to health facilities across the Borough?	Loss of healthcare land or buildings to other uses	None	0
		Number of applications permitted for homes for the elderly	None	1
		Number of existing homes for the elderly	None	9
	Will it help to improve quality of life for local residents?	Number of homes achieving lifetime homes standard (i.e. Part M of Building Regulations)	None	No data available
	Will it promote healthier lifestyles?	Number of hospitals	None	1 – Alexandra Hospital

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
		Number of other health facilities	None	Smallwood Health Centre (Child Health) Smallwood House (Elderly and mental health day care clinics and diabetic unit. Also family planning, young people's clinics, chiropody, occupational therapy)
		Number of Doctor's surgeries	None	14
		Number of dental practices	None	10
		Number of opticians	None	5
		Life expectancy	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Life expectancy at birth (males, 2003-5) = 76.50 Life expectancy at birth (females, 2003-5) = 80.50
	Does it mitigate against noise pollution?	Number of noise pollution complaints received	None	No data available
	Does it mitigate against light pollution?	Number of light pollution complaints received	None	No data available
Provide decent affordable housing for all, of all the right quality and tenure for local needs, in clean, safe and pleasant local environments	Will it provide opportunities to increase affordable housing levels within urban and rural areas of the Borough?	Affordable housing completions (dwellings)	None	59 dwellings
		Percentage of total housing completions which are affordable	Developments of 15 or more dwellings (or 0.5 \geq Ha) should achieve 40% affordable housing.	2006/7 = 17.4%
	Will it provide affordable housing access to a range of housing tenures and sizes?	Percentage of housing completions by size	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2006/7: 1 Bed = 20.5% 2 Bed = 46.3% 3 Bed = 11.2%

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
				4+ Bed = 22%
		Percentage of housing completions by tenure	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2006/7: Private = 82.6% Rented = 12.6% Shared Ownership = 12.6% Low Cost Market = 0%
		Number of persons registered as homeless	None	No data available
	Does it see to provide high quality, well-designed residential environments?	Number of homes meeting the Code for Sustainable Homes (Level 3) standards	None	No data available
		Number of homes exceeding the Code for Sustainable Homes (Level 3) standards	None	No data available
		Number of homes not assessed against the Code for Sustainable Homes	None	No data available
	Are opportunities to increase the amount of construction and demolition waste that is reused incorporated into the LDF?	Number of LDF policies aiming to increase recycling	None	3 – Local Plan No.3 policies B(BE).28, B(BE).29 and B(BE).19
To raise the skills levels and qualifications of the workforce	Will it provide opportunities to further develop educational and attainment facilities within the Borough?	Percentage of the Borough's school leavers with 5 A*-C GCSE's	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All 15 year old pupils achieving Grades A* - C in GCSEs = 57.6% (2006-2007) All 15 year old pupils achieving Grades A* - C in GCSEs (Sep 04-Aug 05) = 50.3 Percentage of students achieving 2 or more GCE/VCE/ A Level or equivalent passes (Sep 04 – Aug 05) = 91.1%

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of students achieving 3 or more GCE/VCE/ A Level or equivalent passes (Sep 04 – Aug 05) = 6.1%
		Percentage of the Borough's population with a FE/HE qualification	50% of young people moving into higher education by 2010	Number aged 16-74 with level 4/5 qualifications (2001) = 7,874
		Amount of new residential development within 30 minutes drive time of a GP, hospital, primary school and secondary school, employment and a major retail centre	Target = 99%	262 dwellings (100%)
		Number and percentage of applications permitted which contribute towards educational facilities as covered by the requirements of the education provision SPD	None	No data available
Reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour	Does it seek to provide high quality well designed environments?	Number and percentage of applications permitted which incorporate crime prevention measures in their design	None	No data available
		Crime statistics per 1000 of the population for sexual offences	None	0.3%
		Crime statistics per 1000 of the population for violence against the person	None	5.5%
		Crime statistics per 1000 of the population for robbery offences	None	0.3%

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
		Crime statistics per 1000 of the population for burglary dwelling offences	None	2.8%
		Crime statistics per 1000 of the population for vehicle and other theft	None	8.4 %
		Crime statistics per 1000 of the population for drug offences	None	1.2%
	Does it promote wide community engagement and civic responsibility?	Percentage of Redditch residents who feel unsafe on their local street	None	25.11% after dark (2006/7) 2.16% during the day (2006/7) 33%
	Does it promote mixed development that encourages natural surveillance?	Number and percentage of applications permitted which incorporate crime prevention measures in their design	None	No data available
Conserve and enhance the architectural, cultural and historic environment heritage and seek well-designed, resource efficient, high quality built environment in new development proposals	Does it provide opportunities for sustainable construction?	Number of homes meeting the Code for Sustainable Homes (Level 3) standards	None	No data available
		Number of applications refused/amended/conditioned because of adverse impacts on heritage and historic assets	None	21 (5.9%) 2009 30 (6.7%) 2008

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
	Will it enhance the Borough's Conservation Areas?	Conservation Area appraisals completed	None	Two – Church Green Conservation Area (Town Centre); Feckenham Conservation Area. There are no other Conservation Areas in Redditch Borough
		Conservation Area management plans completed	None	Two – Church Green Conservation Area (Town Centre); Feckenham Conservation Area. There are no other Conservation Areas in Redditch Borough
		Change in the character or appearance of Conservation Areas	None	No data available
	Will it help safeguard the Borough's Listed Buildings?	Number of listed buildings	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade I = 0 • Grade II* = 10 • Grade II = 146 • Locally listed buildings = 38
	Does it improve the quality of the built environment?	Number of listed buildings at risk	None	None
		Number of Scheduled Monuments at risk	None	None
		Number of locally listed buildings at risk	None	No data available
		Percentage of Redditch covered by historic landscape/urban characterisation studies	None	0%
Ensure efficient use of land through safeguarding of mineral reserves, the best and most versatile agricultural	Will it safeguard the Borough's mineral resources?	Number and percentage of mineral applications permitted/modified related to need/environmental factors/quality of restoration or aftercare	None	No data available

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
lands, land of Green Belt value, maximising use of previously developed land and reuse of vacant buildings, where this is not detrimental to open space and biodiversity interest				
	Will it maximise the use of Previously Developed Land?	Percentage of new and converted dwellings on previously developed land	None	95% (2005/6)
		New homes and employment sites on Previously Developed Land	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing on PDL = 87.4% (2006/7) Employment on PDL = 16.2% (2006/7)
	Will it protect the Borough's open spaces of recreational and amenity value?	Percentage of new dwellings completed at 30 dwellings per hectare	None	2.7%
		Percentage of new dwellings completed at between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare	None	54.6%
		Percentage of new dwellings completed at above 50 dwellings per hectare	None	42.7%
	Will it preserve the openness of the Green Belt?	Green Belt land lost to development	None	2.96 Ha
		Number/percentage of developments in the Green Belt	None	2006/7 = 1 dwelling (0.22%)

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
	Will it help to protect the Borough's agricultural land from adverse developments?	Percentage of agricultural land lost to new development	None	2006/7 = 0%
	Does it provide opportunities for sustainable construction?	Number of homes meeting the Code for Sustainable Homes (Level 3) standards	None	No data available
Promoting resource efficiency and energy generated from renewable energy and low carbon sources	Will it encourage opportunities for the production of renewable and low carbon energy?	Renewable energy capacity installed by type	None	None
	Will it promote greater energy efficiency?	Number or percentage of new development incorporating on-site renewable energy generation	None	No data available
		Average percentage of energy needs met from on-site renewable energy generation in new developments	Renewable generation equivalent to 5% of electricity consumption by 2010 and 10% by 2020	2005: Electricity consumption 419.7 GWh, Renewables 4.4 GWh = 1% 2004: Electricity consumption 429 GWh, Renewables 5.4 GWh = 1.6%
		Number of homes meeting the Code for Sustainable Homes (Level 3) standard	None	No data available
	Will it encourage opportunities to achieve energy efficiency measures above the minimum standard, as defined by the Code for	Number of homes that have met the minimum standard energy efficiency measures (Level 1), as defined by the Code for Sustainable Homes	None	No data available

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Indicators from the SA Framework	Comparators / Targets	Quantified Data
	Sustainable Homes?			

9. Statements

Statement of the Likely Significant Effects of the Proposal

9.1 This SA includes information on the sustainability of the options and the preferred options to deal with the key issues facing Redditch Borough. The appraisal of all of the possible outcomes at each of the stages of plan production has been undertaken and the likely effects as a result of implementing each option is predicted, forming a sound basis for understanding the implications for sustainability and some reasoning behind decision making.

9.2 At the first Preferred Draft Core Strategy Stage, it was predicted that the most likely positive significant effects related to the benefits that the preferred approach towards the strategy to development would bring. It was envisaged that development would be promoted within the sustainable settlement of Redditch where there would be positive effects likely on achieving more sustainable travel patterns, regeneration of poor quality and deprived areas and a good chance of securing efficient use of land. The implications of the WMRSS for Redditch meant that the extent of this positive effect was likely to be significantly reduced because development on Green Belt land and former ADR land was inevitable. However the recent changes in Government which will allow Local Authorities to put forward its own evidence development targets means that the Core Strategy has the opportunity to look at other options which may be more sustainable. It is possible for there to be negative effects on the environmental, social and economic sustainability of the Borough as a result of the Core Strategy DPD however this SA demonstrates that with appropriate mitigation measures, these impacts can be minimised, mitigated against and in many cases an improvement on the baseline situation is possible.

9.3 Development outside of the administrative boundary of Redditch may still be necessary. The SA has found that the most sustainable and therefore preferred location for development outside of the Borough generally to the North of Redditch, which is no change from previous SA and this also, reflects previous evidence findings. Locating development here brings the most significant positive affects in comparison to other potential expansion locations; however the mechanism for continuing with this option through the RSS is unclear given recent changes to the RSS status and the intention to abolish it. This area contributes most to achieving the Core Strategy objectives, most significantly Objective 5 “To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and reduce the need to travel” and Objective 9 “To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites.”

Statement on the Difference the Process has made

9.4 This Sustainability Appraisal process proved beneficial to Officers preparing the revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy, primarily as an aid to evaluate various options including options put forward during consultation and any other subsequent changes. The SA process and documentation in this SA Report has provided a sound piece of evidence to demonstrate how the

preferred options have been selected, which otherwise would have been difficult to provide an audit.

9.5 It is hoped that the appraisal of the effects of implementing options will give consultees a good understanding of the implications of their suggested options in comparison to other options, and has therefore been effective in frontloading the preparation.

9.6 When undertaking the assessment of the larger sites / possible Strategic Sites, the SA process has proved beneficial to both the Borough Council and potential landowners/developers. The Borough Council have been able to provide landowners or developers with an indication of the decision-making criteria used to determine the sustainability of sites, enabling them to consider the potential requirements for their sites.

Difficulties in collecting data and limitations of the data

9.7 The SEA Directive requires that any difficulties encountered in a SA should be described. The most significant difficulty encountered was the uncertainty in identifying the future impacts of the DPD at the Issues and Options stage because of the variety of options available. In some cases the options were likely to involve completely different sustainable effects.

9.8 The most problematic aspect of the Sustainability Appraisal has been the need to develop targets as part of the monitoring of the SA Framework and the difficulties with crossover between the Annual Monitoring Report and the monitoring required in conjunction with the draft delivery strategy as part of the revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy. The other difficulty with the targets is the fact that achievement and delivery of many of the indicators are not reliant on the Core Strategy alone, and other bodies or individuals have greater responsibility for achieving these objectives.

9.10 With respects to actual data collection, where appropriate data is available, a data series – required to establish a trend for a particular indicator, may not always be available. In these instances the Borough Council has sought to compare the Redditch situation with that at the County, regional or national level or against neighbouring authorities to determine whether there might be a sustainability problem in the Borough.

10. Conclusion

10.1 When assessing the different options to determine the preferred option, in many cases it has been determined that there would be significantly harmful effects on sustainability if the 'Business as usual/ Do-nothing' approach is taken. The SA has demonstrated that, in most cases, a proactive approach to dealing with issues is required and for each issue a preferred option is identified.

10.2 This SA also includes an Appropriate Assessment, also known as a Habitats Regulations Assessment and has demonstrated that the Core Strategy would have no effects on the nearest Natura 2000 designated site at Bredon Hill, Wychavon.

10.3 It is possible that there may be some minor detrimental impacts on the environmental, social and economic sustainability of the Borough as a result of the Core Strategy DPD however this SA demonstrates that with appropriate mitigation measures, these impacts can be minimised, mitigated against and in most cases an improvement on the baseline situation is possible. The major outstanding issue yet to be resolved is that expansion of Redditch to meet its needs is clearly more sustainable to the North of the Borough; however the intention to abolish the RSS casts doubt on the ability to be able to achieve this, particularly given that this decision involves the cooperation of the adjacent Local Authority of Bromsgrove. Without this expansion, significant negative effects are predicted for Redditch Borough.

Appendix A - Options Appraisal

The SA has predicted what effects are most likely to occur by assessing the potential effects if each option(s) were to be implemented, against the achievement of the SA Objectives. This process ensures that the general sustainability of each option is considered, which has helped to determine the preferred approach to be taken forward in the Core Strategy.

The SA Report indicates which is the most sustainable option(s) to deal with each issue. In some circumstances more than one option has predicted positive sustainability effects and therefore, the preferred approach may be composed of different aspects of the initial options presented in the Issues and Options document or options put forward during consultation. The tables in this Appendix have been update to include new options or policy choices that have arisen since the Issues and Options stage.

A scoring mechanism has been established to determine which of the options is more sustainable. This is achieved by scoring options against the SA Objectives and draft DPD Objectives. The options(s) with the highest score are recommended to become the preferred approach from a sustainability perspective. If however the actual preferred approach consists of an option(s) which is not the most sustainable as determined by this scoring process, this SA and the Preferred Draft Core Strategy together should set out the reasons why this approach has been recommended.

<u>Key</u>		
Effect		Score
0	= No effects	0
+/-	= Both negative and positive effects	0
-	= Slight negative effect	-1
- -	= Significant negative effect	-2
+	= Slight positive effect	1
+ +	= Significant positive effect	2
?	= Unsure of effects	0

1. Redditch's Development Strategy

Issue/Question - Where should future development be concentrated in Redditch Borough?

Option 1 - Focus development in the most sustainable location in the Borough; the Town Centre

Option 2 - Identify areas in the urban area of Redditch in need of regeneration and focus development in key regeneration areas

Option 3 - Priority for development on brownfield land in the urban area

Option 4 - Rebuilding existing urban areas of poor quality with land efficient buildings

Option 5 - Business as Usual / Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options consultation stage.

New options to consider in policy which have emerged from consultation:

Option 6 - Identify ADR land to meet development needs beyond 2026

Option 7 - Add existing ADR land to Green Belt designation

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Comments/Explanation
++	++	++	++	--	++	+	<p>Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 8, 9, 13 and 17 and there no likely negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13, 14 and 17 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 13 and 17 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 5, 7, 9, 10, 13, 16 and 17 and may result in positive effect on SA Objective 11. There no likely negative effects predicted.</p>
2	2	2	2	-2	2	1	<p>Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 17.</p> <p>Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 16 and 17 however it is also likely to result in negative effects on SA Objective 11.</p> <p>Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 3, 7, 10 and 11 however it is also likely to result in negative effects on SA Objectives 13, 16 and 17.</p>

All of the effects predicted for every option would have an impact on a Borough-wide scale. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 3, 9, 13 and 17 would be very likely. The likelihood of the effects working towards achieving SA Objectives 5, 7, 10 and 11 would be fairly likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 2, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14 and 16 would be a small possibility.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	+/-	+	++	+/-	--	+	++
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0	+	--
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	+	+	+	-	+	+
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and townscape and its best distinctive features;	+	++	+	+/-	--	+	++
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	++	++	++	++	--	+	-
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	++	+	0	0	--	+	-
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	+	+	0	0	-	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	++	?	0	?	-	0	-
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	++	++	++	++	--	++	--
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	++	++	++	++	--	+	-
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	+/-	++	+/-	+/-	--	+	++
12 Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+14	+16	+12	+9	- 19	+12	0

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA Scoring of options determined that Option 2 is the most sustainable option, and is therefore certainly going to inform preparation of the Core Strategy through the identification of strategic sites and as part of a development strategy. Option 1 and Option 3 are also extremely high scoring options and will also be considered as preferable options in the development of policy approaches for the Core Strategy DPD, but may be more appropriate in a policy on efficient use of land and on directing main Town Centre uses to Redditch Town Centre, rather than within a development strategy. Option 4 also scored well and may be considered as a potential alternative Option in the Core Strategy. Option 5 of business as usual scored significantly badly and is therefore doing nothing is not a suitable alternative option.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Preferred Draft Core Strategy stage or as part of Redditch's development options consultation however, the treatment of ADR land was considered an appropriate element for inclusion in this policy.

New options to consider in policy which have emerged from consultation:

Option 6 - Identify ADR land to meet development needs beyond 2026

Option 7 - Add existing ADR land to Green Belt designation

The November 2010 scoring indicated that protecting the ADR land for future development beyond the plan period offered the most suitable option to plan for the future development needs of Redditch. Whilst adding existing ADR land to the Green Belt did have some positive effects, the option offered no flexibility to re-evaluate land to meet future development needs.

Key Issue A – Communities that are Safe and Feel Safe

5. Creating Safe and Secure Environments

Issue/Question - How can we ensure that places at possible risk are safe and secure without creating harsh, fortress-style environments?

Option 1 - Have a policy which states that developments must incorporate where appropriate, counter-terrorism measures

Option 2 - Have a policy which formulates a check-list style approach detailing specific counter-terrorism measures appropriate developments must include

Option 3 - Increase consultation with those with knowledge on designing to prevent terrorism, on applications likely to have a terrorism risk

Option 4 - Business as Usual / Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options consultation stage.

New options to consider in policy which have emerged from Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation:

Option 5 - Consider the design and integration of open space

Option 6 – Meet CABI Building for life Standard ‘Silver’ for developments over 20 dwellings

Option 7 – Meet CABI Building for Life Standard ‘Gold’ for developments over 50 dwellings

Option 8 – Promote accessibility focusing on walking and cycling

Option 9 – Promoting gateways at key locations

Option 10 – Protect and enhance locally distinctive and historic features

Option 11 – Protect and enhance key vistas

Option 12 – Include public art to enhance legibility

Option 13 – Incorporate the principles of the ‘Secured by Design’ Award Scheme

1	2	3	4	5	6	Comments/Explanation
++	++	-	-	++	++	<p>Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 5, 12, 15 and 16 and a possible negative effect on SA Objectives 16 and 17. An effect is predicted on SA Objective 10, however it is not known if this effect will be positive or negative.</p> <p>Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 5, 12, 15 and a possible negative effect on SA Objectives 16 and 17. An effect is predicted on SA Objective 10, however it is not known if this effect will be positive or negative. Mitigation measures should ensure a positive effect is achieved.</p> <p>Because of the small likelihood of Redditch Borough Council receiving planning applications for developments with a likely terrorism risk, implementing this Option would have very few benefits. There would be a negative effect on SA Objectives 16 and 17. An effect is predicted on SA Objective 10 however it is not known if this effect will be positive or negative.</p>
2	2	-1	-1	2	2	<p>Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 12 and 15.</p> <p>Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 5, 7, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16 and 17.</p> <p>Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA objectives 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 18.</p>

7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Comments/Explanation
++	+	+	+	+	+	+	<p>Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA objectives 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 18.</p> <p>Implementing Option 8 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA objectives 2, 3, 7, 11, and 12.</p> <p>Implementing Option 9 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA objectives 3 and 10.</p> <p>Implementing Option 10 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA objective 10.</p>
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	<p>Implementing Option 11 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA objective 10 and 16.</p> <p>Implementing Option 12 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA objective 3, 5, 10, 15 and 16.</p> <p>Implementing Option 13 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA objective 15.</p>

The effects predicted for all of the options would have an impact felt on a Borough-wide scale. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 5 and 9 would be fairly likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against achieving SA Objective 10 would be likely. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 12 and 15 would be dependant on the security risks in the local area, which are unknown. The likelihood of the effects on achieving SA Objectives 16 and 17 would be a small possibility dependant on individual circumstances.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	0	0	0	0	++
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change	0	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Borough's landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	-	-	-	0	++
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	0	0	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium	0	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres	++	++	+	-	+
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night	0	0	-	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites	0	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels	0	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk	0	0	0	0	+
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+4	+4	-2	-2	+8

Core Strategy DPD Objective	6	7	8	9	10
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	+	+	+	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards	+	+	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change	+	+	++	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Borough's landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	+	+	+	+	++
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	+	+	++	+	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium	+	+	+	0	+
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres	+	+	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites	+	+	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels	0	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk	+	+	0	+	+
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning	+	+	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+12	+12	+8	+4	+5

Core Strategy DPD Objective	11	12	13
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Borough's landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	+	+	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	+	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres	0	0	++
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk	+	+	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+3	+4	+3

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA Scoring of options has determined that Option 1 and Option 2 are the most sustainable options and should be considered in the preparation of policy approaches in the Core Strategy. It is possible for both of these options to be presented as preferred approaches in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy and combined into one policy approach, after consideration of comments received during consultation. Option 3 and Option 4 score fairly poorly with negative sustainability benefits, and they are therefore not considered to be sufficient alternatives to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2011):

The option to include counter terrorism measures (Option 1) was not included in policy at Preferred Draft Core Strategy stage because this approach would have limited long term benefits because of the small risk of terrorism and was therefore not a realistic option to pursue for the Borough.

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented an Option that was deemed the most appropriate after considering all alternatives as part of the SA and the Evidence Base. This Option presented a Policy which contained a range of criteria that new developments should implement in order to create safe places.

Following the consultation period on the Preferred Draft Core Strategy a range of other options were presented to include in the revised Policy, and have been appraised above. The new options to include in policy have emerged including:

- **Option 5** - Consider the design and integration of open space
- **Option 6** - Meet CABE Building for life Standard 'Silver' for developments over 20 dwellings
- **Option 7** - Meet CABE Building for Life Standard 'Gold' for developments over 50 dwellings
- **Option 8** - Promote accessibility focusing on walking and cycling
- **Option 9** - Promoting gateways at key locations
- **Option 10** - Protect and enhance locally distinctive and historic features
- **Option 11** - Protect and enhance key vistas
- **Option 12** - Include public art to enhance legibility
- **Option 13** - Incorporate the principles of the 'Secured by Design' Award Scheme

These new Options combined achieve the SA Objectives and the Core Strategy DPD objectives and are considered as the most sustainable approach.

Key Issue B - A Better Environment for Today and Tomorrow

6. The Conflict between the Environment and Climate Change Adaptation

Issue/Question - How can we ensure renewable energy production without compromising environmental quality?

- Option 1** - Development of local guidelines and criteria for different types of renewable energy development
- Option 2** - Identify locations suitable for renewable energy based upon an assessment such as a Landscape Character Assessment
- Option 3** - Require developers to demonstrate how their on-site renewable energy production does not compromise environmental quality
- Option 4** - Request that where developers are unable to meet sustainability standards on-site through reducing emissions and creating their own sustainable energy, that a carbon off-setting procedure is in place to increase the efficiency and sustainability in existing housing
- Option 5** - Business as Usual / Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options consultation stage.

New options to consider in policy which have emerged from Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation:

- Option 6** – Request developments of 10 or more to supply 10% of their energy from a sustainable source
- Option 7** – Request that developments are located in accessible locations and take account of the accessibility needs between uses
- Option 8** – Request that new residential developments must meet the current Code for Sustainable Homes standards contained within the RSS
- Option 9** – Offices and other non-domestic buildings should aim for 10% below the target emission rate of the current Building Regulations by 2016
- Option 10** – Ensure energy efficiency through siting and orientation and through energy conservation measures
- Option 11** – Protect, conserve, manage and enhance natural and built heritage assets
- Option 12** – proposals for medium and large-scale development (greater than 5 residential units or 1,000 square metres for non-residential developments) should be accompanied by a sustainability statement demonstrating that at least the 'good' standards, and wherever possible 'best practice' standards, as set out in the West Midlands Sustainability Checklist for Development, are achieved for each category in the Checklist
- Option 13** - demonstrate that the use of sustainable, locally sourced and recycled materials has been considered
- Option 14** - the retrofit of the existing housing stock with improved insulation and water saving devices will be sought
- Option 15** - low carbon vehicle infrastructure in appropriate developments and locations will be encouraged

1	2	3	4	5	Comments/Explanation
++	++	++	+	--	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 6, 7, 10, 11, 16 and 18 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.
					Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 6, 7, 10 and 18 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.
					Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 6, 7, 10, 11, 16 and 18 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.
2	2	2	1	-2	Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 10, 11 and 18 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.
					Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16 and 18 and there are no likely positive effects predicted.

6	7	8	9	10	Comments/Explanation
+	+	++	+	+	Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 6, 7, 12 and 18.
					Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 3 and 12.
					Implementing Option 8 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 12 and 18.
1	1	2	1	1	Implementing Option 9 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 7 11 and 12.
					Implementing Option 10 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2 and 6.

11	12	13	14	15	Comments/Explanation
+	++	+	+	+	Implementing Option 11 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 10 and 16. Implementing Option 12 is likely to result to a positive effect on SA Objective 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16 and 18.
1	2	1	1	1	Implementing Option 13 is likely to result to a positive effect on SA Objective 1, 2, 6 and 7. Implementing Option 14 is likely to result to a positive effect on SA Objective 1, 2 and 6. Implementing Option 15 is likely to result to a positive effect on SA Objective 2, 3 and 6.

The effects predicted for each of the options would have an impact felt on a Borough-wide scale, however Options 1 to 4 would be measures implemented at a local level in the hope of combating the global issue of climate change. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 2 and 18 is certain but only relative to the local level. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 6 and 10 would be very likely but again only relative to the local level. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 7, 11, 13 and 16 would be fairly likely, however achievement of these Objectives would also have to be done through other means.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	+	?	0	0	-
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards	+	+	+	+	--
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change	++	++	++	++	--
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Borough's landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	+	+	++	+	-
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	0	0	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium	0	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites	0	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels	0	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk	++	++	++	0	--
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+9	+8	+9	+5	-10

Core Strategy DPD Objective	6	7	8	9	10
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	0	0	0	+	+
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards	+	0	+	++	++
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change	+	+	+	++	++
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Borough's landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	0	0	0	0	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	++	+	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium	0	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites	0	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels	0	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk	0	0	0	++	++
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+3	+4	+5	+9	+9

Core Strategy DPD Objective	11	12	13	14	15
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	+	+	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards	+	+	+	++	+
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change	++	+	+	++	+
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Borough's landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	++	+	0	0	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	+	0	0	+
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium	0	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres	0	+	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites	0	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels	0	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk	++	+	+	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+10	+9	+4	+5	+4

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA Scoring of options has determined that Option 1, Option 3, 9, 10 and Option 11 are the most sustainable options and are likely to inform the approach in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy. It is possible for both of these options to be implemented as the preferred approaches simultaneously, taking on board the comments received during consultation. Option 2 and Option 4 did have very good scores and may be considered as reasonable alternative options but because they were not predicted to have score as high as Option 1 and Option 3 they are not to be considered as the preferred options, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation. Implementing Option 4 would require

procedures to enable carbon off-setting which have a big impact on economic resources. Option 5 scored significantly poorly as an option and is therefore not suggested as a suitable alternative option to deal with this issue.

The option to include a Policy considering the conflict between the environment and climate change adaptation was not included as a separate policy at Preferred Draft Core Strategy stage because it was considered more appropriate to have this approach within a broader climate change policy.

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented an Option that was deemed the most appropriate after considering all alternatives as part of the SA and the Evidence Base. This Option presented a Policy which contained a range of criteria that new developments should implement in order to adapt and mitigate to the effects of climate change.

Following the consultation period on the Preferred Draft Core Strategy a range of other options were presented to include in the Policy, and have been appraised above. The new options to include in policy have emerged including:

- Request developments of 10 or more to supply 10% of their energy from a sustainable source – it was considered that developments of 5 or more should supply 10% of their energy from a sustainable source as there are significantly more sites in Redditch that are capable of accommodating between 5 and 10 dwellings, rather than over 10. It is considered this would be a more sustainable than having a threshold of 10 or more dwellings;
- Request that developments are located in accessible locations and take account of the accessibility needs between uses; and
- Request that new residential developments must meet the current Code for Sustainable Homes standards contained within the RSS. Since the publication of the Preferred Draft Core Strategy Regional Spatial Strategies have been revoked. It is not consider that the most sustainable approach would be for residential developments to meet the national standard of the Code for Sustainable Homes.

These new Options combined achieve the SA Objectives and the Core Strategy DPD objectives and are considered as these were the most sustainable approach.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

Following the consultation on the Preferred Draft Core Strategy, it is still considered that the best approach is to present a policy which contains a range of options which scored highly in the appraisal. Due to emerging evidence and consultation responses to the previous consultation periods some of the criteria have not been included in the revised policy.

The following options are deemed the most appropriate to include in the revised policy and have scored highly through the appraisal:

Option 7 – Request that developments are located in accessible locations and take account of the accessibility needs between uses

Option 8 – Request that new residential developments must meet the current Code for Sustainable Homes standards contained within the RSS

Option 10 – Ensure energy efficiency through siting and orientation and through energy conservation measures

Option 11 – Protect, conserve, manage and enhance natural and built heritage assets

Option 12 – proposals for medium and large-scale development (greater than 5 residential units or 1,000 square metres for non-residential developments) should be accompanied by a sustainability statement demonstrating that at least the ‘good’ standards, and wherever possible ‘best practice’ standards, as set out in the West Midlands Sustainability Checklist for Development, are achieved for each category in the Checklist

Option 13 - demonstrate that the use of sustainable, locally sourced and recycled materials has been considered

Option 14 - the retrofit of the existing housing stock with improved insulation and water saving devices will be sought

Option 15 - low carbon vehicle infrastructure in appropriate developments and locations will be encouraged

Option 8 has been updated to reflect the changes in planning policy and now requests that all new residential development meets the current national standards of the Code for Sustainable Homes. It is considered that this would achieve the same sustainability appraisal score and would therefore be appropriate to pursue.

This Policy also contains a requirement to ensure all new non-domestic development must be assessed against the BREEAM assessment method, this option has been appraised below under Issue 8.

7. Proportion of Renewable Energy in New Developments

Issue/Question - What proportion of renewable energy should be required from all new development?

Option 1 - The standard request rate, as stated in the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy Preferred Option document (currently 10%)

Option 2 - To improve on current standards (20%), please specify why you think this and any evidence you have for this

Option 3 - Business as Usual / Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options consultation stage.

New options to consider in policy which have emerged from Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation:

A number of options were presented at Preferred Draft Core Strategy stage. As Issue 7 was presented along with Issue 6 as a combined Policy at Preferred Draft Core Strategy Stage the alternative Options presented have been appraised above in relation to issue 6.

1	2	3	Comments/Explanation
++	++	--	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 6 and 18 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.
			Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 6 and 18 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.
2	2	-2	Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 2, 6 and 18 and there are no likely positive effects predicted.

The effects predicted for all of the options would have an impact felt on a Borough-wide scale, however Options 1 and 2 would be measures implemented at a local level in the hope of combating the global issue of Climate Change. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 2 and 18 is certain but only relative to the local level. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against achieving SA Objective 6 would be very likely but only relative to the local level.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	+	+	-
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	++	++	--
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	+	+	-
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+6	+6	-6

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA Scoring of options has determined that both Option 1 and Option 2 are the most sustainable options. Either option can be presented as the preferred approach in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy however implementation of both options is not possible therefore consideration of comments received during consultation and other available evidence would need to inform the preferred option. Option 3 scored very poorly and is therefore not considered to be a suitable alternative option to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The option to include a Policy considering the proportion of renewable energy in new development was not included as a separate policy at Preferred Draft Core Strategy stage because it was considered more appropriate to have this approach within a broader climate change policy.

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented an Option that was deemed the most appropriate after considering all alternatives as part of the SA and the Evidence Base. This Option presented a Policy which contained a range of criteria that new developments should implement in order to adapt and mitigate to the effects of climate change. The alternative option presented as the Preferred Draft Core Strategy Stage have been appraised and detailed above in relation to Issue 6.

8. Standards of Development

Issue/Question - What should Redditch Borough request in terms of feasible level/ standards for all new development to meet?

Option 1 - Level 4 or above of the Code for Sustainable Homes should be requested on all new housing

Option 2 - The Code for Sustainable Homes standard sought in the Borough should only be the same as that sought regionally (currently Level 3 in the WMRSS Preferred Option document)

Option 3 - Some other level for residential development, please specify why you think this and provide any evidence you have for this

Option 4 - Require all new non-residential developments to achieve at least 'very good' BREEAM rating (a recognised independent assessment of the environmental performance of buildings)

Option 5 - Some other level for non-residential development, please specify why you think this and provide any evidence you have for this

Option 6 - Business as Usual / Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options consultation stage.

New options to consider in policy which have emerged from Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation:

A number of options were presented at Preferred Draft Core Strategy stage. As Issue 7 was presented along with Issue 6 as a combined Policy at Preferred Draft Core Strategy Stage the alternative Options presented have been appraised above in relation to issue 6.

1	2	3	4	5	6	Comments/Explanation
++	++	N/A	++	N/A	--	<p>Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 16 and 18; however there is a possible small negative effect on SA Objective 10.</p> <p>Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 16 and 18; however there is a possible small negative effect on SA Objective 10.</p> <p>Implementation of Option 3 is no longer applicable because consultation on alternative options has already taken place.</p>
2	2	N/A	2	N/A	-2	<p>Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 16 and 18; however there is a possible small negative effect on SA Objective 10.</p> <p>Implementation of Option 5 is no longer applicable because consultation on alternative options has already taken place.</p> <p>Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11 and 18 and there are no predicted positive effects.</p>

The effects predicted for all of the options would have an impact felt on a Borough-wide scale, however Options 1 to 3 would be measures implemented at a local level in the hope of combating the global issue of Climate Change. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against achieving SA Objective 1 would be very likely. The likelihood of the effects on achieving SA Objectives 2 and 18 is certain but only relative to the local level. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 6, 7, 8, 11 and 16 would be fairly likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against achieving SA Objective 10 would be likely to a small extent.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	-	++	N/A	-	N/A	--
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	++	++	N/A	++	N/A	--
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	+	++	N/A	++	N/A	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	+/-	+/-	N/A	+/-	N/A	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+4	+8	N/A	+5	N/A	-6

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 2 is the most sustainable option, and therefore should be the preferred approach to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy, subject to consideration of comments received during consultation. Options 1 and 4 also scored well and could be considered as alternatives however it is not likely that requirements above the WMRSS targets could be justified in Redditch Borough. Also, Option 4 can be taken forward as another preferred approach in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy in addition to Option 2; however Option 1 cannot be done in tandem with Option 2 therefore it is not to be considered as a suitable alternative option. Option 3 and Option 5 are no longer

relevant for inclusion as an approach because they are not considered to be relevant options to deal with the issue. Option 6 scored significantly poorly and it is therefore not suitable as an alternative option to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The option to include a Policy considering the standards of new development was not included as a separate policy at Preferred Draft Core Strategy stage because it was considered more appropriate to have this approach within a broader climate change policy.

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented an Option that was deemed the most appropriate after considering all alternatives as part of the SA and the Evidence Base. This Option presented a Policy which contained a range of criteria that new developments should implement in order to adapt and mitigate to the effects of climate change. The alternative option presented as the Preferred Draft Core Strategy Stage have been appraised and detailed above in relation to Issue 6, in particular Option 4 has been implemented as part of a wider climate change policy.

9. Sustaining Redditch Borough's Rural Area

Issue/Question - How can we support the economy of the rural areas of Redditch?

Option 1 - Focus on the reuse of buildings for economic purposes in preference to residential

Option 2 - Support farm diversification in appropriate circumstances

Option 3 - Encourage the provision of, and expansion and improvement of, static caravan parks or holiday chalet developments

Option 4 - Rely on Regional Planning Policy Guidance in the Regional Spatial Strategy

Option 5 - Encourage the development of local shops and services in Feckenham, because the village can sustain them

Option 6 - Business as Usual / Do nothing

New options to consider in policy which have emerged from consultation:

The following were considered to be the alternative viable options suggested during consultation on issues and options:

Option 7 - If deposits of building stone are found in the Borough consider the potential for employment generated in extracting these.

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation stage.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Comments/Explanation
++	++	+	+	+	--	0	<p>Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 6, 16 and 17, however there is likely to be a negative effect on SA Objective 13.</p> <p>Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 6, 16 and 17, however there is likely to be a negative effect on SA Objective 13.</p> <p>Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13 and 16, however there is likely to be a negative effect on SA Objective 10.</p>
2	2	1	1	1	-2	0	<p>Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 6, 16, 17 and 18 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 5, however there may possibly be a negative effect on SA Objective 9. An effect is also predicted for SA Objective 3, however it is not known if this is likely to be a positive or negative effect.</p> <p>Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 3, 4, 5, 6, 16 and 17.</p> <p>Implementing Option 7 is not likely to have any impacts upon the SA Objectives.</p>

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 5 are more likely to affect the rural areas of Redditch Borough. The effects of implementing Option 5 would be felt at a more local level, perhaps only of benefit to the residents of the village of Feckenham. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 4 would be minimal, and achievement of this Objective would have to be through other means. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objectives 5 and 6 would be fairly likely; however the achievement of this Objective would have to be through other means. The likelihood of the negative effect working against SA Objective 9 is only likely if Option 5 were to be implemented as there may be potential effects for the District Centre of Astwood Bank. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 10 would be likely. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 13, 16 and 17 is very likely with the implementation of Options 1 and 3. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 3 is unknown.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	0	0	+/-	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	?	0	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	++	++	-	+/-	0	-	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	+	0	?	+	+/-	-	?
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	+	+	++	+	+	-	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	+/-	+/-	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	--	0	+	+	0	-	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	++	+	+	+	+	-	+
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0	+	-
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+6	+6	+4	+5	+3	-7	0

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA scoring of options determined that Option 1 and Option 2 are the most sustainable options, and therefore were considered to be the preferred approaches presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 3 scored well against sustainability and had potential to be broadly incorporated into the Preferred Draft Core Strategy alongside Options 1 and 2. Option 4 Option 5, and Option 7 had overall positive sustainability effects however they were not taken forward as preferred approaches because they did not score as highly as Option 1 and Option 2 and would not resolve the issues at the local level. Option 6 scored significantly poorly and were therefore not suitable alternative options for consideration to resolve this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented Options 1 and 2; no new options have emerged since the publication of the Preferred Draft Core Strategy. As Options 1 and 2 remain the most sustainable options it is proposed that these options be taken forward into the revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy. The other options mentioned above with potential positive sustainable outcomes could also be taken forward, however it is acknowledged that these were not pursued previously.

10. Coalescence of Settlements

Issue/Question - How can we ensure that one of the purposes of Green Belts (to prevent the coalescence of settlements) is not undermined between Redditch and Astwood Bank?

Option 1 - The landscape characteristics of Redditch Borough are well-defined in these areas of Green Belt and should be protected for their landscape value alone

Option 2 - Rely on National Policy in Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belt

Option 3 - Business as Usual / Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options consultation stage.

1	2	3	Comments/Explanation
+	+	-	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 10 and 17 and there are no predicted negative effects.
1	1	-1	Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 17 and there are no predicted negative effects.

The effects predicted for all options above are more likely to affect the areas of Redditch Borough designated as Green Belt and areas conspicuous from the Green Belt. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 10 and 17 are certain.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and townscape and its best distinctive features;	+ +	+ +	- -
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	+	+	-
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	-	-	+
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	-	-	+
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	+ +	+ +	- -
12 Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities.	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+4	+4	-4

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA Scoring of options has determined that Option 1 and Option 2 are the most sustainable options, however only one option can form the preferred approach to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy and this is to be determined following consideration of comments received during consultation and other relevant evidence. Option 3 scored significantly poorly and is therefore not to be considered as a suitable alternative option to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

Limited content on the coalescence of settlements featured in the PDCS. This was because option 2 is considered a stronger, more locally relevant way forward. There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at PDCS stage or as part of Redditch's development options consultation therefore there is no further SA analysis required.

14. Tall Buildings

Issue/Question - Should Redditch Borough adopt a local policy on tall buildings for a range of uses, if so, where?

Option 1 - Progress a policy on tall buildings appropriate to the local circumstances for the Town Centre only

Option 2 - Progress a policy on tall buildings appropriate to the local circumstances for the whole Borough

Option 3 - Progress a policy on tall buildings appropriate to local circumstances only in certain parts of the Borough, if so where and please provide a reason why?

Option 4 - Rely on National Planning Policy and Guidance on tall buildings from English Heritage and CABE (2007) for the consideration of tall building proposals (Equivalent to Business as Usual / Do nothing)

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options consultation stage or Preferred Draft Core Strategy stage.

1	2	3	4	Comments/Explanation
+	+	?	+	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 10 and 17 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.
				Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 10 and 17 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.
				It is not possible to predict the effects of implementing Option 3 because it is not determined which areas would benefit from a tall buildings policy.
1	1	0	1	Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 10 and 17, however this option would not maximise the potential benefits of SA Objective 17 to its fullest extent. There are no likely negative effects predicted.

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 4 would be noticeable on a Borough-wide scale. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 10 and 17 would be certain.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	++	++	++	++
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	++	++	++	++
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	+	0	?	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	++	++	++	++
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	++	++	++	++
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	++	++	++	++
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+12	+11	+10	+11

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA Scoring of options has determined that Option 1 is the most sustainable option, and is the preferred approach for the Preferred Draft Core Strategy and this will be considered in tandem with comments received during consultation and other relevant evidence. All other options scored significantly well as alternative options, so any could be considered as reasonable alternatives, however only one policy approach can be implemented to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

There was no specific policy on tall buildings in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy because it was deemed that the best approach was to rely on national planning policy, English Heritage and CABE guidance as there wasn't any locally specific issues triggering a need for a local policy.

Key Issue C – Creating a Borough where Business can thrive

15. Location of Employment

Issue/Question - Where should employment growth be located in order to contribute to sustainable development?

Option 1 - Adjacent to new residential development in all circumstances

Option 2 - Adjacent to new residential development where there is suitable infrastructure for industrial development

Option 3 - Concentrate in and around existing employment sites

Option 4 - Principally in and around existing employment sites with the remainder distributed in relation to the location of new housing

Option 5 - Concentrate development along main transport routes

Option 6 - Locate employment land adjacent to attractive surroundings

Option 7 - Business as Usual / Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options consultation stage.

New options to consider in policy which have emerged from Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation:

Option 8 – Do not develop new factories as there are current ones vacant and being re-developed as housing.

Option 9 – Make specific reference to waste management facilities in the policy

Option 10 – Consultation with Economic Development to ascertain the most appropriate usage on employment sites

1	2	3	4	5	Comments/Explanation
-	+	-	-	-	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 3, however it is also likely to result in negative effects on SA Objectives 6, 10, 12 and 16.
					Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 3, however it is also likely to result in negative effects on SA Objectives 6, 10, 12 and 16.
					Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3 and 10, however it is also likely to result in negative effects on SA Objectives 16 and 17.
-1	1	-1	-1	-1	Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3 and 10, however it is also likely to result in negative effects on SA Objectives 16 and 17.
					Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 3, however it is also likely to result in negative effects on SA Objectives 16 and 17.

6	7	8	9	10	Comments/Explanation
--	--	-	++	++	Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 3, 7, 10, 11, 16 and 17.
					Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 16 and 17.
					Implementing Option 8 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA objective 13 and a negative effect on SA Objectives 4 and 6.
-2	-2	-1	+2	+2	Implementing Option 9 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 1, 2 and 6.
					Implementing Option 10 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA objectives 4 and 6.

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 10 would be noticeable on a Borough-wide scale. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 3, 4, 6 and 17 would be very likely in all cases. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 1, 2, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 16 would be fairly likely.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	?	?	?	?	?
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	?	?	?	?	-
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	+	++	+/-	+/-	++
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	+	+	+	+	+
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0
13. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 1	+ 4	0	0	+ 1

Core Strategy DPD Objective	6	7	8	9	10
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	--	-	+/-	?	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	+	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	-	-	+/-	?	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	-	-	+/-	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	-	+/-	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	+	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	+	0	--	+	++
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	-	+/-	0	0	0
14. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	-6	-5	-2	+4	+4

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA Scoring of options determined that Option 2 was the most sustainable option and should therefore be presented as the preferred approach in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 5 also scored positively as a sustainable option and was proposed for consideration when preparing a suitable policy approach alongside Option 2. Both Option 3 and Option 4 had no predicted positive or negative effects on sustainability and were therefore not considered to be suitable alternative options to deal with the issues. Option 1, Option 6 and Option 7 were not considered to be suitable alternative options to deal with the issue because they scored negatively.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented elements of options 2 and 4, although it should be noted that these were incorporated as criteria elements of the policy whereby any proposed sites that had not been identified in the Employment Land Review could come forward for employment purposes subject the criteria being met.

New options to include in policy have emerged including:

- Do not develop new factories as there are current ones vacant and being re-developed as housing.
- Make specific reference to waste management facilities in the policy
- Consultation with Economic Development to ascertain the most appropriate usage on employment sites

Options 9 and 10 score positively and are therefore considered appropriate for consideration for inclusion in the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 7 scored negatively and from an SA perspective should not be pursued. In relation to previous options 1, 2 and 5 score positively and therefore could be considered for inclusion. Options 3, 4 and 6 either scored neutral or negatively and therefore do not deal with the issue highlighted from a sustainability point of view.

15b. Location of Employment

Issue/Question - How should the Borough of Redditch meet its Employment Land requirement?

Option 1 - Identify small to medium sized locations for employment growth based on market forces

Option 2 - Rely on an Employment Land Review to identify the most appropriate approach

Option 3 - Business as Usual / Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options or Preferred Options consultation stage.

1	2	3	Comments/Explanation
-	++	--	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 4, 6 and 14 and there are no likely positive effects predicted.
-1	2	-2	Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 6, 14 and 17 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.
			Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 4, 6 and 14 and there are no likely positive effects predicted.

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 3 would be noticeable on a Borough-wide scale. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objective 4, 6 and 17 would be certain. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objective 14 would be fairly likely.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	-	-	-
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	+/-	+	-
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	+/-	+	-
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	++	++	-
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	0	+5	-6

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA Scoring of options determined that Option 2 was the most sustainable option, and it was therefore considered to be the preferred approach for the Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 1 and Option 3 scored poorly and therefore were not considered suitable alternative policy approaches to be progressed.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options or Preferred Options consultation stage.

The update to this analysis still determines that option 2 is the most sustainable options, and it is therefore proposed that this option be taken forward in the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Again both options 1 and 3 scored poorly and it is proposed that they are not taken forward.

16. Existing Employment Areas

Issue/Question - What is the best approach towards Redditch's employment areas?

- Option 1** - Protect all employment sites for employment purposes that demonstrate they have market attractiveness and viability; physical suitability of land for employment purposes; are served by high quality public transport and have potential for contributing to employment land requirement (This will be assessed through the Employment Land Review).
- Option 2** - Encourage existing companies to participate in the revival of local business communities by establishing local partnerships
- Option 3** - Prioritise areas for funding regimes, with areas in need of renewal being identified through the Employment Land Review
- Option 4** - Business as Usual / Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options consultation stage

New options to consider in policy which have emerged from Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation:

- Option 5** – Incorporate additional criteria to policy which state: “it is no longer viable as an employment area either following a period of unsuccessful marketing or undertaking a viability assessment”.
- Option 6** – Develop criteria to assist with determining where a site is no longer viable
- Option 7** – Restrict non-employment development on sites that would result in a shortage of employment land in that area

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Comments/Explanation
+	+	+	-	+	+	+	<p>Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 6 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4 and 5 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 5, 6, 10, 16 and 17 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 16 and 17 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.</p>
1	1	1	-1	1	1	1	<p>Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 13 and a neutral effect against SA Objectives 4 and 6 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 13 and a neutral effect against SA Objectives 4 and 6 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 6 and 14 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.</p>

The effects predicted for Options 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 would be noticeable on a Borough-wide scale and Option 4 would be predominantly noticeable in areas in need of renewal. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against Objective 3 would be fairly likely with regards to Option 2. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objectives 4, 5, 6 and 17 would be very likely. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 10, 11, 13 and 16 would be fairly likely. The likelihood of working towards or against Objective 13 is not particularly likely, the purpose of the policy is not necessarily to achieve this outcome.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	++	0	+	-	0	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	-	0	0	0	+	+	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	++	+	++	--	-	-	++
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 5	+ 2	+ 6	-4	+ 1	+ 1	+ 3

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA Scoring of options has determined that Option 3 was the most sustainable option, and therefore was considered for inclusion in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy in line with other evidence and comments received during consultation. Option 1 also scored well as an option and also warranted consideration for inclusion in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 2 scored well against sustainability but not as well as other options because it would not deal with the identified issue and it was therefore not considered to be a suitable option. Option 4 scored significantly poorly and was therefore not suitable as an alternative option.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented Option 1 but in addition set out some criteria to help guide developers where it may be feasible for non employment development to developed in employment areas.

New options to include in policy have emerged including:

- Incorporate additional criteria to policy which state: “it is no longer viable as an employment area either following a period of unsuccessful marketing or undertaking a viability assessment”.
- Develop criteria to assist with determining where a site is no longer viable
- Restrict non-employment development on sites that would result in a shortage of employment land in that area

All of these new options have scored well in the SA process, in particular option 7 scores particularly well. It should be noted that options 5 and 6 score positively due to the fact that there is the chance that SA objective 13 and Core Strategy objective 9 may be met. In reality the purpose of including these options within the policy is to assist with protecting employment land rather than encourage alternative development, however where it is identified that the employment land is not developable for employment purposes against the options contained within the policy it is considered that there is a likelihood that a housing may be delivered on the site.

17. Diversification of the economy (previously: High Technology Corridor (HTC) and Economic Growth)

Issue/Question - How can the economy be diversified and should links with the High Technology Corridor be encouraged?

Option 1 - Actively encourage high technology industries into the Borough of Redditch by promoting specific high technology employment zones

Option 2 - No specific encouragement to promoting high technology areas

Option 3 - Establish links with Higher and further education institutions to tap into HTC industry

Option 4 - Business as Usual / Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options or Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation stage.

1	2	3	4	Comments/Explanation
++	--	++	--	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 6, 12 and 14 and there are no likely negative effects predicted. Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 4, 6, 12 and 14 and there are no likely positive effects predicted.
2	-2	2	-2	Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 6, 12 and 14 and there are no likely negative effects predicted. Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 4, 6, 12 and 14 and there are no likely positive effects predicted.

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 3 would be noticeable on a Borough-wide scale. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 4 and 6 would be very likely. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 12 and 14 is a small possibility.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	0	0	0	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	0	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	+ +	-	+	--
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0
13. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 4	-3	+ 3	-4

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA Scoring of options determined that Option 1 and Option 3 were the most sustainable options, and are therefore the preferred approaches to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy. It was proposed that these options could have been implemented in tandem, and a suitable policy approach could have incorporated both of these options simultaneously. Option 2 and Option 4 scored poorly as options to deal with this issue and are therefore not suitable alternative policy options.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented Options 1 and 3 simultaneously as was suggested during the SA process. The revised SA scoring process has determined that options 1 and 3 would be the most sustainable and it is proposed that these options should be taken forward. Options 2 and 4 are still considered unsustainable and should not progressed.

18. Redditch Town Centre

Issue/Question - How can we maintain the vitality and viability of Redditch Town Centre?

- Option 1** - Place Redditch Town Centre at the top of the Hierarchy of Centres, as the preferable location for major retail developments, uses which attract large numbers of people and large scale offices
- Option 2** - Place Redditch Town Centre at the top of the Development Strategy, as the preferable location for housing
- Option 3** - Expand the Town Centre boundary to accommodate retail and office development needs set out in the WMRSS
- Option 4** - Business as Usual / Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at issues and options stage.

Outcome of Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation

- Option 5** - Land at Edward Street would be an ideal site for 'Redditch Heritage Museum' with a small urban park and facilities for coaches.
- Option 6** - Improve connectivity between the key areas and the prominence of the retail core.
- Option 7** - Short to medium term external signage should be considered and improvements to the external treatment of the shopping centre.
- Option 8** - Lower the comparison floor space figure due to the economic climate
- Option 9** - Edward Street and Church Rd should be aimed at families who can't afford to buy properties such as low cost fuel efficient flats to rent
- Option 10** – Church Rd site should be developed for housing and offices
- Option 11** – Edward Street should be developed for housing and offices
- Option 12** – Redevelop old job centre and redundant market area
- Option 13** – To have no additional retail or office development
- Option 14** – Develop public toilets
- Option 15** - plan for approximately 30,000sqm of comparison floorspace for the period up until 2021 and aim to make provision for an additional 20,000sqm floorspace between 2021 and 2026 within the Town Centre.
- Option 16** - redevelopment and diversification of the Town Centre providing vibrant mixed use areas;
- Option 17** - promote the appropriate re-use and redevelopment of land and existing floorspace within or immediately adjacent to the Town Centre
- Option 18** – Town Centres to serve the Borough as a whole and be the preferred location for leisure, entertainment and cultural activities;

Option 19 – Town Centre to be the preferred location for major retail developments, large scale leisure, tourist, social and community venues and large scale office uses (Class B1a) , and other uses that attract large numbers of people.

1	2	3	4	5	Comments/Explanation
+	+	+	-	++	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 9 and 17 and there are no predicted negative effects.
					Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 9 and 17 and there are no predicted negative effects.
1	1	1	-1	2	Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 6, 9 and 17 and there are no predicted negative effects.
					Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 3, 6, 9 and 17 and there are no predicted positive effects.
					Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, and 17. There is an unknown effect on SA Objective 4 and there are no predicted negative effects.
6	7	8	9	10	Comments/Explanation
+	+	?	+	++	Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA objectives 3 and 9. There is an unknown effect on all other SA objectives and there are no predicted negative effects.
					Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA objectives 3 and 9. There is an unknown effect on all other SA objectives and there are no predicted negative effects.
1	1	0	1	2	Implementing Option 8 will have an unknown effect on all SA objectives.
					Implementing Option 9 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 13 and 16. There is an unknown effect on all other SA objectives with no predicted negative effects.
					Implementing Options 10 & 11 are likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 13 and 16. There is an unknown effect on all other SA objectives with no predicted negative effects.

11	12	13	14	15	Comments/Explanation
++	++	-	+	+	Implementing Option 12 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 6, 9, 10, 15 and 17 and there are no negative effects. Mitigation measures – redevelopment would have to include offices for it to be a positive effect on objectives 4 & 6.
					Implementing Option 13 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 4, 6 and 9 and there are no predicted positive effects.
2	2	-1	1	1	Implementing Option 14 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 9 and there are no predicted negative effects.
					Implementing Option 15 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 9 and 10 and there are no predicted negative effects.

16	17	18	19	Comments/Explanation
++	++	++	+++	Implementing Option 16 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 5, 9, 10, 13 and 15 and there are no predicted negative effects.
				Implementing Option 17 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 15 and 17 and there are no predicted negative effects. (mitigation that Edward Street and Church Rd Developed)
2	2	2	3	Implementing Option 18 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14 and 15 and there are no predicted negative effects. (mitigation that Edward Street and Church Rd Developed)
				Implementing Option 19 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14 and 17 and there are no predicted negative effects.

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 4, 7, 8, 13 and 15-19 would be noticeable on a Borough-wide scale. The effect predicted for Option 5, 6, 0-12 and 14 would be noticeable in the vicinity of the Town Centre. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 3, 4, 9 and 10 would be certain. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 6 would be fairly likely in relation to Options 3 and 4. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 15 and 17 would be very likely.

Core Strategy DPD Objectives	1	2	3	4	5
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0	0	+
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	0	0	0	0	+
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and achieving a balance between road hierarchy principles of Redditch New Town with reducing the need to travel;	+	+	+	-	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	+	0	+	-	+
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	+	+	+	-	+
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	+	0	-	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	+	0	0	-	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+5	+4	+4	-6	+6

Core Strategy DPD Objectives	6	7	8	9	10
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	+	0	0	0	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and achieving a balance between road hierarchy principles of Redditch New Town with reducing the need to travel;	+	0	0	+	+
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	+	+	-	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	+	+	-	+	+
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	+	+
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	0	+
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+5	+3	-2	+4	+6

Core Strategy DPD Objectives	11	12	13	14	15
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	0	0	0	0	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and achieving a balance between road hierarchy principles of Redditch New Town with reducing the need to travel;	+	+	-	0	+
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	+	-	+	+
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	+	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	+	+	-	+	+
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	+	+	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	+	+	-	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+6	+8	-5	+3	+4

Core Strategy DPD Objectives	16	17	18	19
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	+	+	0	+
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and achieving a balance between road hierarchy principles of Redditch New Town with reducing the need to travel;	+	+	+	+
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	+	+	+	+
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	+	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	+	+	+	+
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	+	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	+	+	0	+
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	+	0	0	+
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+10	+7	+5	+9

The SA Scoring of options has determined that Option 16 is the most sustainable scoring significantly higher than other options, and is therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 12, 17 and 19 also scored highly in terms of sustainability and could be implemented as a preferred approach alongside Option 16 subject to consideration of other evidence and comments received during consultation. Option 4 scored significantly poorly and is therefore not a suitable alternative policy option to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented options 16, 17 and 19 as principles to be applied in the Town Centre.

New option to include in policy is to redevelop the old job centre and redundant market area however this option is previously developed land and is already included in option 17.

Options 5, 6, 10, 11 and 18 score positively and are therefore considered appropriate for consideration for inclusion in the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 8 and 13 scored negatively and from an SA perspective should not be pursued.

18b. Redditch Town Centre

Issue/Question - How can we improve Redditch Town Centre's night time economy?

- Option 1** - Secure monies from Town Centre developments for facilities for families to be provided in the Town Centre as part of a planning obligations policy
- Option 2** - Secure monies from Borough wide development for facilities for families to be provided in the Town Centre as part of a planning obligations policy
- Option 3** - Encourage the provision of uses likely to promote a family orientated night time economy
- Option 4** - Business as Usual / Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at issues and options consultation stage.

Outcome of Preferred Draft Core Strategy Consultation

- Option 5** - Plan to improve and manage by controlling location and types of licensed premises and hot food takeaway to ensure harm is not caused to the neighbourhood.
- Option 6** - promoting a vibrant and safe, high quality, evening economy comprising a mix of leisure and entertainment uses suitable and accessible for all members of the public;

1	2	3	4	5	6	Comments/Explanation
+	+	+	- -	+	+	<p>Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 5, 9 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 5, 9 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 5, 9, 15 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p>
1	1	1	-2	1	1	<p>Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 5, 9 and 15 and there are no predicted positive effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 9 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 5 and 9 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p>

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 4 and 6 would be noticeable predominantly in Redditch Town Centre. The effects predicted for Option 5 would be noticeable predominantly in, and adjacent to, the New Town District Centres of Redditch. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 3 and 9 would be very likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 5 would be fairly likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 15 would be very likely.

Core Strategy DPD Objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	0	0	0	-	0	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and achieving a balance between road hierarchy principles of Redditch New Town with reducing the need to travel;	0	0	0	-	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	+	+	+	-	0	+
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	+	+	+	-	+	+
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+3	+3	+3	-6	+2	+3

The SA Scoring of options has determined that Option 1 -3 and 6 are the most sustainable options, and therefore any of these options could form the preferred approach to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy, subject to consideration of other evidence and comments received during consultation. Option 5 also scored highly in terms of sustainability. Option 4 scored poorly with regards to sustainability and is therefore not a suitable alternative policy option to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented elements of options 3, 5 and 6, although it should be noted that these were incorporated as criteria elements of the policy.

19. District Centres

Issue/Question - The New Town era District Centres in Redditch are not attractive and need to be improved, how can we do this?

- Option 1** - Redevelop and regenerate all District Centres built during the New Town era, providing for the needs of the existing and the likely future local communities
- Option 2** - Expand the boundaries of the District Centres to enhance the local retail offer and other services and facilities
- Option 3** - Continue to protect the allocated District Centres and retain the current boundaries
- Option 4** - Allocate new District Centres where necessary
- Option 5** - Encourage District Centres as community focal points with distinctive design and architecture encouraged for each Centre
- Option 6** - Set a limit in the number of hot food takeaways in each District Centre so that it continues to perform its role and function to provide variety and choice to communities
- Option 7** - Business as Usual / Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options consultation stage.

Outcome of Preferred Draft Core Strategy Consultation

- Option 8** - Develop Public Toilets
- Option 9** – Enclose Matchborough District Centre
- Option 10** – Improve landscaping around the church at Matchborough Centre
- Option 11** – redesign access and overflow car parks
- Option 12** – District Centre to provide day to day needs, supported by a limited range of other shops and non retail services serving their local communities;
- Option 13** - Appropriate for environmental enhancements.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Comments/Explanation
++	+	-	-	+	+	--	<p>Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 9, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 16, with no predicted positive effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objective 15 and a positive effect on SA Objective 9.</p> <p>Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 9, 10 and 17 and a positive effect on SA Objective 16.</p> <p>Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 9, 10 and 17 and a positive effect on SA Objective 16.</p>
2	1	-1	-1	1	1	-2	<p>Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 5, 9, 10 and 16 and. There are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 1 and 9, with no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 9, 15 and 16, with no predicted positive effects.</p>

8	9	10	11	12	13	Comments/Explanation
+	0	++	+/-	+	+	<p>Implementing Option 8 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 9 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 9 is likely to result in no effects on any SA Objectives</p> <p>Implementing Option 10 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 5, 7 and 11 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p>
1	0	2	0	1	1	<p>Implementing Option 11 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objective 3 and a positive effect on SA Objective 9.</p> <p>Implementing Option 12 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3 and 9 and there are no predicted negative effects</p> <p>Implementing Option 13 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 7, 9 and 11 and there are no predicted negative effects</p>

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 13 would be noticeable predominantly in, and adjacent to, the New Town District Centres of Redditch, however effects would also be felt Borough-wide. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 1 would be fairly likely with regards to Option 6. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 5 would be very likely with regards to Option 5. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objectives 9, 10, 15 and 16 would be certain. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 17 would be very likely.

Core Strategy DPD Objectives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	+	0	+	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	+	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	0	0	0	+	+	0	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and achieving a balance between road hierarchy principles of Redditch New Town with reducing the need to travel;	+	+	0	+	0	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0	-	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	+	+	-	+	+	0	-
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	+	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	+	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	-	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	+	+	0	+	+	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+6	+6	-1	+6	+5	+2	-4

Core Strategy DPD Objectives	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	+	0	0	+
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0	0	+
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	0	0	+	0	0	+
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and achieving a balance between road hierarchy principles of Redditch New Town with reducing the need to travel;	0	0	0	+	+	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	+	0	+	+	+	+
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	+	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	2	0	5	2	4	4

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 1 is the most sustainable, and is therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 2, Option 4 and Option 5 also scored positively against sustainability and these could all be implemented simultaneously and interpreted into a policy approach subject to consideration of other evidence and comments received during consultation. Option 3, Option 7 and Option 9 did not score well in relation to sustainability are therefore not considered to be an alternative policy approach to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented elements of options 1, 2 and 5.

New options to include in policy have emerged including:

- Improve landscaping around the church at Matchborough Centre
- District Centre to provide day to day needs, supported by a limited range of other shops and non retail services serving their local communities;
- be appropriate for environmental enhancements.

Options 10, 12 and 13 score positively and are therefore considered appropriate for consideration for inclusion in the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 8 and 11 scored negatively and from an SA perspective should not be pursued.

Key Issue D - Improving Health and Well-being

20. Health Facilities

Issue/Question - Are there any locations within the Borough that could be safeguarded for health-related uses?

Option 1 - Within the curtilage of the Alexandra Hospital

Option 2 - Town Centre

Option 3 - District Centres

Option 4 - In areas currently furthest away from a GP surgery

Option 5 - Within new developments

Option 6 - Business as usual/ Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at issues and options consultation stage.

There were no options relating to the above locations during the Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation, however a new option relating to the policy is:

Option 7 - A locational strategy should be developed for the provision of health facilities in accordance with areas of identified /expected growth

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Comments/Explanation
++	+	+	+	?	-	+	<p>Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 6 and 12 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 9 and 12 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 9 and 12 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 12 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p>
2	1	1	1	0	-1	1	<p>Implementing Option 5 cannot be accurately assessed against sustainability because the exact locations are not known.</p> <p>Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objective 12. This is assuming that the current safeguarding of land within the curtilage of the Alexandra Hospital through Local Plan No.3 is not continued.</p> <p>Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 12. There were no predicted negative effects.</p>

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 7 would be noticeable predominantly in, and adjacent to, the specific areas mentioned, however effects would also be felt Borough-wide, particularly in relation to Option 6. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 3 would be very likely in relation to Options 1, 2 and 3 and fairly likely in relation to Option 4. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 6 would be fairly likely in relation to Option 1. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 9 would be certain in relation to Options 2 and 3. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against Option 12 would be certain in relation to all options. Safeguarding land for health-related uses within the curtilage of the Alexandra Hospital would see more beneficial effects than safeguarding land suggested in other Options. Implementing Option 4 would not be as beneficial for the achievement of SA Objective 12 as it would be to implement Options 2 and 3.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	0	0	0	?	?	?	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	0	0	0	0	0	0	?
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	++	++	+	?	+	+	+
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	0	-	0	?
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	0	-	0	?
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 5	+ 4	+ 3	+ 2	0	-1	+ 2

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 1 and Option 2 were the most sustainable options, and are therefore either of these were identified as preferred approaches to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy subject to consideration of other evidence and the comments received during consultation. Option 3 and Option 4 also scored positively in relation to sustainability but not as well as Option 1 and Option 2. Option 5 and Option 6 scored poorly and were therefore not considered to be suitable alternative policy options to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented Options 1, 2 and 3

New options to include in policy have emerged including:

- A locational strategy should be developed for the provision of health facilities in accordance with areas of identified /expected growth

The SA scoring of options has determined that option 1 and 2 are still the most sustainable and it is therefore proposed that these continued to be progressed in the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 6 scores negatively and Option 5 scores neutral, it is therefore proposed that these options should not be pursued. In relation to option 3 this was taken forward in the previous consultation phase and as it still scores positively it is proposed that this could be taken forward again.

Health (b)

Issue/Question – Are there ways that planning can have a positive impact on healthy living

Option 1 - For certain applications (more than 5 dwellings, leisure and economic development) develop principles that assist in the consideration as to whether an application demonstrates health benefits.

Option 2 – Do nothing business as usual

This is a new policy approach and has not been consulted on previously during the development of the Core Strategy.

1	2	Comments/Explanation
+	-	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, and 12 and there are no predicted negative effects.
1	-1	Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objective 12 and there is a questionable effect on SA Objective 3, and there are no predicted positive effects.

The effects predicted for Option 1 would be noticeable Borough-wide. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 3 is fairly likely for option 1 and questionable for option 2. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 12 would be very likely in relation to Options 1 and 2.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	0	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	+	?
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	+	-
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	++	--
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 5	-4

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The SA scoring of options has determined that option 1 is the most sustainable approach and this should be progressed in the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 2 scores negatively; it is therefore proposed that this option should not be pursued.

21. Leisure and Tourism

Issue/Question - How should we promote tourism and culture/ leisure in Redditch Borough?

Option 1 - Support existing tourist attractions (i.e. Arrow Valley Park, Forge Mill Needle Museum) and encourage new visitor attractions

Option 2 - Improve conference facilities

Option 3 - Increase the quality and quantity of tourist accommodation

Option 4 - Attract retail tourism to the Town Centre

Option 5 - Business as usual/ Do nothing

The following were considered to be the alternative viable Options suggested during consultation:

Option 6 - Resist the loss of existing facilities unless it can be demonstrated that the facility is no longer needed or the services provided by the facility can be served in an alternative location.

Preferred Draft Core Strategy additional options:

Option 7 – In the future development of the Abbey Stadium area consider the sensitivity of some of the environmental features including the need to protect and enhance associated ecological habits and historic landscape within the park and surrounding area

Option 8 – Ensure full consideration given to all infrastructure required to support future development in Abbey Stadium area

Option 9 – Improve links to Public Rights of Way to increase opportunities for recreation

Option 10 – Consider the potential of the natural environment to provide recreational opportunities, whilst ensuring this does not place undue pressure on designated areas

1	2	3	4	5	Comments/Explanation
+	0	+	+	-	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 5 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects.
					Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in no effects on SA Objectives, assuming that the principles of PPS6 are applied.
1	0	1	1	-1	Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 16 and there are no predicted negative effects, assuming that the principles of PPS6 are applied.
					Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 5, 9 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects.
					Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objective 16 and there are no predicted positive effects.

6	7	8	9	10	Comments/Explanation
0	++	++	++	++	Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in unknown effects on SA Objective 16 and there are no predicted negative effects
					Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 7, 8, 10, 11 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects
0	2	2	2	2	Implementing Option 8 is likely to result in positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 7, 11 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects
					Implementing Option 9 is likely to result in positive effect on SA Objectives 3 and 12 and an unknown effect on Objective 11, mitigation measures would be required to ensure positive effect
					Implementing Option 10 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 7, 8, 10 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects and an unknown effect on Objective 11, mitigation measures would be required to ensure positive effect

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 5 and 7 and 8 would be noticeable predominantly in, and adjacent to, the specific areas mentioned, however effects would also be felt Borough-wide, particularly in relation to Options 2, 3 and 5. Other options would have effects on a Borough-wide scale. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 16 would be fairly likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 7 would be certain. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 12 would be a small likelihood.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	+	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	++	0	0	+	--
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	+/-	?	+/-	++	-
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	++	++	++	+	--
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	?	?	+/-	+	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	?	+	+	+	-
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 6	+ 3	+ 6	+ 7	-7

Core Strategy DPD Objective	6	7	8	9	10
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	+	0	0	+
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	0	+	?	?	+
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	?	0	+	++	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	+ /-	?	+	++	++
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	?	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	+	0	0	+
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	?	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	0	+ 3	+ 2	+ 4	+ 5

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 1 and Option 4 are the most sustainable options, and are therefore the preferred approaches to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation. Both of these options could be implemented in tandem in order to compose a suitable policy. Option 2 and Option 3, although scoring well with positive sustainability benefits, they would not be suitable approaches to deal with this issue, but may be considered in developing the policies. Option 5 scored poorly in relation to sustainability and is therefore not a suitable alternative policy option.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented Option 1 in Policy H.1 'Leisure and Tourism'. The Abbey Stadium site was also included as a Strategic Site. Following consultation on the Issues and Options and PDCS a number of new options were suggested. Option 10 scored well against the DPD objectives and will therefore be carried forward to policy. Options 7, 8 and 9 scored positively but not as well as option 5 and will be considered for inclusion in policy.

New options to include in policy have emerged including:

- Consider the potential of the natural environment to provide recreational opportunities, whilst ensuring this does not place undue pressure on designated areas

In order to implement Option 10, mitigation measures for DPD objectives 4 & 11 would be required to ensure there are no adverse effects.

22. Open Space

Issue/Question - Should Redditch continue to be distinctive with it's higher than average standard of open space?

Option 1 - Yes, keep Redditch distinctive. Definitely do not build on any open space

Option 2 - Yes, keep Redditch distinctive. But some land on the periphery of open space or parkland could be used for development. Please suggest possible locations

Option 3 - No, comprehensively review the open space to identify significant parcels of land (including parkland) for development, even if this has the potential to undermine local distinctiveness

Option 4 - No, compromise local distinctiveness and parkland provision in an attempt to reduce open space standards in Redditch to the averages of surrounding Districts

Option 5 - Business as usual/ Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at the Issues and Options consultation stage. It was considered that a criterion based approach to assessing proposals for the loss of open space could be an option.

Option 6 - Develop criteria to assess proposals for the loss of open space

Preferred Draft Core Strategy additional options

Option 7 - Complete a Green Infrastructure Strategy to guide policy

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Comments/Explanation
-	?	-	-	-	-	++	<p>Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 13 and 17 and a positive effect is predicted for SA Objectives 5, 7 and 9.</p> <p>It is not possible to fully assess the sustainability of Implementing Option 2 because the exact locations are not known.</p> <p>Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 6 and 13, and a negative effect is predicted for SA Objectives 7, 9, 10 and 17.</p>
-1	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	2	<p>Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 17 and possibly 8; however a positive effect is predicted for SA Objectives 6 and 13.</p> <p>Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 6 and 13 and there are no predicted positive effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in negative effects on SA Objectives 11 and 17 and there are no predicted positive effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in positive effects on SA Objectives 2, 3, 10, 11 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p>

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 5 would be Borough-wide. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objectives 2, 3 and 5 would be fairly likely. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 7, 11 and 16 would be fairly likely, but dependant on site by site circumstances. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 9, 13 and 17 would be certain. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 10 would be very likely.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	++	+/-	-	--	+	+/-	++
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	+	?	-	-	-	0	+
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	++	+/-	--	--	+/-	-	++
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	++	+	--	--	--	--	++
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	--	+/-	++	++	+/-	+/-	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	--	+/-	++	++	+/-	+/-	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	++	+/-	--	--	--	-	++
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	+	+/-	-	-	-	+/-	+
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+4	+ 1	-6	-7	-6	-5	+12

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 1 is the most sustainable option, and was therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation. Option 2 had no positive or negative effects overall and Option 3, Option 4 and Option 5 had an overall negative effect on sustainability therefore they are not suitable alternative policy options. Option 6 also scored negatively and would therefore not be the best policy approach for the Core Strategy. Option 7 scored very positively and therefore should be the preferred policy approach.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented Option 6, which although it did not score positively was considered the best option in light of the fact there was no Green Infrastructure Strategy being progressed for the Borough. The policy followed the same approach to that in the Adopted Local Plan, however this criterion based approach is considered more suitable as a development control style policy rather than for a Core Strategy.

New options to include in policy have emerged including:

- Complete a Green Infrastructure Strategy to guide policy

Option 7, to complete a Green Infrastructure Strategy to guide policy scored very positively in comparison to the other options and should therefore be recommended as the preferred policy approached for the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy.

Key Issue F – Stronger Communities

23. Previously Developed Land

Issue/Question - What is the most suitable approach to delivering as much housing on Previously Developed Land?

- Option 1** - Set a local target for housing development on Previously Developed Land in line with National Planning Policy based on all types of Previously Developed Land, inclusive of back gardens (see issue below)
- Option 2** - Set a local target for housing development on Previously Developed Land in line with National Planning Policy based on all types of Previously Developed Land, with a specific policy relating to the protection of back gardens (see issue below)
- Option 3** - Prioritise all possible Previously Developed Land for housing regardless of its suitability for other uses
- Option 4** - Business as Usual / Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options consultation on stage

New options to consider in policy which have emerged from consultation:

- Option 5** - Protect brownfield land with biodiversity/ open space value
- Option 6** - 25% on PDL (RSS evidence)
- Option 7** - 15% on PDL (SHLAA evidence)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Comments/Explanation
+	+	-	- -	++	++	++	<p>Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 7 and 17 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 7 and 17 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Options 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 17, however it is also likely to result in negative effects on SA Objectives 9 and 13.</p> <p>Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 7, 11 and 17.</p>
1	1	-1	-2	2	2	2	<p>Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive impact on SA Objectives 2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 and 17 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive impact on SA Objectives 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17 and 18 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a positive impact on SA Objectives 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17 and 18 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.</p>

The likelihood of the effect working towards SA Objectives 7 and 17 would be certain with regards to Options 1 to 7 with the exception of Option 4, which would be likely to work against SA Objectives 7 and 17. The likelihood of the effect working towards SA Objectives 2, 8 and 10 is fairly likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objectives 11 and 13 is fairly likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards SA Objectives 5, 12, 16 and 18 would be a small possibility. The likelihood of the effect working against SA Objective 9 would be a small possibility.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0	0	++	++	+
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0	+	+
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and townscape and its best distinctive features;	-	++	--	0	+	+	+
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	+	+	+/-	0	0	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0	0	+	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	++	--	-	++	+
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	--	--	-	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	-	+	--	-	+	+	+
12 Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	0	+ 5	-6	-7	+ 6	+ 9	+ 7

SA Analysis 31/10/2008 to 8/5/2009

The SA scoring of options for this period determined that Option 2 was the most sustainable, and was therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation. Option 1 also scored well in relation to sustainability and could also be considered as an alternative option, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation. Option 3 and Option 4 did not score well in relation to sustainability and were therefore not suitable alternative policy options to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented Option 2 but without a specific policy relating to the protection of back gardens. The policy did however make provision for potential back garden development to be in keeping with the surrounding environment, thus affording protection to potential garden development in inappropriate locations and offering appropriate consideration to development in less sensitive locations.

New options to include in policy have emerged including:

Option 5 - Protect brownfield land with biodiversity/ open space value

Option 6 - 25% on PDL (RSS evidence)

Option 7 - 15% on PDL (SHLAA evidence)

The November 2010 SA scoring of options has determined that Options 6 and 7 are the most sustainable, and are therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation. Options 6 and 7 are a progression of Option 2 as they both identify locally set PDL targets. Option 6 is the more sustainable of the two options, however further evidence may indicate that this target is not achievable. Therefore Option 7 would be the most appropriate option to progress. Option 5 offers a sustainable approach to efficiently using land and should also be included in the policy. Options 1, 3 and 4 did not score well in relation to sustainability and are therefore not suitable alternative policy options to deal with this issue.

24. Development on Back Gardens

Issue/Question - How can the effects of development on back gardens be minimised?

Option 1 - Implement a policy in line with the Regional Spatial Strategy restricting development on back gardens where there is evidence of its impacts on the locality

Option 2 - Set out a criteria based policy which aims to ensure any development on back gardens is in keeping with the surrounding environment

Option 3 - Business as Usual / Do nothing

The following were considered to be the alternative viable Options suggested during consultation on issues and options:

Option 4 - Do not use any back gardens

1	2	3	4	Comments/Explanation
+	+	--	-	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 7, 10, 11, 13 and 16 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.
				Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 7, 10, 11, 13 and 16 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.
1	1	-2	-1	Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 7, 10, 11, 13, 16 and 17.
				Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 13 and 17

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 3 would be noticeable on a Borough-wide scale. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 7, 10, 11 and 16 would be fairly likely depending on the site by site circumstances. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objective 13 would be fairly likely. The likelihood of the effects working against SA Objective 17 would be fairly likely.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and townscape and its best distinctive features;	++	++	-	++
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	0	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	-	-	+	--
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	++	++	--	++
12 Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities.	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	4	4	-4	2

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 1 and Option 2 are the most sustainable option so these can be considered as the preferred option for inclusion in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation. Option 4 also scored positively in relation to sustainability but not as well as Option 1 and Option 2 therefore it is not considered to be a suitable alternative to deal with this issue. Option 3 had negative effects and is therefore not considered to be a suitable option to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented Option 2. Consultation responses proposed no other alternatives to test through the SA.

The November 2010 SA scoring of options has determined that Option 2 is still the most sustainable for a locally distinctive policy approach, and is therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 2 is considered to contribute to further progression of the policy rather than providing a policy direction in its own right. It offers an additional contribution to providing a more rounded approach to delivering efficient and effective use of land for development within the Borough.

25. Housing Density

Issue/Question - What is the most appropriate approach to density standards across the Borough?

- Option 1** - 30 dwellings per hectare, except in the Town and District Centres being 70 dwellings per hectare (as per minimum National Standards for density)
- Option 2** - 30 dwellings per hectare for the urban area of Redditch, Astwood Bank and Feckenham being developed at densities of between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare and the Town and District Centres being 70 dwellings per hectare
- Option 3** - Apply a density standard of 30 dwellings per hectare for Astwood Bank and Feckenham, and a density standard for the urban area of Redditch of 30 – 50 dwellings per hectare, with the Town and District Centres being 70 dwellings per hectare
- Option 4** - Different densities for each District in Redditch (between 30 – 70 dwellings per hectare) depending on their character
- Option 5** - Business as Usual / Do nothing

The following were considered to be the alternative viable options suggested during consultation at issues and options consultation stage:

- Option 6** - Density should be approached on a site by site basis
- Option 7** - No more than 30 dwellings per hectare across the whole Borough

New options to consider which emerged prior to PDCS consultation:

- Option 8** - Allow for higher density levels if it can be demonstrated that there will be no detrimental impacts
- Option 9** - Higher densities will be sought in locations close to public transport interchanges

1	2	3	4	5	Comments/Explanation
+	+	++	+	-	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 9, 10, 13 and 16. However, it does not ensure that SA Objective 17 is fulfilled to its fullest extent. Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 9, 10, 13, 16 and 17 and there are no likely negative effects predicted. Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 9, 10, 13, 16 and SA Objective 17 would be maximised to its fullest extent. There are no likely negative effects predicted.
1	1	2	1	-1	Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 9, 10, 13, 16 and 17 and there are no likely negative effects predicted. Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 9, 10, 11, 13 and 17.

6	7	8	9	Comments/Explanation
?	-	++	++	Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 9, 10, 11, 13 and 17. Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objective 17.
0	-1	2	2	Implementing Option 8 is likely to result in a positive impact on SA Objectives 2, 7, 10, 13, 16, 17 and 18 however it is also likely to result in negative effects on SA Objective 8. Implementing Option 9 is likely to result in a positive impact on SA Objectives 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17 and 18 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 4, and 8 and 9 would be noticeable on a Borough-wide scale. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 9, 10, 13 and 16 would be certain for all options. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 17 is very likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards SA Objectives 2, 7, 11 and 18 is quite likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards SA Objective 3 would be a small possibility. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 8 would be a small possibility.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and townscape and its best distinctive features;	+	+	+	++	-
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	+	+	+	+	--
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	+	++	+	+	--
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	+	0
12 Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities.	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 4	+ 5	+ 5	+ 6	-6

Core Strategy DPD Objective	6	7	8	9
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	-	-	+
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	+	+
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	+	+
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and townscape and its best distinctive features;	+	+	+	+
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	+	+	0	+
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	-	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	+	+/-	++	+
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	+/-	+/-	+	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	+	-	+	+
12 Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities.	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 4	-1	+ 7	+ 9

SA Analysis 31/10/2008 to 8/5/2009

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 4 is the most sustainable option, but also Option 2 and Option 3 were high scoring options and either Option could be taken forward for inclusion in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation. Option 1 and Option 6 also scored well in relation to sustainability but not as well as Option 2, Option 3 or Option 4 so it is therefore not one of the preferred approaches. Option 5 and Option 7 scored poorly against sustainability and they are therefore not a suitable alternative policy options to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented a combination of Options 2 and 3. Although Option 4 scored the highest, the policy did include reference to consideration of other densities which reflected the character of an area, thus avoiding the need for specific area character appraisal within the policy.

New options to consider which emerged prior to PDCS consultation:

Option 8 - Allow for higher density levels if it can be demonstrated that there will be no detrimental impacts

Option 9 - Higher densities will be sought in locations close to public transport interchanges

The November 2010 SA scoring of options has determined that Option 9 is the most sustainable, closely followed by Option 8. Options 8 and 9 are considered to contribute to further progression of the policy rather than being policy directions in their own right. They offer an additional contribution to providing a more rounded approach to delivering efficient use of land for development within the Borough.

28. Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Issue/Question - Which criterion are the most important when considering sustainable broad locations for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople?

- Option 1** - Near existing facilities and transport networks
- Option 2** - Previously Developed Land
- Option 3** - Established industrial or employment sites with spare land
- Option 4** - Anywhere in the urban area, subject to other planning considerations
- Option 5** - Business as usual/ Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at issue and options consultation stage.

New options to consider in policy which have emerged from Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation:

- Option 6** – Well screened and landscaped and will not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Option 7** – Will not result in disturbance or loss of amenity to any neighbouring residential properties
- Option 8** – Have a satisfactory water supply, sewerage and refuse disposal facilities

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Comments/Explanation
++	++	-	-	-	+	+	+	<p>Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 11 and 13 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 11, 13 and 17 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objective 13 and there are no predicted positive effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 3, 7, 11 and 13 and there are no predicted positive effects.</p>
2	2	-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	<p>Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 3, 7, 11 and 13 and there are no predicted positive effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 7, 10, 11 and 15.</p> <p>Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 5 and 12.</p> <p>Implementing Option 8 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 1, 5, 7 and 12.</p>

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 5 would be Borough-wide. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 3 and 13 would be certain. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 7 and 11 is a small possibility dependant on site by site circumstances.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	+	0	?	?	+	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	+	0	+	?	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	0	0	?	-	-	+	+	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	++	+	++	--	-	0	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	++	++	0	+	--	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	-	?	-	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 7	+ 6	+ 2	-3	-6	+ 3	+ 2	+ 1

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 1 and Option 2 are the most sustainable options, and are therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation. Both of these options can be implemented simultaneously in order to progress a suitable policy approach. Option 3 also scored well against sustainability but not as well as Option 1 and Option 2. Option 3, although scoring positively, it did not score as highly as Option 1 or Option 2 and is therefore not the

preferred option. Both Option 4 and Option 5 would have negative effects on sustainability and therefore are not suitable policy approaches to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented a combination of Option 1 and 2 as this was the most approach.

New options that emerged at the Preferred Draft Core Strategy Stage include:

Option 6 - Well screened and landscaped and will not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area

Option 7 - Will not result in disturbance or loss of amenity to any neighbouring residential properties

Option 8 - Have a satisfactory water supply, sewerage and refuse disposal facilities

These Options have scored well against the SA objectives and are considered suitable to include as part of a criteria based policy.

29. Getting Around in Redditch Borough

Issue/Question - What should be the transport requirements expected of new developments in Redditch Borough?

Option 1 - Transport Assessment to accompany any new development regardless of size

Option 2 - Transport Assessment should only be sought for planning applications involving a significant travel demand, as currently sought by the WMRSS Preferred Option document

Option 3 - To ensure the development is located within 250m of passenger transport (bus stop or train station)

Option 4 - A green travel plan to accompany any new development regardless of size

Option 5 - Green travel plans should only be sought for certain developments, as set out by PPG13 –Transport

Option 6 - All developments to be accessible to all modes of transport

Option 7 - Business as usual / Do nothing.

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at issues and options consultation stage.

New options to consider in policy which have emerged from Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation:

Option 8 -Transport Assessments will be required for all development proposals with significant transport implications.

Option 9 - Principles of a structured road hierarchy and will seek to extend such principles in any proposal.

Option 10 – Meet development requirements in accessible locations and take account of interactions between uses

Option 11 – Deliver a comprehensive network of routes for pedestrians and cyclists that is coherent, direct, safe, accessible and comfortable to use, building on, adapting and extending the network that exists

Option 12 – Ensure infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists is provided that facilitates walking, cycling and public transport

1	2	3	4	5	6	Comments/Explanation
-	+	++	-	+	++	<p>Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objective 4 (as a principle applicable to any development, the feasibility of this option is not economically sustainable), however it is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 3.</p> <p>Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 3 and there are no negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 3 and there are no negative effects predicted.</p>
-1	1	2	-1	1	2	<p>Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objective 4 (as a principle applicable to any development, the feasibility of this option is not economically sustainable), however it is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 3.</p> <p>Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 3 and there are no negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 3, 7, 9 and 12 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p>

7	8	9	10	11	12	Comments/Explanation
- -	+	-	+	+	+	<p>Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 2, 3, 7 and 12 and there are no predicted positive effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 8 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2 and 3.</p> <p>Implementing Option 9 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 10.</p>
-2	1	- 1	1	1	1	<p>Implementing Option 10 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2 and 3.</p> <p>Implementing Option 11 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 3 and 12.</p> <p>Implementing Option 12 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 3 and 12.</p>

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 5 would be Borough-wide. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 2 and 7 would be fairly likely but only in relation to the scale of Redditch Borough. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 3 would be certain. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 9 and 12 would be a small possibility, with improved access to services and facilities.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	+	+	+	+	+	+/-
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	+	++	++	+	++	++
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	++	0	0	+
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	0	0	+
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	0	0	+
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 1	+ 4	+ 7	+ 1	+ 4	+ 7

Core Strategy DPD Objective	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	+	0	+	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards	0	+	0	+	+	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	- -	0	0	+	+	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	0	0	++	+	+	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	- -	++	+	++	+	+
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	-	0	0	0	+	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	+	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	+	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	++	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	- 5	+ 4	+ 6	+ 7	+ 7	+ 2

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 3 and Option 6 are the most sustainable options, and are therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation. Both of these options can be implemented simultaneously to progress a suitable policy approach. Option 1, Option 2, Option 4 and Option 5 all had positive effects but not to the same extent as Option 3 or Option 6 and these could be considered as preferred options, but because of the nature of the

options, they would be more appropriately dealt with in future LDDs. Option 7 scored significantly poorly in relation to sustainability and is therefore not a suitable alternative policy option to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented a combination of the Options presented that were appraised as being sustainable. It was considered that the best approach would be to present a policy that contained a number of the options rather than just focus on one.

New options to include in policy have emerged including:

Option 8 - Transport Assessments will be required for all development proposals with significant transport implications.

Option 9 - Principles of a structured road hierarchy and will seek to extend such principles in any proposal.

Option 10 - Meet development requirements in accessible locations and take account of interactions between uses

Option 11 - Deliver a comprehensive network of routes for pedestrians and cyclists that is coherent, direct, safe, accessible and comfortable to use, building on, adapting and extending the network that exists

Option 12 - Ensure infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists is provided that facilitates walking, cycling and public transport

These options have been combined into one policy. It is worth noting that Option 9 has been pursued through the High Quality and Safe Design Policy.

29b. Getting Around in Redditch Borough

Issue/Question - Where should the broad location be for coach parking in Redditch Borough?

Option 1 - Redditch Town Centre

Option 2 - Forge Mill Museum

Option 3 - Arrow Valley Countryside Park

Option 4 - Business as usual/ Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options consultation stage.

New options to consider in policy which have emerged from Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation:

Option 5 - Set down passengers in Town and then parking space should be away from Town

Option 6 - Near the Abbey Stadium

Option 7 - On the outskirts of the Town Centre, within walking distance of the Town Centre

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Comments/Explanation
++	+	+	0	+	+	+	<p>Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3 and 9 and there are no negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3 and 16 and there are no negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3 and 16 and there are no negative effects predicted.</p>
2	1	1	0	1	1	1	<p>Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in no effects to any of the SA Objectives.</p> <p>Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3 and 9 and there are no negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3 and 16 and there are no negative effects predicted.</p> <p>Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3 and 9 and there are no negative effects predicted.</p>

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 4 would be Borough-wide. The likelihood of the effects working towards SA Objectives 3 and 9 would be certain. The likelihood of the effect working towards SA Objective 16 would be very likely in relation to Options 2 and 3.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	++	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	++	+	+	--	+	+	+
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	++	++	++	--	++	++	++
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 6	+ 4	+ 6	-4	+ 4	+ 4	+ 4

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 3 is the most sustainable option, and could therefore be the preferred approach to be included in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy, however the Borough Council is aware that a scheme for coach parking here is imminent and for this reason other considerations would better help deal with this issue. Option 1, Option 2, Option 5, Option 6 and Option 7 all scored equally positively and could

be considered as the preferred options, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation. Option 4 had overall negative effects on sustainability and is therefore not a suitable alternative policy option to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy did not implement the provision of coach parking as an option as Arrow Valley Countryside Park was deemed the most suitable option and it is anticipated that that this will be implemented in the near future. The Town Centre was not put forward as an option for coach parking as there were no sites that could be identified. However it is still noted within the Policy that the provision of coach parking within the Borough will be supported as it has emerged favourably in the above analysis to ensure provision.

29c. Getting Around in Redditch Borough

Issue/Question - What are the key priorities to create a sustainable transport network in Redditch Borough?

- Option 1** - Reduce the need to travel
- Option 2** - Provision of walking and cycling facilities
- Option 3** - Promote travel awareness initiatives e.g. car sharing
- Option 4** - Significant improvement in public transport
- Option 5** - Better management of public and private car parking
- Option 6** - Demand management measures
- Option 7** - Better management of transport networks
- Option 8** - Business as usual/ Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at Issues and Options consultation stage.

New options to consider in policy which have emerged from Preferred Draft Core Strategy consultation:

- Option 9** - Ensure all trip attractors are directly linked to the core passenger transport network, and are made easily accessible by bicycle or on foot

1	2	3	4	5	Comments/Explanation
++	++	++	++	+	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 3, 7, 9, 11 and 12 and there are no predicted negative effects. Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 3, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects. Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 3, 7, 9, 11 and 12 and there are no predicted negative effects.
2	2	2	2	1	Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 3, 7, 9, 11 and 12 and there are no predicted negative effects. Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3 and 9 and there are no predicted negative effects.

6	7	8	9	Comments/Explanation
++	++	--	++	Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 3, 7, 9, 11 and 12 and there are no predicted negative effects. Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 3, 7, 9, 11 and 12 and there are no predicted negative effects.
2	1	-2	2	Implementing Option 8 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 2, 3, 7, 9, 11 and 12 and there are no predicted positive effects. Implementing Option 9 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 3, 7, 9, 11 and 12 and there are no predicted negative effects.

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 8 would be Borough-wide. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 2, 3 and 7 would be extremely likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 9 would be fairly likely, with better access to services

and facilities. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objective 11 would be a small possibility; however the achievement of these Objectives would have to be achieved through other means.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	+	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	++	++	+	++	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	0	+	0	+	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	++	++	++	++	+
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	+	++	0	++	++
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	++	0	0	+
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	+	0	0	0	++
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 8	+ 12	+ 5	+ 9	+ 7

Core Strategy DPD Objective	6	7	8	9
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	- -	+ +
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	0	0	0	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	+ +	+ +	- -	+ +
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	- -	+
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	-	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 4	+ 3	- 9	+ 7

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 2 is the most sustainable option and is the preferred option for inclusion in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 4 and also scored significantly positive which can also be considered as alternative options for inclusion in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 3, Option 5, Option 6, Option 7 and Option 9 also scored highly, and could be considered, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation. Option 8 had a negative effect on sustainability and is therefore not a suitable alternative policy approach to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

Options that were deemed sustainable to include in a policy include Options 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 9.

Option 5 has not been included in the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy as the Borough Council has little control over the management of car parking, which is mainly controlled by private bodies.

29d. Getting Around in Redditch Borough

Issue/Question - Should public transport routes (bus and emergency vehicles only) be opened up to general traffic if there is a wider and demonstrable community benefit e.g. the regeneration of a District Centre?

Option 1 - Yes, they should be opened up where a wider community benefit can be demonstrated

Option 2 - No, they should be retained in their current state (equivalent to business as usual/ Do nothing)

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at issues and options consultation stages or Preferred Draft Core Strategy Stage.

1	2	Comments/Explanation
+	-	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 9 and 15, however a negative effect is predicted on SA Objective 3.
1	-1	Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 9 and 15, however a positive effect is predicted on SA Objective 3.

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 3 would relate to the areas in, and adjacent to, the bus only routes and also roads in the immediate vicinity which lead to the bus only routes. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 3 and 9 would be certain. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 15 would be very likely.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	-	+
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	+	+
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	+	-
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	+	-
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	+	-
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	-	+
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	3	-1

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 1 is the most sustainable option, and is therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the preferred draft core strategy, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation. Option 2 has a negative effect predicted on sustainability and it therefore not a suitable alternative policy option to deal with this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy has not implemented Option 2 as this approach was not widely supported. The most sustainable approach implemented a combination of the Options appraised in Issue 29a-d.

30. Lifetime Homes

Issue/Question - How can we improve the flexibility and adaptability of housing in Redditch Borough?

Option 1 - Encourage people to move to the most suitable housing through the allocation/promotion of specialist homes and developments

Option 2 - Only locate homes for the elderly in locations which accessible to facilities, services and public transport

Option 3 - All new residential developments to include a proportion of dwellings to be constructed to 'Lifetime Homes' standard

Option 4 - Business as usual/ Do nothing

There were no suitable alternative options presented to the Borough Council at issues and options consultation stages.

1	2	3	4	Comments/Explanation
++	+	+	--	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 12, 13 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects. Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 9, 12, 13 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects.
2	1	1	2	Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 12, 13 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects. Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 12 and 13 and there are no predicted positive effects.

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 4 would relate to the whole Borough. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 3, 9, 12 and 13 would be very likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 16 would be fairly likely.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and townscape and its best distinctive features;	0	0	0	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	++	++	++	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	++	++	++	-
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0
12 Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities.	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 6	+ 5	+ 5	- 1

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 1 is the most sustainable option, and is therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy. It is possible to have other options as preferred approach in tandem with Option 2. Option 1 and Option 3 also scored highly in relation to sustainability and both could be progressed as preferred approaches, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation. Option 4 scored slightly positive in relation to sustainability but not to the same extent as Options 1, 2 and 3.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented Option 3. However it should be noted that Options 1 and 2 would also be implemented indirectly through other Core Strategy policies which promote sustainable locations for residential development. Consultation responses proposed no other alternatives to test through the SA.

There were aspects of the Issues and Options document which could not be appraised in the same way as the Issues and Options have been appraised in other SA tables. There were open ended questions presented in the Issues and Options document, where no alternative options were presented because they were not available. Where options have emerged as a result of further consultation, this part of the SA analyses the effects of these alternatives. Also further issues have arisen since the issues and options document was published and therefore the SA includes reference to these additional issues and the alternative approaches to deal with the issues.

Appraisal of additional effects

There are aspects of the Issues and Options document which could not be appraised in the same way as the Issues and Options have been appraised in the tables above. There were open ended questions presented in the Issues and Options document, where no alternative options were presented because they were not available. Where options have emerged as a result of further consultation, this part of the SA analyses the effects of these alternatives. Also further issues have arisen since the issues and options document was published and therefore the SA includes reference to these additional issues and the alternative approaches to deal with the issues.

Historic Environment

The Issues and Options document asked people if they could think of any buildings to be added to the Schedule of Buildings of Local Interest. The ongoing maintenance of the local list ensures that SA Objective 5 "To provide opportunities for communities to participate in and contribute to decisions that affect their neighbourhood and quality of life, encouraging pride and social responsibility in the local community"; and SA Objective 16 "Conserve and enhance the architectural, cultural and archaeological heritage and seek well-designed, resource efficient, high quality built environment in new development proposals" are achieved.

Option 1 - Include a policy in the Core Strategy to maintain and enhance historic environment features

Option 2 - Include a policy in the Core Strategy regarding the Schedule of Buildings of Local Interest

Option 3 - Rely on national guidance/ Business as usual / Do nothing

Preferred Draft Core Strategy and Evidence Base additional options:

Option 4 - Include a policy to encourage methods to improve energy efficiency of historic properties without compromising conservation issues

Option 5 – Include a policy to encourage conservation-led regeneration

Option 6 – Include a policy to enhance networks of historic amenity value

1	2	3	4	5	6	Comments/Explanation
+	+	-	+	+	+	<p>Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 10 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 5, 10 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 10 and 16.</p>
1	1	-1	1	1	1	<p>Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 4 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 9, 10 and 16. Mitigation measures would need to be in place to ensure there are no negative effects on SA Objective 16.</p> <p>Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 10 and 16 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p>

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 4 and 6 would relate to the whole Borough. The effects predicted for Option 5 are likely to be in the Town Centre but may be felt in other locations. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objective 10 would be very likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 16 would be certain. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 2 and 5 would be a small likelihood.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6
1.To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	++	++	--	+/-	+	++
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	+	0	0
3.To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	+	0	0
4.To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	+	+	--	0	+	+
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel	0	0	0	0	0	0
6.To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	?	?	0	0	0	0
7.Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0	0
8.To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	+	?	0	0	+	0
9.To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+5	+4	-5	+3	+4	+4

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy did not present a dedicated 'Historic Environment' policy but the protection and enhancement of the Historic Environment featured in a number of other policies, which is the most sustainable option following the SA scoring of options. Following consultation and collection of further evidence new options for policy were generated. All options except 'business as usual' scored positively against the DPD Objectives and can therefore be carried forward to policy in the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Mitigation measures will have to be in place for Option 4 to ensure that no negative effects were felt in relation to DPD Objective 1.

New options to include in policy have emerged including:

- Encouraging the improvement of energy efficiency of historic properties without compromising conservation issues
- Encouraging conservation-led regeneration
- Enhancing networks of historic amenity value

Redditch Distinctiveness

In the Issues and Options document, a number of things which make Redditch distinctive were presented alongside the advantages and disadvantages of maintaining or encouraging them in the future.

The first distinctive feature presented was trees and when considering this against the SA Framework it is recommended that the Core Strategy set out a policy approach aiming for the retention of trees in order to achieve SA Objective 2 "Reduce causes of and adapt to the impacts of climate change"; SA Objective 10 "Safeguard and strengthen landscape and townscape character and quality"; SA Objective 11 "To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity"; SA Objective 13 "Provide decent affordable housing for all, of all the right quality and tenure for local needs, in clean, safe and pleasant local environments"; and SA Objective 16 "Conserve and enhance the architectural, cultural and archaeological heritage and seek well-designed, resource efficient, high quality built environment in new development proposals", irrespective of the negative effects on SA Objective 15 "Reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour". An alternative to this is to not present a policy on trees which would affect the same SA Objectives, only negatively rather than positively.

The second distinctive feature presented was self-contained districts and when considering this against the SA Framework it is recommended that the Core Strategy sets out a policy approach aiming for self-contained districts to be avoided in order to achieve SA Objective 3 "To reduce the need to travel and move towards more sustainable travel patterns; SA Objective 9 "To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres and the quality of, and equitable access to, local services and facilities, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio - economic status or educational attainment"; SA Objective 15 "Reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour". Because the promotion of self-contained districts would rely to some extent on the road hierarchy being implemented in new development, the approach can more than likely only be presented in the form of a road hierarchy policy. The only alternative to this approach would be to do nothing/not present this policy which would have a negative effect on SA Objective 3 "To reduce the need to travel and move towards more sustainable travel patterns; and SA Objective 9 "To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres and the quality of, and equitable access to, local services and facilities, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio - economic status or educational attainment".

The third distinctive feature was the Redditch road hierarchy and when considering this against the SA Framework there are both positive and negative effects on the achievement of SA Objectives if the Core Strategy was to maintain and encourage this feature, however there are also both positive and negative effects on the achievement of SA Objectives if the preferred approach was to relax the approach to road layout. If the preferred approach maintained and encouraged the distinctive road layout it would help to achieve SA Objective 9 "To improve the vitality and viability of Town

and District Centres and the quality of, and equitable access to, local services and facilities, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio-economic status or educational attainment"; SA Objective 10 "Safeguard and strengthen landscape and townscape character and quality"; and SA Objective 11 "To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity" but would hinder the achievement of SA Objective 3 "To reduce the need to travel and move towards more sustainable travel patterns"; SA Objective 4 "Develop a knowledge-driven economy, with the appropriate employment land, infrastructure and skills base whilst ensuring all share the benefits urban and rural"; and SA Objective 17 "Ensure efficient use of land through safeguarding of mineral reserves, the best and most versatile agricultural lands, land of Green Belt value, maximising use of previously developed land and reuse of vacant buildings, where this is not detrimental to open space and biodiversity interest". Because the promotion of self-contained districts would rely to some extent on the road hierarchy being implemented in new development, the approach can more than likely only be presented in the form of a road hierarchy policy. The only alternative to this approach would be to do nothing/not present this policy which would have a negative effect on SA Objective 3 "To reduce the need to travel and move towards more sustainable travel patterns; and SA Objective 9 "To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres and the quality of, and equitable access to, local services and facilities, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio-economic status or educational attainment".

The final distinctive feature presented was the separation of roads and footpaths and when considering this against the SA Framework it is recommended that the Core Strategy set out a policy approach aiming for roads and footpaths to be provided in an integrated manner. This is recommended because continuing to maintain or encourage this feature would hinder the achievement of SA Objective 3 "To reduce the need to travel and move towards more sustainable travel patterns"; SA Objective 9 "To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres and the quality of, and equitable access to, local services and facilities, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio-economic status or educational attainment"; SA Objective 12 "To improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health"; and SA Objective 15 "Reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour". This is likely to be promoted in a sustainable transport and accessibility policy. The only alternative to this approach would be to do-nothing/have no policy, which would likely have a negative effect on achieving SA Objectives 3 "To reduce the need to travel and move towards more sustainable travel patterns"; SA Objective 9 "To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres and the quality of, and equitable access to, local services and facilities, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio-economic status or educational attainment"; SA Objective 12 "To improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health"; and SA Objective 15 "Reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour".

Town Centre Strategy

In May 2009 Redditch Borough Council commissioned consultants Arup to produce a Town Centre Strategy. The strategy was endorsed by members in November 2009 and includes a number of priority projects and actions.

Option 1 – Tackling the Ringway – Breaking down the concrete collar

Option 2 – Regeneration of Train Station

Option 3 - Redevelopment of Silver Street/Royal Square and Enclosed Market Area

1	2	3	Comments/Explanation
+	++	++	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 9 and 10 and there are no predicted negative effects Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 9, 10, 15, 16, and 17 and there are no predicted negative effects
1	2	2	Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 9, 10, 13, 15, and 17 and there are no predicted negative effects

The effects predicted for Options 1-3 would relate to the whole Borough. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 3 and 9 would be very likely.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3
1.To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	+	+	0
2.To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	+
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	+	+	+
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel	+	++	+
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	+	+	+
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	+	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	+	+	+
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	?	?	+
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	?	0	?
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	?	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+6	+9	+8

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 2 is the most sustainable option, and is therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 1 and 3 also scored highly in terms of sustainability and could be implemented as a preferred approach alongside Option 16 subject to consideration of other evidence and comments received during consultation.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

New options to include in policy have emerged including:

- Tackling the Ringway – Breaking down the concrete collar
- Regeneration of Train Station
- Redevelopment of Silver Street/Royal Square and Enclosed Market Area

Office Development

Office development was not considered as an Issue in the Issues and Options Document; however this is now considered as an issue due to emerging evidence, including the Borough Councils Office Needs Assessment (2009) and the West Midland Regional Spatial Strategy Phase Two Revision.

Option 1 - Retail development to take precedence over office development in the town centre

Option 2 - The strategy for office development should reflect the aspiration of the Council for types of offices

Option 3 – A maximum threshold of 5000sq.m per site of office development outside of the town centre

Option 4 – Aim to deliver 30,000 sq.m of offices with 8000sq.m being accommodated outside the town centre due to capacity issues

Option 5 – Aim to deliver 45,000 sq.m which would have been in line with the RSS proposed figure

Option 6 – In the first instance offices should be developed within or on the edge of the town centre

Option 7 – Business as Usual / Do nothing

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Comments/Explanation
- -	++	+	++	++	+	-	<p>Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a negative effect on SA Objectives 4, 6 and 9 and there are no predicted positive effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 6 and 14 and there are not predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3 and 13, however a negative effect is predicted for SA Objective 4.</p> <p>Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 4 and 9 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p>
-2	2	1	2	0	1	-1	<p>Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 4 and 9 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 3 and there are no predicted negative effects.</p> <p>Implementing Option 7 is likely to result a negative effect on SA Objective 4, and there is a questionable effect on SA Objective 3.</p>

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features;	0	0	0	0	0	+	-
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	0	++	++	++	++	-
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	+	0	0	0	0	-	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	-	0	0	++	++	++	-
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	--	++	++	++	++	++	-
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	-4	+ 4	+ 5	+ 8	+ 6	+ 7	-5

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

Option 5 and 6 have been implemented as these are the most suitable and sustainable options for this issue.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

Options 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 all score significantly well from a sustainability point of view, clearly it is not feasible to implement both options 4 and 5. However implementing one of these options combined with options 2, 3 and 6 is considered a sustainable approach. It is not considered sustainable to be implementing Options 1 and 7 as these options score extremely poorly.

Flood Risk and Water Management

Flood risk and water management was not presented as an issue at the Issues and Options Stage of the Core Strategy as it was not considered a locally distinctive, however the Borough Councils commissioned at Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 and Water Cycle Study (jointly with Bromsgrove District Council) in January 2009 which raised a number of local issues regarding flood risk and water management that needed to be addressed.

Option 1 – Have a local policy on Flood Risk and Water Management which is informed by Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 1 and Level 2 and the Water Cycle Study and Water Cycle Study Refresh

Option 2 – Rely on National Planning Policy/ Business as Usual

1	2	Comments/Explanation
+	+	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 7 and 8.
1	1	Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in appositve effect on SA Objective 8.

The effects on Objective 8 would be positive with both Options; however it is considered that Option 1 would have more of a positive effect on SA Objective 7 than not having a policy.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	+	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	+	0
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 3	+ 1

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 1 is the most sustainable option, and is therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy will continue to implement Option 1 as this was and still remains the most sustainable approach; this approach is continually being informed by the completion of evidence base work.

Settlement Hierarchy

New options to consider in policy:

Option 1 - Encourage development principally in Redditch urban area with limited development in the smaller rural settlements of Astwood Bank and Feckenham;

Option 2 - Proportional development relative to the population size of Redditch, Astwood Bank and Feckenham;

Option 3 - Business as usual.

1	2	3	Comments/Explanation
++	+	+/-	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16 and 17 and there are no likely negative effects predicted.
			Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 7, 13, 16 and 17 however it is also likely to result in negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 8, 10 and 11.
2	1	0	Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 7, 13 and 16 however it is also likely to result in negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 8, 10 and 11. There is a likelihood of both positive and negative impacts on SA Objective 17.

The effects predicted for Options 1 to 3 would relate to the whole Borough. The likelihood of the effects working towards SA Objectives 2, 7, 13 and 16 would be very likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objective 17 is fairly likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards SA Objective 5 would be a small possibility. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against SA Objectives 3, 8, 10 and 11 would be a small possibility.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	+	+	+
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	+	+	+
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and townscape and its best distinctive features;	+ +	-	-
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	+ +	-	-
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	+	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	+	+	+
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	+	+	+
12 Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities.	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 11	+ 3	+ 2

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 1 is the most sustainable option, and is therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented Option 1. Consultation responses proposed no other alternatives to test through the SA.

The November 2010 SA scoring of options has determined that Option 1 is still the most sustainable, and is therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Options 2 and 3 may lead to excessive levels of development in Redditch's rural settlements which would impact on their character and local distinctiveness.

Landscape Character

This issue was not presented in the Issues and Options Document as it wasn't considered a locally distinctive issue. However the Landscape Character Assessment produced by Worcestershire County Council combined with the Sensitivity Appraisals currently completed identified a number of areas that were sensitive to development in the Borough therefore it is considered appropriate to address this issue through the Core Strategy.

Option 1 – Have a local policy which is informed by the Worcestershire Landscape Character Assessment

Option 2 – Rely on National Planning Policy/ Business as Usual

1	2	Comments/Explanation
+	+	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 7, 10 and 11.
1	1	Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in appositive effect on SA Objective 11.

The effects on Objective 11 would be positive with both Options; however it is considered that Option 1 would additional positive effect on SA Objectives 7 and 10.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2
1.To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	+	+
2.To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0
3.To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	++	+
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	+	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	++	+
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+7	+4

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 1 is the most sustainable option, and is therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation. It is considered that both Options are sustainable but having a local policy would allow the Boroughs best distinctive landscape features to be protected.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented Option 1 as this was the most sustainable approach. This policy now forms part of the Natural Environment Policy within the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy.

Pollution

This issue was not considered appropriate to be presented in the Issues and Options Document as the requirements highlighted in national and regional planning policy were too detailed for the Issues and Options stage of the Core Strategy. However due to Air Quality issues in the County it was deemed appropriate to consider whether this would be a suitable issue to address through policy in the Core Strategy.

Option 1 – Have a local policy due to potential air quality issues in the Borough

Option 2 – Rely on National Planning Policy/ Business as Usual

1	2	Comments/Explanation
+	+	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 7 and 12.
1	1	Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in appositve effect on SA Objective 2, 7, and 12.

Both Options would have positive effects on SA Objectives 2, 7 and 12.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	0	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	0	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	+	+
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 2	+ 2

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

It was considered appropriate to implemented option 1 at the Preferred Draft Core Strategy stage to test whether a draft policy was successful.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

Following consultation on the Preferred Draft Core Strategy and the SA scoring of these options demonstrating that the implications of implementing both options would be the same it is appropriate to rely on national planning policy to guide this issue.

Trees

Trees are a distinctive feature of Redditch, it is important to maintain and enhance this feature in the Borough.

Option 1 – Have a local policy on retaining trees

Option 2 – Rely on National Planning Policy/ Business as Usual

1	2	Comments/Explanation
+	0	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 7, 10, 11 and 12. .
1	0	Implementing Option 2 is likely to have a slight positive effect on SA Objective 11.

Option 1 has more positive effects on the SA Objectives than Option 2. Option 2 may have a slight positive effect on SA Objective 11 but not a significant as Option 1. This policy now forms part of the Natural Environment Policy within the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	+	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	+	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	++	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	++	+
5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	++	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 9	+ 1

Analysis for Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008):

The SA scoring of options has determined that Option 1 is the most sustainable option, and is therefore the preferred approach to be presented in the Preferred Draft Core Strategy, subject to consideration of further evidence and comments received during consultation.

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The Preferred Draft Core Strategy implemented Option 1 as this was the most sustainable approach this will be continued through to the next stage of the Core Strategy. This policy now forms part of the Natural Environment Policy within the Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy.

Natural Environment Policy

There were a range of locally distinctive issues that emerged as a result of the representations received to the Issues and Options consultation and therefore these features should be tested as options to deem their suitability to a policy in the Core strategy.

Option 1 - demonstrate that the use of sustainable, locally sourced and recycled materials has been considered

Option 2 - incorporate water efficiency measures and appropriate SUDS techniques that utilise detention/ retention methods suitable for Redditch

Option 3 - protect and enhance the quality of natural resources and Green Infrastructure including water, air, land, habitats and biodiversity

Option 4 - integrate with biodiversity and geodiversity through enhancing, linking and extending natural habitats

Option 5 - remediate contaminated land, where appropriate

1	2	3	4	5	Comments/Explanation
+	+	+	+	+	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 7.
					Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 6, and 7.
1	1	1	1	1	Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 1, 2, 7, 11 and 12.
					Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 2, 7 and 11.
					Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objective 2, 7, 11 and 12.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5
1. To maintain and provide a high quality natural, rural and historic environment with a Green Infrastructure network which maximises opportunities for biodiversity value, wildlife and ecological connectivity;	0	0	+	+	0
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough will work towards the achievement of being carbon neutral in line with the National Standards;	+	+	+	+	0
3. To reduce the causes of, minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change;	++	0	+	+	0
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Boroughs landscape and Redditch Borough's other distinctive features	0	0	+	+	+

5. To encourage safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and maintain a balanced road hierarchy and reduce the need to travel;	0	0	0	0	0
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities including Abbey Stadium;	0	0	0	0	0
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime through high quality design, with regeneration achieved at the former New Town District Centres;	0	0	0	0	0
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix, and type in the best locations, including on Strategic Sites;	0	0	0	0	0
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	0	0	0	0	0
11. To protect and enhance water, air and soil and minimise flood risk;	0	0	0	0	0
12. Ensuring there is a range of health facilities that support existing and new communities and to promote the role of healthy living through good planning.	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	+ 4	+ 2	+ 5	+ 5	+ 2

Analysis for Revised Preferred Draft Core Strategy (November 2010):

The SA has determined that all of the Options would have sustainable effects in particular Option 1, 3 and, 4. Therefore these Options will be combined in a policy which seeks to ensure the natural environment of Redditch Borough is enhanced. These options have been incorporated in the Natural Environment Policy.

Appendix B - SA Assessment of Large and Strategic Sites

In order to better understand the implications of including Strategic Sites in the Core Strategy, a Sustainability Appraisal of the potential sites needs to be undertaken. The table below includes all large sites which have been considered for inclusion in the Core Strategy as a Strategic Site. The SA Objectives and decision making criteria have been used in the assessment of each site. Each site has then been scored against assessment criteria. Please note that this assessment does not include the ADR sites as this site assessment is performed later in this SA. Some of these Strategic Sites may be taken forward in the Core Strategy and some will not, however the comments related to the assessment include some valuable ideas for content of Strategic Site policy.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
To manage waste in accordance with the	Will it reduce the production of waste and manage waste in	Significantly												This could be assessed by identifying if there are any constraints to the site in terms of collection of household recycling
		To a small extent	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		No												

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
waste hierarchy: reduce, reuse, recycle, compost, recovery, disposal	accordance with the waste hierarchy?	Unknown												<p>waste or industrial or commercial waste. It can only partly be assessed if it is known whether waste management facilities will be included as part of any development scheme.</p> <p>Infrastructure consultation with the Council waste department confirms that there are no know waste collection issues and no issues with recycling facilities being provided at the Strategic Sites.</p> <p>It is recommended that to ensure that this objective is achieved, that waste management is encouraged in the Core Strategy.</p>
Reduce causes of and adapt to the impacts	Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases?	Significantly												This can only be assessed if it is known whether measures are to be implemented to reduce emissions as part of any development scheme.
		To a small extent	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		No												

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
of climate change		Unknown												<p>The assessment could also be linked to criteria to reduce the need to travel, where there would be less emissions from vehicles for shorter journey times.</p> <p>It is recommended that to ensure that this objective is achieved, that encouraging ways of reducing emissions should be included in the Core Strategy. Larger sites such as the Land to the rear of the Alexandra Hospital may have more scope for inclusion medium scale renewables.</p>
	Does it promote patterns of spatial development that are adaptable to	Significantly		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		To assess this, there are two questions which need to be asked - How do things become adaptable? Also is the location accessible to
		To a small extent	✓										✓	
		No												

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
	and suitable for predicted changes in climate?	Unknown												<p>more sustainable forms of transport, for example, near to Transport Interchanges and bus routes. The first question can only be assessed if it is known whether measures are to be implemented to adapt to climate change as part of any development scheme.</p> <p>The sites at Abbey Stadium and Woodrow would only achieve this objective to a small extent because it is less accessible to a transport interchange than other sites, but both are still accessible to bus routes.</p>
To reduce the need to travel and move towards more sustainable travel patterns	Will it reduce the need to travel?	Significantly because of its location		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		<p>This can be assessed in two ways. The first is to ask if the site is within the urban area, near to a transport interchange, near to multi-modal access or within the Town Centre. The second can only be assessed if it is known what transport provision is to be implemented as part of any development scheme.</p> <p>The Abbey Stadium site and the</p>
		Extensively through its transport provision												
		To a small extent because of its location	✓										✓	

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
		To a small extent through its transport provision												Woodrow Site would only achieve this objective to a small extent because other sites have dedicated bus routes and transport interchanges adjacent to the sites. General policy on encouraging walking and cycling should help to improve the achievement of this objective.
		No												
	Will it provide opportunities to increase	Yes		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			To assess this, the question needs to be asked - Is the site within the Town/District Centre or near a
		Possibly	✓											
		No												

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
	sustainable modes of travel?	Unknown										✓	✓	<p>transport interchange? This can only partly be assessed if it is known whether sustainable modes of travel can be implemented as part of any development scheme.</p> <p>The location of the Abbey Stadium site where it is accessible by public transport means that the planned increase in patronage to the redevelopment will increase usage of sustainable modes of travel.</p> <p>Due to their location, it is not know what opportunities there would be for increases in sustainable modes of travel at the Car Park 4 site and Woodrow site.</p>
	Does it focus development in existing centres, and make use of existing infrastructure to reduce the need to travel?	Significantly because it is within or adjacent to an existing centre			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		To assess this, the question needs to be asked - Is the site within the Town/District Centre or near a transport interchange? This can only partly be assessed if it is known what transport provision is to be implemented as part of any development scheme.
		Significantly because it is near existing		✓										

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
		infrastructure												
		To a small extent because it is fairly near to an existing centre or existing infrastructure	✓										✓	
		No												
Develop a knowledge-driven economy, with the appropriate employment land, infrastructure and skills base whilst ensuring all share the benefits urban and rural	Will it contribute towards urban and rural regeneration?	Yes	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	To assess this, if the answer to the questions above is yes, then sites fulfilling these criteria should significantly contribute to regeneration.
		No		✓										

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
	Will it provide opportunities for businesses to develop and enhance their competitiveness?	Significantly		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓				This can only be assessed if it is known whether employment development is to be implemented as part of any development scheme. There are no opportunities to measure enhancement to business competitiveness. The Abbey Stadium site, Car Park No.4 site and Woodrow Strategic site have no potential to contribute towards this objective. The Church Road Site and Edward Street site would include uses which would achieve this objective. Other remaining sites have the potential to contain uses which significantly contribute towards this objective.
		To a small extent							✓		✓			
		Unknown											✓	
	Will it support the shopping hierarchy?	Yes			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		To assess this, the question needs to be asked - is the site within or adjacent to the Town/District
		To a small extent								✓			✓	

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
		No												<p>Centre? This can only partly be assessed if it is known whether retail will be implemented as part of any development scheme in order to support the shopping hierarchy or is a development site which can add custom to the District Centres.</p> <p>The Abbey Stadium site and Land to the rear of the Alexandra hospital have no retail potential and are not located within or on the edge of a centre. The prospect hill site and Woodrow strategic site are close by the town centre and Woodrow district centre respectively and can offer an increase in patronage. Other remaining sites are within centres which have a significantly positive effect on achieving this objective.</p>
	Will it help to improve skills levels in the	Yes												This can only be assessed if it is known whether land uses related to education or skills are to be
		To a small extent												

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
	workforce?	No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	implemented as part of any development scheme. None of the sites have potential for education or skills related uses.
	Will it support tourism?	Yes	✓											This can only be assessed if it is known whether land uses related to tourism are to be implemented as part of any development scheme.
		To a small extent							✓		✓			
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	
		Unknown												The abbey stadium site has the potential to attract local tourism and is located close by to other tourist attractions. Church Rd site and Edward St site have the potential to include some leisure uses or can improve the town centre image to the extent that this objective can be achieved to a small extent. None of the other remaining sites have the potential to achieve this objective.
Promote and support the development of new	Does it encourage innovative and environmentally	Yes												This can only be assessed if it is known whether innovative and environmentally friendly technologies are to be implemented as part of any
		To a small extent												

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
technologies, of high value and low impact, especially resource efficient technologies and environmental technology initiatives	friendly technologies?	No												development scheme.
		Unknown	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	None of the sites have a known capacity to be able to achieve this objective. There should be a general Core Strategy policy to encourage innovative and environmentally friendly technologies to be implemented Borough-wide.
	Does it promote and support the development of new technologies, of high value and low impact?	Yes												This can only be assessed if it is known whether new technologies of high value and low impact are to be implemented as part of any development scheme.
		To a small extent												
		No												
		Unknown	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	None of the sites have a known capacity to be able to achieve this objective. There should be a general Core Strategy policy to encourage new technologies to be implemented Borough-wide.
Protect and improve the quality of	Will it provide opportunities to improve or	Yes												This can only be assessed if it is known whether measures to improve or maintain water quality / water
		To a small extent	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
water, soil and air and water resources	maintain water quality/water resource?	No												resources are to be included as part of any development scheme. It is also relevant to determine the proximity of the site to relevant water sources. It is possible for all sites to include water efficiency measures in their development to improve the water resource element of this objective. None of the sites would explicitly have a negative impact on water quality but there are no known positive measures for these sites to ensure that this part of the objective is achieved.
		Unknown												
Ensure development does not occur in high-risk flood prone areas and does not adversely contribute to	Does it protect the floodplain from inappropriate development?	Yes - no impacts/not on or near the floodplain	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	The question needs to be asked - where is the site located in relation to the flood zones? This can only be partly assessed if it is known whether measures to mitigate against flooding are to be implemented as part of any development scheme.
		Yes - positive mitigation measures in place												

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
fluvial flood risks or contribute to surface water flooding in all other areas		No												All sites with the exception of the Abbey Stadium are not within close proximity to a floodplain. The Abbey Stadium site is not within to adjacent to a flood plain, but is in close proximity. The location is not likely to have any negative effects on achieving this objective and a site specific flood risk assessment confirmed this.
	Does it take account of all types of flooding?	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	The questions need to be asked - where is the site located in relation to the flood zones - are there likely to be any flood management installations as part of any development scheme. The flood management installations would not be required for these sites. There are no site specific issues based on information in the SFRA and WCS.
		To a small extent												
		No												
	Does it promote Sustainable	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	This can only be assessed if it is known whether Sustainable Urban
		No												

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
	Urban Drainage Systems where appropriate?	Unknown												Drainage Systems will be incorporated into any development scheme.
To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres and the quality of, and equitable access to, local services and facilities, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio - economic status or educational attainment	Will proposals enhance the provision of local services and facilities?	Significantly	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓		<p>The questions need to be asked - Is the site to be located within the Town/District Centre and is any development scheme likely to incorporate retail or community facilities uses or residential uses contributing to the support of nearby local services or open space provision?</p> <p>The land to the rear of the Alexandra Hospital would have no beneficial effect on achieving this objective because there is no opportunity to incorporate these types of uses on site. The prospect hill site, Edward street site and Woodrow strategic site would only help to achieve this objective by providing custom for the services and facilities in close proximity to the sites. Other sites, because of their location and potential use would significantly contribute towards this objective.</p>
		To a small extent								✓	✓		✓	
		No		✓										
		Unknown												

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
	Will it contribute to rural service provision across the Borough?	Significantly												<p>The question needs to be asked - is the site within the rural area (or likely to influence the provision in the rural area) and if it is known whether economic development will be implemented as part of any development scheme.</p> <p>None of the sites are located within or in close proximity to the rural area.</p>
		To a small extent												
		No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		Unknown												
	Will it enhance accessibility to services by public transport?	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		<p>The question needs to be asked - is the site located within the Town/District Centre or is it near to a transport interchange?</p> <p>All strategic sites with the exception of Woodrow site are well located to contribute to this objective being achieved. The Woodrow site will achieve this objective to a small extent because there is some access to public transport.</p>
		To a small extent											✓	
		No												
		Unknown												
Safeguard	Will it safeguard	Yes	✓										✓	This can be assessed through a site

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
and strengthen landscape and townscape character and quality	and strengthen landscape and townscape character and quality?	To a small extent		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		specific Landscape Character Assessment.
		No												
		Unknown												The planning applications have been received on the two sites at Abbey Stadium and Woodrow and landscape and townscape principles are safeguarded. Other strategic sites have not been assessed however the Core Strategy should include a policy to ensure that this objective is achieved.
To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Will it help to safeguard the Borough's biodiversity and geodiversity?	Yes - not related to sites of biodiversity or geodiversity interest		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	The question needs to be asked - where is the site in relation to SSSIs, SWSs and LNRs? This can only be partly assessed if it is known what measures to protect or enhance biodiversity and geodiversity are to be implemented as part of any development scheme.
		To a small extent - mitigation measures in place	✓											With the exception of the Abbey Stadium site, none of the other sites have a relationship with existing sites of biodiversity or geodiversity.
		No												

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
		Unknown												The Abbey Stadium site has a granted planning permission with no detrimental effect against achieving this objective. In all cases, a Core Strategy policy can require that this objective is achieved.
	Will it protect sites and habitats designated for nature conservation?	Yes - not related to sites designated for nature conservation		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	The question needs to be asked - where is the site in relation to SSSIs, SWSs and LNRs? This can only be partly assessed if it is known what measures to protect sites designated for nature conservation are to be implemented as part of any development scheme. With the exception of the Abbey Stadium site, none of the other sites have a relationship with existing sites of nature conservation. The Abbey Stadium site has a granted planning permission with no detrimental effect against achieving this objective. In all cases, a Core Strategy policy can require that this objective is achieved.
		To a small extent - mitigation measures in place	✓											
		No												
		Unknown												
	Will it help to	Yes	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		This can only be assessed if it is

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
	achieve targets set out in the Biodiversity and Geodiversity Action Plans?	No												known what measures to ensure targets in the Worcestershire and Redditch BAP are to be implemented as part of any development scheme. Until it is know whether there is the potential to implement this objective on the sites the score is unknown. Site specific ecological assessments would need to be encouraged for all relevant sites in the Core Strategy. It would not be relevant for brownfield these brownfield sites to undertaken this survey and are therefore classed as achieving. The Abbey Stadium site has planning permission granted, and the application included an ecological survey.
		Unknown		✓									✓	
To improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health	Will it improve access to health facilities across the Borough?	Yes - it is close to a health facility			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			The question needs to be asked - is the site within close walking distance (300m) of a health facility. A health facility means any GP surgery in and around Redditch Borough or the Alexandra Hospital. This can only be partly assessed if it is known whether health provision will be
		Yes - mitigation measures in place												
		No	✓	✓								✓	✓	

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
		Unknown												<p>implemented as part of any development scheme and the distances.</p> <p>The Abbey Stadium site, car park 4 site, Land to the Rear of the Alexandra Hospital and Woodrow site are not located within 300m of such a facility. All other sites are generally well located and therefore access is very good. It may seem surprising that land to the rear of the Alexandra Hospital has poorer accessibility to health, however this is determined to be correct given that the local health facility is located at Woodrow District Centre. The Core Strategy should include a policy about the accessibility to health facilities at the land to the rear of the Alexandra Hospital.</p>
	Will it promote healthier lifestyles?	Significantly	✓											This can only be assessed if it is known whether leisure uses or open space provision is to be implemented as part of any
		To a small extent		✓	✓								✓	
		No								✓	✓	✓		

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
		Unknown				✓	✓	✓	✓					<p>development scheme.</p> <p>The Abbey Stadium site is for leisure use so would significantly contribute towards achieving this objective. The Woodrow Site, Land to the Rear of the Alexandra Hospital site and Church Hill District Centre sites have scored to a small extent because of open space provision and improvements to health facilities. The potential health improvements for the other District Centres are as yet unknown. The Prospect Hill site, Edward Street site and Car par 4 site have no land use opportunity to contribute to this objective, but do not hinder its achievement.</p>
	Does it mitigate against noise pollution?	Yes												The question needs to be asked - is this strategic site located adjacent to a land use which has known noise problems (e.g. a number of
		No												

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
		Unknown	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	complaints to Environment Health about noise). Internal consultation can determine this. This can only be partly assessed if it is known whether mitigation against noise pollution is to be implemented as part of any development scheme.
	Does it mitigate against light pollution?	Yes												The question needs to be asked - is this site located within or adjacent to high density areas such as the Town Centre. This can only be partly assessed if it is known whether mitigation against light pollution is to be implemented as part of any development scheme.
		No												
		Unknown	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Provide decent affordable housing for all, of all the right quality and tenure	Will it provide opportunities to increase affordable housing levels within urban and rural areas of the	Yes		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	The question needs to be asked - is this site capable of accommodating residential development? If it is not, the judgement of the site against this decision making criteria should not be penalised. This can only be partly assessed if it is known whether
		No - residential development may not be appropriate for this site	✓								✓	✓		

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
for local needs, in clean, safe and pleasant local environments	Borough?	No - there are reasons for no affordable housing provision												affordable housing is to be implemented as part of any development proposal.
		Unknown												The Abbey Stadium site, Edward St site and Land to the Rear of the Alexandra Hospital have no opportunity to deliver against this objective because residential use may not be appropriate. All other sites are likely to provide sufficient dwellings to be able to contribute towards affordable housing provision.
	Will it provide affordable housing access to a range of housing tenures and sizes?	Yes		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	The question needs to be asked - is this site capable of accommodating residential development? If it is not, the judgement of the site against this decision making criteria should not be penalised. This can only be partly assessed if it is known whether
		No - residential development may not be appropriate for this site	✓									✓	✓	

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
		No - there is no affordable housing access to a range of housing tenures and sizes												affordable housing access with a range of tenures and sizes is to be implemented as part of any development scheme.
		Unknown												The Abbey Stadium site, Edward St site and Land to the Rear of the Alexandra Hospital have no opportunity to deliver against this objective because residential use may not be appropriate. All other sites are likely to provide sufficient dwellings to be able to contribute towards affordable housing provision.
	Does it seek to provide high quality, well-designed residential environments?	Yes		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	The question needs to be asked - is this site capable of accommodating residential development? If it is not, the judgement of the site against this decision making criteria should not be penalised. This can only be assessed if it is known whether a
		No - residential development may not be appropriate for this site	✓									✓	✓	

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
		No - high quality/well designed environment not to be incorporated												high quality, well designed residential environment is to be implemented as part of any development scheme.
		Unknown												The Abbey Stadium site, Edward St site and Land to the Rear of the Alexandra Hospital have no opportunity to deliver against this objective because residential use may not be appropriate. All other sites are likely to achieve this objective and the Core Strategy should include a policy to require high quality design and environments in new development.
To raise the skills levels and qualifications of the workforce	Will it provide opportunities to further develop educational and attainment facilities within the Borough?	Yes												This can only be assessed if it is known whether educational or attainment facilities are to be incorporated as part of any development scheme.
		No	✓	✓						✓	✓	✓	✓	
		Unknown			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
Reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour	Does it promote mixed development that encourages natural surveillance?	Yes - mixed use development and demonstrable natural surveillance			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					<p>The question needs to be asked - if this site is able to implement mixed uses, are measures to encourage natural surveillance also demonstrated? This can only be partly assessed if it is known whether a mixed use development is to be implemented and whether natural surveillance principles will be incorporated as part of any development scheme.</p> <p>The nature of developments within centres means that high levels of natural surveillance is necessary and possible. The Land to the Rear of the Alexandra Hospital site and the Prospect Hill site are for a mix of uses where natural surveillance can result from a mix.</p>
		To a small extent - mixed use development		✓						✓				
		No	✓											
		Unknown									✓	✓	✓	
Conserve and enhance the architectural, cultural and	Does it provide opportunities for sustainable construction?	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	This can only be assessed if it is known whether sustainable construction techniques will be implemented as part of any development scheme.
		No												

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
archaeological heritage and seek well-designed, resource efficient, high quality built environment in new development proposals		Unknown												The sites have been determined to achieve this, because the Core Strategy can generally require sustainable construction techniques to be implemented.
	Will it enhance the Borough's Conservation Areas?	Site not in or adjoining Conservation Area	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	The question needs to be asked - where is the site in relation to a Conservation Area? If the site is within or adjacent to a Conservation Area what mitigation measures are in place to ensure that the Conservation Area is enhanced. This can only partly be assessed if it is known whether mitigation measures to enhance a Conservation Area are to be applied as part of any development scheme.
		Adverse effect on Conservation Area												
		Improve or no affect							✓					
		Unknown												

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
	Will it help safeguard the Borough's Listed Buildings?	Site not listed or adjacent to listed building(s)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	The question needs to be asked - are there any listed buildings within or likely to be affected by the development of a site? If a site includes a listed building or affects a listed building what mitigation measures are in place to ensure that the listed building is safeguarded. This can only partly be assessed if it is known whether mitigation measures to safeguard a listed building are to be applied as part of any development scheme. The Church Road site and Edward Street site have an unknown effect on listed buildings. More investigation will be required as to the effects and the core strategy will need to specifically refer to enhancing and safeguarding the listed buildings.
		Adverse effect on Listed Building(s)												
		Improve or no effect	✓											
		Unknown							✓		✓			
	Does it improve the quality of the	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	The question needs to be asked - will development of the potential

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
	built environment?	No												strategic site allow for vacant or Previously Developed Land to be redeveloped. If this is the case, it is assumed to improve the quality of the built environment in new development, whether it be for design reasons or functionality reasons.
Ensure efficient use of land through safeguarding	Will it safeguard the Borough's mineral resources?	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	There are no mineral reserves within Redditch Borough, so it is therefore assumed that all strategic sites will safeguard mineral reserved.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
of mineral reserves, the best and most versatile agricultural lands, land of Green Belt value, maximising use of previously developed land and reuse of vacant buildings, where this is not detrimental to open space and biodiversity interest		No												

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
	Will it maximise the use of Previously Developed Land?	Yes - It is on PDL and at high density or mixed uses			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		The question needs to be asked - if this site is located on Previously Developed Land, are there opportunities to maximise its use (either through higher densities or mixed uses) included as part of any development scheme? This can only partly be assessed if it is known whether measures to maximise the use of PDL are implemented.
		To a small extent - it is on PDL	✓										✓	
		No		✓										
	Will it protect the Borough's open spaces of recreational and amenity value?	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		This can be assessed if it is known whether any relevant designated open space on a site is to be continued to be protected.
		No											✓	
	Will it preserve the openness of the Green Belt?	Not on/adjacent to Green Belt land	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	This can only be assessed if it is known whether the site is within or adjacent to Green Belt land and whether the development of the site may result in harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
		Yes - compliant with PPG2		✓										

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
		No - there would be harm to Green Belt land												
	Will it help to protect the Borough's agricultural land from adverse developments?	Yes - not on agricultural land	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	The question needs to be asked - is the site on agricultural land? If it is not, then the site protects agricultural land, if it is, the question needs to be asked - whether appropriate mitigation measures are to be implemented as part of any development scheme?
		To a small extent - on agricultural land with mitigation measures in place												
		No - there would be harm to agricultural land												
Promote resource efficiency	Will it encourage opportunities for the production of	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	This can only be assessed if it is known whether production of renewable and low carbon energy is
		No												

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
and energy generated from renewable energy and low carbon sources	renewable and low carbon energy?	Unknown												to be implemented as part of any development scheme. The Core Strategy should include a general policy encouraging renewable energy and low carbon energy to be provided in developments.
	Will it promote greater energy efficiency?	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	This can only be assessed if it is known whether a site will incorporate measures to be more energy efficient as part of any development scheme. The Core Strategy should include a general policy encouraging renewable energy and low carbon energy to be provided in developments.
		No												
		Unknown												
	Will it encourage opportunities to achieve energy efficiency	Yes												This can only be assessed if it is known whether a site will incorporate measures to achieve above the minimum standard, as defined by the
		No	✓										✓	

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Large or Strategic Sites											Comments
			Abbey Stadium	Land to the RO Alex Hospital	Church Hill District Centre	Winyates District Centre	Matchborough District Centre	Woodrow District Centre	Church Rd	Prospect Hill	Edward St	Car Park No. 4	Woodrow Strategic Site	
	measures above the minimum standard, as defined by the Code for Sustainable Homes?	Unknown		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		Code for Sustainable Homes.

Appendix C - SA Assessment of WYG Options (Stage 1)

Issue/Question - Where should future development be concentrated beyond Redditch Borough?

Option 1 - Land north of Astwood Bank

Option 2 - Land adjacent to Ham Green

Option 3 - West of Redditch Golf Course

Option 3A - Golf Club and Morton Stanley Park

Option 4 - Land west of A448

1	2	3	3A	4	Comments/Explanation
- -	- -	- -	-	- -	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 17.
					Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 17.
					Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16 and 17.
-2	-2	-2	-1	-2	Implementing Option 3A is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 7, 10 and 17.
					Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 7, 10 and 17.

All of the effects predicted for options 1 to 4 would have an impact on a Borough-wide scale and on its environs in the neighbouring District of Bromsgrove. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 7 and 17 would be a certainty. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 3, 8, 10 and 13 would be very likely. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 9, 16 and 18 would be fairly likely, and achievement of these Objectives would have to be achieved through other means.

Option 5 - Land off A448

Option 6 - Land north and south of Lowan's Hill Farm

Option 7 - Abbey Park Golf Course

Option 8 - A441 and Ryckniel Street

Option 9 - Land between Ryckniel Street, M42 and A435

5	6	7	8	9	Comments/Explanation
-	+/-	- -	+/-	-	Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 8, 10 and 17.
					Implementing Option 6 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 4, 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 8, 10 and 17.
					Implementing Option 7 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 9, 13 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 8, 10, 11, 16 and 17.
-1	0	-2	0	-1	Implementing Option 8 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 9, 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 8 and 17.
					Implementing Option 9 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 9, 10 and 17.

All of the effects predicted for options 5 to 9 would have an impact on a Borough-wide scale and on its environs in neighbouring Bromsgrove District. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objective 17 would be a certainty. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 3, 8, 9, 10 and 13 would be very likely. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 16 and 18 would be fairly likely, and achievement of these Objectives would have to be achieved through other means.

Option 10 - Land south of Holt End

Option 11 - Land south of Cobley Hill

Option 12 - Rough Hill Wood and land north of Jill Lane

Option 13 - Land to north of Sambourne and Middletown villages

Option 14 - Land between Studley and Redditch

10	11	12	13	14	Comments/Explanation
					Implementing Option 10 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 4 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 10, 16 and 17.
- -	- -	-	- -	- -	Implementing Option 11 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 17.
					Implementing Option 12 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 10 and 17.
-2	-2	-1	-2	-2	Implementing Option 13 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 8, 10 and 17.
					Implementing Option 14 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 8, 10 and 17.

All of the effects predicted for options 10 to 14 would have an impact on a Borough-wide scale and on its environs in the neighbouring Districts of Bromsgrove and Stratford. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objective 17 would be a certainty. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 3, 8, 10 and 13 would be very likely. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 9, 16 and 18 would be fairly likely, and achievement of these Objectives would have to be achieved through other means.

Option 15 - Land east and northeast of Studley

Option 16 - Land south of Hardwick Lane

Option 17 - Land east of A435 and south of A4189

Option 18 - Narrow strip of land between Redditch and A435

Option 19 - Land north of A4189 and east of A435

Option 20 - Land between A435 and Blind Lane

15	16	17	18	19	20	Comments/Explanation
-	-	-	-	-	-	Implementing Option 15 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 8, 10, 16 and 17.
-	-	-	-	-	-	Implementing Option 16 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13, and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 8, 9, 10, 16 and 17.
-	-	-	-	-	-	Implementing Option 17 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 9, 10 and 17.
-2	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	Implementing Option 18 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 9, 10 and 17.
-2	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	Implementing Option 19 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 9, 10 and 17.
-2	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	Implementing Option 20 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 9, 10 and 17.

All of the effects predicted for options 15 to 20 would have an impact on a Borough-wide scale and on its environs in the neighbouring Districts of Bromsgrove and Stratford Districts. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objective 17 would be a certainty. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 3, 8, 10 and 13 would be very likely. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 9, 16 and 18 would be fairly likely. The likelihood of the effect working towards or against achieving SA Objective 12 would be minimal, and achievement of these Objectives would have to be achieved through other means.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	3A	4
1. To have high quality open spaces and the best open spaces to meet needs, a key component of Redditch Borough;	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough is carbon neutral;	?	?	?	?	?
3. To reduce the causes of, and minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change especially flood risk;	--	--	--	+/-	+/-
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Borough's natural, rural and built environment and its best distinctive features;	--	--	--	--	--
5. To move towards safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and reduce the need to travel;	--	--	--	--	-
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities;	?	?	?	?	?
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime;	?	?	?	?	?
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix and type in the best locations;	++	++	++	++	++
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	?	?	?	?	?
11. To maintain and support local landscape character and distinctiveness.	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	-8	-8	-8	-5	-4

Core Strategy DPD Objective	5	6	7	8	9
1. To have high quality open spaces and the best open spaces to meet needs, a key component of Redditch Borough;	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough is carbon neutral;	?	?	?	?	?
3. To reduce the causes of, and minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change especially flood risk;	--	--	--	--	+/-
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Borough's natural, rural and built environment and its best distinctive features;	--	--	--	--	--
5. To move towards safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and reduce the need to travel;	+	+	+	+	--
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities;	?	?	?	?	?
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime;	?	?	?	?	?
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix and type in the best locations;	++	++	++	++	++

Core Strategy DPD Objective	5	6	7	8	9
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	?	+	?	?	?
11. To maintain and support local landscape character and distinctiveness.	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	-4	-2	-5	-3	-5

Core Strategy DPD Objective	10	11	12	13	14
1. To have high quality open spaces and the best open spaces to meet needs, a key component of Redditch Borough;	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough is carbon neutral;	?	?	?	?	?
3. To reduce the causes of, and minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change especially flood risk;	+/-	--	+/-	--	--
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Borough's natural, rural and built environment and its best distinctive features;	--	--	--	--	--
5. To move towards safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and reduce the need to travel;	--	--	--	--	--
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities;	?	?	?	?	?
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime;	?	?	?	?	?
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix and type in the best locations;	0	++	++	++	++
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	++	?	?	?	?
11. To maintain and support local landscape character and distinctiveness.	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	-6	-8	-5	-8	-8

Core Strategy DPD Objective	15	16	17	18	19	20
1. To have high quality open spaces and the best open spaces to meet needs, a key component of Redditch Borough;	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough is carbon neutral;	?	?	?	?	?	?
3. To reduce the causes of, and minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change especially flood risk;	--	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Borough's natural, rural and built environment and its best distinctive features;	--	--	--	--	--	--
5. To move towards safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and reduce the need to travel;	--	--	--	-	--	--

Core Strategy DPD Objective	15	16	17	18	19	20
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities;	?	?	?	?	?	?
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime;	?	?	?	?	?	?
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix and type in the best locations;	++	++	++	++	++	++
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	?	?	?	+	?	?
11. To maintain and support local landscape character and distinctiveness.	--	--	--	--	--	--
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	-8	-6	-5	-3	-5	-5

The SA Scoring of Options has determined that Option 6 is the most sustainable option and is therefore confirmed as a site suitable for consideration when determining the preferred development option in Redditch's Preferred Draft Core Strategy. Option 8 and Option 18 are also high scoring options as well as Option 4 and Option 5 which scored slightly lower.

White Young Green Options – Report 2

Issue/Question – Where is the preferred option for future development to be concentrated beyond Redditch Borough?

Option 1 - Bordesley Park

Option 2 - Bordesley Park (NLP)

Option 3 - 3 ADRs and Foxlydiate

Option 4 - A435 ADR, Webheath ADR and Foxlydiate

Option 5 - A435 ADR, Brockhill ADR (west of railway) and Foxlydiate

1	2	3	4	5	Comments/Explanation
+	+	-	--	-	Implementing Option 1 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 9, 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 8 and 17.
					Implementing Option 2 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 3, 9, 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 8 and 17.
+1	+1	-1	-2	-1	Implementing Option 3 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 7, 10 and 17.
					Implementing Option 4 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 7, 10 and 17.
					Implementing Option 5 is likely to result in a positive effect on SA Objectives 4, 13, 16 and 18 and likely to result in significant negative effects on SA Objectives 3, 10 and 17.

All of the effects predicted for options 1 to 5 would have an impact on a Borough-wide scale and its environs in the neighbouring Districts of Bromsgrove and Stratford. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against SA Objectives 7 and 17 would be a certainty. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 8, 10 and 13 would be very likely. The likelihood of the effects working towards or against achieving SA Objectives 3, 16 and 18 would be fairly likely, and achievement of these Objectives would have to be achieved through other means.

Core Strategy DPD Objective	1	2	3	4	5
1. To have high quality open spaces and the best open spaces to meet needs, a key component of Redditch Borough;	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
2. To ensure that all new development in Redditch Borough is carbon neutral;	?	?	?	?	?
3. To reduce the causes of, and minimise the impacts of and adapt to climate change especially flood risk;	--	--	--	-	--
4. To protect, promote and where possible enhance the quality of the Borough's natural, rural and built environment and its best distinctive features;	--	--	--	--	--
5. To move towards safer, sustainable travel patterns, improve accessibility and reduce the need to travel;	+	+	-	--	-
6. To enhance the visitor economy and Redditch's cultural and leisure opportunities;	?	?	?	?	?
7. Reduce crime and anti social behaviour and the fear of crime;	?	?	?	?	?
8. To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres in the Borough by day and night;	0	0	0	0	0
9. To have sufficient homes meeting demographic needs, including affordable housing, providing for a range, mix and type in the best locations;	++	++	++	++	++
10. To have a strong, attractive, diverse and enterprising economic base with sufficient employment land, including Strategic Sites and employees with higher skills levels;	?	?	-	-	?
11. To maintain and support local landscape character and distinctiveness.	-	-	--	--	--
TOTAL SCORE (appraisal against SA Objectives score is included)	-1	-1	-7	-8	-6

The SA Scoring of Options has determined that Option 1 is the most sustainable option for meeting the current Preferred Option RSS housing allocation and is therefore confirmed as the most sustainable option for Redditch's Core Strategy Preferred Option for its development strategy. Option 2 would be the most suitable option if housing allocations are increased as an outcome of the RSS Examination in Public and is the potential alternative.

SA Assessment of WYG Options (Stage 2)

The following sustainability matrix has been produced in tandem with the Growth Implications for Redditch Stage 2 study. The matrix is designed to ensure each growth scenario explored during the study has been evaluated against agreed sustainability criteria. This SA Assessment was undertaken by WYG planning in line with Redditch Borough Council's decision making criteria.

The SA Objectives were used to test 5 development options considered as part of the Growth Implications for Redditch Stage 2 report. All of the options include developing all identified SHLAA sites at the time of the WYG Options assessment.

It should be noted that only Option 2 would meet the higher NLP growth option preferred growth option of 9100 dwellings. Options 1, 3, 4 and 5 meet the requirements of the preferred RSS housing figure of 6,600.

These development options assessed are set out below:

Options 1 – Bordesley Park (WYG option) developed to meet the RSS preferred growth option. This option requires 6,600 dwellings to be accommodated within and around Redditch.

Option 2 – Bordesley Park developed to meet the NLP growth option of 9,100 dwellings.

Option 3 – All 3 ADR's and 2,814 dwellings at Foxlydiate – Meeting the RSS preferred option requiring the development on previously undeveloped land across 4 locations including part development of the Foxlydiate SUE.

Option 4 – All Foxlydiate SUE, Webheath and the A435 ADR – Meeting the RSS preferred option requiring the development on previously undeveloped land across 3 locations.

Option 5 – All Foxlydiate SUE, Brockhill West ADR and A435 ADR – Meeting the RSS preferred option requiring the development on previously undeveloped land across 3 locations.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
To manage waste in accordance	Will it reduce the production of waste and	Significantly						This is not affected by scale or location of development.
		To a small extent						
		No						

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
with the waste hierarchy: reduce, reuse, recycle, compost, recovery, disposal	manage waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy?	Unknown	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Reduce causes of and adapt to the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases?	Significantly						The assessment is linked to criteria to reduce the need to travel, where there would be less emissions from vehicles for shorter journey times and the potential for introducing low carbon technology. Options that offer the greatest potential to reduce green house gas emissions by virtue of its location and scale are north of Redditch. The size and concentration of development in one location also maximises the potential for shared low carbon technologies.
		To a small extent	✓	✓				
		No			✓	✓	✓	
		Unknown						
	Does it promote patterns of spatial development that are adaptable to and suitable for predicted changes in climate?	Significantly						None of the development sites advocate development at locations which would specifically be affected by climate change. Flood risk, which would have the moist significant potential to impact on the development, can be accommodated within open space areas on all of the development options examined.
		To a small extent						
		No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		Unknown						
To reduce the need to travel	Will it reduce the need to travel?	Significantly because of its location						This can be assessed in two ways. The first is if the site is within the urban area, near to a transport interchange, near

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
and move towards more sustainable travel patterns		Extensively through its transport provision						<p>to multi-modal access or within the Town Centre. The second relates to the potential for new and alternative public transport infrastructure to be provided. Option 1 and 2 by virtue of its location and good potential links into the wider Redditch pathway and cycleway system offers the best opportunity to reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>All other development options are further removed from the town centre within limited potential to reduce people's need to travel. Good public transport links at these locations would be required to mitigate the increased travel demands created by residential development way from central locations.</p>
		To a small extent because of its location	✓	✓				
		To a small extent through its transport provision						
		No			✓	✓	✓	
	Will it provide opportunities to increase sustainable modes of travel?	Yes						<p>This can be assessed in two ways. The first is if the site is within the urban area, near to a transport interchange, near to multi-modal access or within the Town Centre. The second relates to the potential for new and alternative public transport infrastructure to be provided. Option 1 and 2 by virtue of its location and good potential links into the wider Redditch pathway and cycleway system offers the best opportunity to reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>Sustainable transport is easier to facilitate where development is concentrated so options 3, 4 and 5 do not maximise the chances of increasing sustainable modes of travel.</p>
		Possibly	✓	✓				
		No			✓	✓	✓	
		Unknown						
	Does it focus development in existing centres,	Significantly because it is within or adjacent						This assessment focuses on the requirement to create new communities to meet regional housing growth targets.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
	and make use of existing infrastructure to reduce the need to travel?	to an existing centre						
		Significantly because it is near existing infrastructure						
		To a small extent because it is fairly near to an existing centre or existing infrastructure						
		No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Develop a knowledge-driven economy, with the appropriate employment land, infrastructure and skills base whilst ensuring all share the benefits urban and rural	Will it contribute towards urban and rural regeneration?	Yes						Development of Greenfield land does not contribute towards urban regeneration and development at any of these locations will not regenerate the rural communities locally.
		No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Will it provide opportunities for	Significantly						Focussing growth and increasing population and therefore demand for local services has the potential to impact
		To a small extent	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
	businesses to develop and enhance their competitiveness?	Unknown						positively on local business. Location of the development is not likely to influence the success of meeting this objective.
	Will it support the shopping hierarchy?	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Focusing growth and increasing population in and around Redditch will increase demand for retail and improve town centre viability. New urban expansion sites will create new local centres which mirrors the current shopping hierarchy.
		To a small extent						
		No						
	Will it help to improve skills levels in the workforce?	Yes						Development of additional dwellings will not directly impact on skills levels in the workforce.
		To a small extent						
		No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Will it support tourism?	Yes	✓					Development of additional dwellings will not directly impact on tourism in the area.
		To a small extent						
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	
		Unknown						
Promote and support the development of	Does it encourage innovative and environmentally	Yes						There is increased potential for ensuring innovative and environmentally friendly technologies with a concentration of a single large SUE such as Bordesley Park. Further
		To a small extent						
		No						

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
new technologies, of high value and low impact, especially resource efficient technologies and environmental technology initiatives	friendly technologies?	Unknown	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	initiatives would be evaluated as part of an urban expansion site development briefs and masterplanning.
	Does it promote and support the development of new technologies, of high value and low impact?	Yes						This relates more to the development of commercial and employment sites.
		To a small extent						
		No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		Unknown						
Protect and improve the quality of water, soil and air and water resources	Will it provide opportunities to improve or maintain water quality/water resource?	Yes						This is not specifically relevant to any of the development options. All appropriate measures would be put in place at the development master planning stage.
		To a small extent						
		No						
		Unknown	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
Ensure development does not occur in high-risk flood prone areas and does not adversely contribute to fluvial flood risks or contribute to surface water flooding in all other areas	Does it protect the floodplain from inappropriate development?	Yes - no impacts/not on or near the floodplain						Floodplains have been mapped for each of the development options and suitable mitigation and avoidance measures will be employed to ensure development does not impact on areas affected by flooding.
		Yes - positive mitigation measures in place	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		No						
	Does it take account of all types of flooding?	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	All flood zones have been taken into account for all sites.
		To a small extent						
		No						
	Does it promote Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems where appropriate?	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Development of SUDS schemes are a key design element of any new residential development and are expected to be employed at a detailed design stage.
		No						
		Unknown						
To improve the vitality and viability of Town	Will proposals enhance the provision of local	Significantly	✓	✓				For Bordesley Park option 1 and 2 the opportunities are maximised for enhancing and providing local services which meet the needs of local people. To a lesser extent
		To a small extent				✓	✓	
		No			✓			

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
and District Centres and the quality of, and equitable access to, local services and facilities, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio - economic status or educational attainment	services and facilities?	Unknown						the smaller Foxlydiate SUE also looks to improve local services for the northwest area of Redditch. Developing on all smaller sites will result in fewer opportunities to provide local services and facilities.
	Will it contribute to rural service provision across the Borough?	Significantly						None of the sites reviewed are separate rural sites and none of the development options will offer specific benefits to the rural communities.
		To a small extent						
		No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		Unknown						
	Will it enhance accessibility to services by public transport?	Yes	✓	✓				The concentration of development at one location closest to the town centre offers the maximum potential to improve and integrate public transport links.
		To a small extent				✓	✓	
		No			✓			
		Unknown						
Safeguard and strengthen landscape and	Will it safeguard and strengthen landscape and	Yes	✓					The impact on landscape, townscape and the current urban form is a key consideration for any of the urban expansion sites. Developing into open countryside will
		To a small extent		✓				
		No			✓	✓	✓	

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
townscape character and quality	townscape character and quality?	Unknown						<p>have a pronounced impact on the current settlement form and surrounding landscape.</p> <p>Development of Option 1 or 2 at Bordesley Park has been assessed for landscape impact and by virtue of the land form is considered to be the least impact location in accommodating both RSS preferred option and the growth scenario. Its location to the north of Redditch has the least impact with relatively few properties affected by development on the site. The Foxlydiate site is not contained within the landscape to the same extent as Bordesley Park.</p> <p>The A435 ADR as a development option would have a significant impact on the eastern settlement boundary with the town perceptibly moving into the open countryside as development moves out to meet the road itself. The Brockhill ADR to the north of Enfield Industrial Estate would have significant impact on the skyline.</p> <p>The Webheath ADR is more contained although there is no obvious development boundary with the site seemingly spilling into the open countryside. Good quality landscapes here would also be affected.</p>
To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Will it help to safeguard the Borough's biodiversity and geodiversity?	Yes - not related to sites of biodiversity or geodiversity interest						Greenfield development will be required to accommodate both the RSS preferred option and Growth Option. The avoidance of areas of high quality natural habitats will maximise the potential for sites of nature importance to be retained as part of future masterplanning exercise.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
		To a small extent - mitigation measures in place	✓	✓				<p>Option 1 and 2 have relatively few areas of natural habitat with the significant majority of the site being open agricultural land. Areas of flood risk around the watercourses offer the most significant concentration of deciduous woodland. The current fishing ponds also have significant ecological potential. It is envisaged that these areas would be included within the open spaces provision on site with the key features retained and enhanced.</p> <p>The Foxlydiat site is a similar area of agricultural land although there is a substantial increase in the quality of mature hedgerows and woodland across the site when compared with Bordesley. Webheath ADR also provides a similar ecological landscape to Foxlydiat with a mix of mature trees and watercourses along field boundaries.</p> <p>The A435 ADR has substantial areas of mature woodland. Planting has been introduced and the semi-natural environment offers a more broader range of habitat than more common agricultural environments.</p> <p>Brockhill ADR has a limited impact on natural habitats with the sites agricultural use and relative size limiting the impact.</p>
		No			✓	✓	✓	
		Unknown						
	Will it protect sites and habitats designated for nature conservation?	Yes - not related to sites designated for nature conservation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	The masterplanning of this site would offer greater insight into the potential for introducing ecological diverse and high quality features. As a general approach the development at Bordesley offers the most potential with sizable water

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
		To a small extent - mitigation measures in place						features on site and an overall scale and size which offers the greatest chance of accommodating biodiversity within the sites open space.
		No						The higher growth option at Bordesley requires more open space and therefore offers greater potential for more natural habitat areas alongside recreational open space facilities. Development of all ADR sites creates the least opportunity to provide for natural habitats. As a principle each sites relative size and requirement for informal and formal play facilities limits the potential to introduce natural habitat features of any size.
		Unknown						
	Will it help to achieve targets set out in the Biodiversity and Geodiversity Action Plans?	Yes						This can only be assessed if it is known what measures to ensure targets in the Worcestershire and Redditch BAP are to be implemented as part of any development scheme.
		No						
		Unknown	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
To improve the	Will it improve	Yes - it is close to a health facility						None of the options evaluated are in close proximity to the

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health	access to health facilities across the Borough?	Yes - mitigation measures in place						Alexandra Hospital. Any provision of GP facilities would be introduced as part of a master plan with the SUE's at Bordesley and Foxlydiate offering the best opportunities for accommodating new facilities.
		No						
		Unknown	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Will it promote healthier lifestyles?	Significantly						The potential for leisure facilities and creation of good car alternatives at Bordesley will assist in promoting healthier lifestyles. For other more fragmented development options the promotion of active and healthier lifestyles through walking or cycling to the town centre is not so easy to achieve.
		To a small extent	✓	✓				
		No						
		Unknown			✓	✓	✓	
	Does it mitigate against noise pollution?	Yes						Noise issue would need to be assessed as part of a development proposal.
		No						
		Unknown	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	Does it mitigate against light pollution?	Yes						Any extensions to the urban area will exacerbate light pollution issues. Mitigation measures would need to be considered at detailed design stage.
		No						
		Unknown	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Provide decent affordable housing for all, of all the right quality and tenure for local	Will it provide opportunities to increase affordable housing levels within urban and rural areas of	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	The provision of affordable housing will be improved through the development of any of the sites considered. There are fewer competing costs elements such as contamination or mitigation measures to overcome in bringing in any of the large sites forward.
		No - residential development may not be appropriate for this site						

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
needs, in clean, safe and pleasant local environments	the Borough?	No - there is no affordable housing provision						
		Unknown						
	Will it provide affordable housing access to a range of housing tenures and sizes?	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	The provision of affordable housing will be improved through the development of any of the sites considered. There are fewer competing costs elements such as contaminations or mitigation measures to overcome in bringing any of the large sites forward.
		No - residential development may not be appropriate for this site						
		No - there is no affordable housing access to a range of housing tenures and sizes						
		Unknown						
	Does it seek to provide high quality, well-designed residential environments?	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Development at all of the sites offers an opportunity to deliver a high quality, well designed residential environment.
		No - residential development may not be appropriate for this site						
		No - high quality/well designed environment not to be incorporated						
		Unknown						

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
To raise the skills levels and qualifications of the workforce	Will it provide opportunities to further develop educational and attainment facilities within the Borough?	Yes						Not relevant.
		No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		Unknown						
Reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour	Does it promote mixed development that encourages natural surveillance?	Yes - mixed use development and demonstrable natural surveillance						Development options are not mixed uses development sites. All relevant standards for designing out crime would be introduced as part of the proposal although large missed use areas do not form a part of the options identified.
		To a small extent - mixed use development						
		No	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		Unknown						
Conserve and enhance the architectural,	Does it provide opportunities for sustainable	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	This can only be assessed at a detailed stage although sustainable construction techniques will be implemented as part of any development scheme.
		No						

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
cultural and archaeological heritage and seek well-designed, resource efficient, high quality built environment in new development proposals	construction?	Unknown						
	Will it enhance the Borough's Conservation Areas?	Site not in or adjoining Conservation Area	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Conversation areas will not be affected by development of the options identified.
		Adverse effect on Conservation Area						
		Improve or no affect						
		Unknown						
	Will it help safeguard the Borough's Listed Buildings?	Site not listed or adjacent to listed building(s)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Listed buildings will not be affected development of the options identified.
		Adverse effect on Listed Building(s)						
		Improve or no effect						

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
		Unknown						
	Does it improve the quality of the built environment?	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	The introduction of modern well design residential environments constructed to the latest code for sustainable homes standards offers the opportunity to ensure the best quality designs are employed.
		No						
Ensure efficient use of land through safeguarding of mineral reserves, the best and most versatile agricultural lands, land of Green Belt value, maximising use of previously developed land and reuse of vacant buildings, where this is not detrimental to open space and biodiversity interest	Will it safeguard the Borough's mineral resources?	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Details on mineral resources are not known at this time.
		No						

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
	Will it maximise the use of Previously Developed Land?	Yes - It is on PDL and at high density or mixed uses	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	The development of all existing urban capacity identified within the SHLAA is an integral part of each development option.
		To a small extent - it is on PDL						
		No						
	Will it protect the Borough's open spaces of recreational and amenity value?	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	This stage 2 Growth Implications for Redditch study has thoroughly evaluated open space provision including the development potential of low quality spaces. All development options are predicted on the basis of development at densities which will allow recreational and amenity land of high value to be retained within the town and provided within the development options.
		No						
	Will it preserve the openness of the Green Belt?	Not on/adjacent to Green Belt land						To achieve both the preferred RSS target and the growth target development will need to occur on greenbelt land. A review of the SHLAA shows an urban capacity of 2,430 has been identified.
		Yes - compliant with PPG2						

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
		No - there would be harm to Green Belt land	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Meeting the RSS target would require 4,170 units developed outside of the current settlement limits with the growth option increasing this number to 6,670. An allowance has been made for the potential offsetting of non greenbelt land through the reallocation of Redditch's ADR's. For example, Bordesley Park Option 1 would allow for the inclusion of all 3 ADR sites into the Greenbelt which in turn offsets a proportion of greenbelt land lost to that development. The offsetting process would mean that the loss of Greenbelt land is broadly similar for each development option.
	Will it help to protect the Borough's agricultural land from adverse developments?	Yes - not on agricultural land						There will be loss of agricultural land for all development options pursued.
		To a small extent - on agricultural land with mitigation measures in place						
		No - there would be harm to agricultural land	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Promote resource efficiency and energy	Will it encourage opportunities for the production of renewable and low	Yes – significant opportunity	✓	✓				The larger the development sites the better the opportunity for integrating renewable and low carbon technologies. The development of Bordesley offers the potential to concentrate all development within one large site which in
		Yes – Potential opportunity				✓	✓	

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Development Options					Comments
			OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPTION 3	OPTION 4	OPTION 5	
generated from renewable energy and low carbon sources	carbon energy?	No			✓			turn gives the maximum potential for employing new technologies.
	Will it promote greater energy efficiency?	Yes	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	All new residential development is expected to meet the highest standards with guidance coming from the Code for Sustainable Homes suggesting zero carbon communities by 2016. As meeting either the RSS preferred option or growth option will involve planning beyond the 2016 period all development will conform to the required standards. Development on any of the sites is expected to deliver the required standard as a minimum.
		No						
		Unknown						
	Will it encourage opportunities to achieve energy efficiency measures above the minimum standard, as defined by the Code for Sustainable Homes?	Yes						This can only be assessed if it is known whether each option will incorporate measures to achieve above the minimum standard, as defined by the Code for Sustainable Homes.
		No						
		Unknown	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

Appendix D - Prediction of Core Strategy effects

The table below provides a SA assessment of the likely effects of implementing the preferred approach as set out in the Core Strategy. The table provides a picture of how the Redditch core strategy is likely to effect the achievement of what sustainability is considered to be. This has been updated in advance of the December 2010 Core Strategy redraft.

Key

++	Clear, strongly positive implications
+	Overall implications likely to be positive
Ø	Neutral
?	Mixed or Unclear
-	Overall implications likely to be negative
--	Clear, strong negative implications
0	Not relevant

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Score	Overall Implications of the Core Strategy
To manage waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy: reduce, reuse, recycle, compost, recovery, disposal	Are opportunities to increase recycling incorporated into the LDF?	+ +	Recycling is not an issue with any key locally distinctive issues to resolve and ways to deal with any issues. Recycling was not included as an issue in the Issues and Options document, however the Core Strategy must address this matter in line with national guidance; therefore opportunities to increase the rate of recycling needs to be encouraged. This would need to set some principles to encourage recycling in development and other measures which new development should meet. The location for any potential cross boundary development would not have any other effect on this decision making criteria.
	Will it reduce the production of waste and manage waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy?	+ +	Managing waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy is not a key locally distinctive issue for Redditch and so it was not included as an issue as part of the Issues and Options document, however the Core Strategy must address this matter in line with national guidance; therefore opportunities to manage waste needs to be encouraged. This would need to set some principles or standards which new development should meet. The location for any cross boundary development would not have any other effect on this decision making criteria.
	Are opportunities to increase the amount of construction and demolition waste that is reused incorporated into the LDF?	+ +	The reuse of construction and demolition waste is not a key locally distinctive issue for Redditch and so was not included as an issue in the Issues and Options document, however the Core Strategy must address this matter in line with national guidance therefore opportunities to increase the reuse of construction and demolition waste needs to be encouraged. The location for cross boundary development would not have any other effect on this decision making criteria.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Score	Overall Implications of the Core Strategy
Reduce causes of and adapt to the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases?	+ +	The likely growth in households, economic activity and transport as is inevitably likely to increase gross energy demand in Redditch (even if demand per head may decrease as a result of other measures). Some aspects of the Core Strategy would need to be included to ensure mitigation against any rise in CO2 e.g. through the percentage of energy to be provided from renewable sources, or the promotion of sustainable transport. The location for cross boundary development would potential have an effect on this objective as a result of increased CO2 emissions though transport trips to key destinations.
	Are opportunities to promote measures to mitigate causes of climate change in the LDF?	+ +	The Core Strategy needs to make provision for the mitigation of climate change in a number of ways e.g through building design, landscaping, transport, flooding. In terms of renewable energy and the percentage of renewable energy produced on site, the Core Strategy can only request the rate as set out in the WMRSS, even though this is revoked the evidence underpinning this is not disputed, also there are no locally distinctive issues or evidence to suggest that any higher or lower requirements would be appropriate in Redditch. Also the Core Strategy must aim for proposals to achieve a 'very good' BREEAM rating for all new non-residential development and for residential development to achieve the Code for Sustainable Homes requirements as set out in the WMRSS. The location for cross boundary development would not have any other effect on this decision making criteria.
To reduce the need to travel and move towards more sustainable travel patterns	Will it reduce the need to travel?	+	The Core Strategy will need to make it clear where development should generally be directed, so that the need to travel is reduced by guiding development to the most sustainable locations. Other aspects relating to sustainable transportation must also be included in the Core Strategy. The location for cross boundary development is likely to require the implementation of a range of measures to reduce the need to travel, and possibly some enhancements to the road network, so the location would have an effect on this decision making criteria.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Score	Overall Implications of the Core Strategy
	Will it provide opportunities to increase sustainable modes of travel?	+ +	The Core Strategy will need to make it clear where development should generally be directed to, so that development can be guided to places which are more accessible and where sustainable modes of travel are available. Other aspects relating to sustainable transportation must also be included in the Core Strategy in line with national guidance. The location for cross boundary development has potential links with the existing cycle and pathway system and some locations are within a reasonable distance of sustainable modes of travel at Redditch Town Centre.
	Does it focus development in existing centres, and make use of existing infrastructure to reduce the need to travel?	+	The Core Strategy must make sure that any new development is located in areas which are accessible to public transport, and this should be ensured in the formulation of an appropriate settlement hierarchy. Also by promoting main Town Centre uses to Redditch Town Centre, public transport is likely to be promoted. Establishing a Hierarchy of Centres would ensure that appropriate development is steered to the right locations. Redevelopment of the former new town district centres would also positively effect the achievement of this decision making criteria. The potential locations for cross boundary development are not within existing centres and all would require new infrastructure, but some locations are less reliant on new infrastructure than others, so the location would effect this decision making criteria.
Develop a knowledge driven economy, with the appropriate infrastructure and skills base whilst ensuring all share the benefits urban and rural	Will it contribute towards urban and rural regeneration?	+ +	The Core Strategy should require a number of measures to be implemented in order to encourage the sustainable growth of the rural economy in line with the rural regeneration aims of the WMRSS, despite this being revoked as the aim is formulated in line with national policy. The Core Strategy should promote the regeneration of the former New Town District Centres of the Borough and is also likely to require a large amount of its development requirements into the main settlement of Redditch. The potential locations for cross boundary development would not contribute towards urban or rural regeneration.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Score	Overall Implications of the Core Strategy
	Will it provide opportunities for businesses to develop and enhance their competitiveness?	+	Opportunities for businesses to develop and enhance competitiveness must not be precluded by the Core Strategy. Although the Core Strategy is limited in how it could actively promote any positive measures to achieve this, recognition of the Borough Council's economic strategy would be needed. The potential locations for cross boundary development do not affect this decision making criteria.
	Will it support the shopping hierarchy?	++	The Core Strategy must reflect Redditch's status in the Network of Centres as set out in the WMRSS and also develop its own Hierarchy of Centres; despite the RSS being revoked the explanation of Redditch Town Centre's strategic role is not disputed. An appropriate policy regarding the role and function of the Centres within this hierarchy needs to be included in the Core Strategy. Strategic sites within and adjacent to Redditch Town Centre should aim to deliver new retail floorspace and other main Town Centre uses to help meet increased demand for these uses. The potential location for cross boundary development could require a new local centre to meet retail needs which would be expected to comply and be incorporated within the shopping hierarchy.
	Will it help to improve skills levels in the workforce?	++	The Issues and Options document asked how the economy can be diversified and one of the options presented to achieve this was to establish links with higher and further education institutions to tap into High Technology industry. The Core Strategy should encourage businesses to establish links with local higher education establishments so this matter can be addressed. The potential locations for cross boundary development do not affect this decision making criteria.
	Will it support tourism?	++	The Core Strategy should support and promote new and existing leisure and tourism in Redditch Borough in appropriate circumstances in line with national guidance. The potential locations for cross boundary development do affect this decision making criteria as those site in close proximity to Redditch's tourism assets have the potential to make linkages to these assets.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Score	Overall Implications of the Core Strategy
Promote and support the development of new technologies, of high value and low impact, especially resource efficient technologies and environmental technology initiatives	Does it encourage innovative and environmentally friendly technologies?	+ +	The Core Strategy should include the use of BREEAM standards and other requirements as per the standards set out in the WMRSS, although the RSS is revoked the evidence is not refuted. The preferred location for cross boundary growth does not affect this decision making criteria.
	Does it promote and support the development of new technologies, of high value and low impact?	+ +	A policy should make reference to the kind of economic activity which Redditch Borough wants to encourage, which would need to include new technologies. A locally distinctive issue in Redditch is its high levels of B8 uses (warehousing and distribution) and the high land take of these uses. The potential locations for cross boundary development do not affect this decision making criteria.
Protect and improve the quality of water, soil and air and water resources	Will it provide opportunities to improve or maintain water quality?	+ +	This will need to form part of a policy to be contained in the Core Strategy and will be informed by the Water Cycle Study refresh. Potential development at the locations for cross boundary development would also need to be informed by the WCS at a more detailed planning stage.
	Will it improve or maintain air quality?	+	The WMRSS stated that developments generating significant numbers of visitors should be accompanied by measures to minimise their potential to create or add to poor air quality, especially where plans impact upon European designated sites. This was not considered to be a locally distinctive issue for the Issues and Options document because there are no nearby European Designated sites where any impacts from the core strategy would be felt and also because the Borough has no Local Air Quality Management Areas. Although the RSS is revoked, this WMRSS guidance is not refuted and therefore the Core Strategy should address the potential negative effects on air quality. The preferred location for cross boundary growth has no further impact upon this decision making criteria.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Score	Overall Implications of the Core Strategy
	Will it provide opportunities to improve or maintain soil quality?	+	The WMRSS stated that new sites for facilities, to store, treat and recycle soils and construction/demolition waste should be provided and although the RSS is revoked, this guidance is not refuted. The Core Strategy must therefore address this issue. The Core Strategy should also refer to likely soil contamination. The potential locations for cross boundary development have no further impact upon this decision making criteria.
	Will it provide opportunities to improve or maintain water resource?	++	Water usage increases are noted as a significant issue associated with the WMRSS. The SA accompanying the Phase Two Revision stated that a policy should be developed to ensure high standards of water efficiency in new development. It is for the Local Planning Authority to include policies regarding water efficiency. The Core Strategy should address this issue through a policy including requirements to achieve the Code for Sustainable Homes which requires new dwellings to meet water conservation standards and also through a policy on flooding. The potential location for cross boundary development has no further impact upon this decision making criteria.
Ensure development does not occur in high-risk flood prone areas and does not adversely contribute to fluvial flood risks or contribute to surface water flooding in all other areas	Does it protect the floodplain from inappropriate development?	+	The Core Strategy is likely to include a policy which protects the floodplain from inappropriate development. It is also unlikely that any sites identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment will be on Flood Zones 2 or 3 (3a or 3b). The LDF for Redditch Borough will be informed by an up to date Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2. In terms of surface water flooding appropriate policies on flooding must be included in the Core Strategy. The potential locations for cross boundary development contain some watercourses and areas at risk of flooding. Appropriate mitigation measures would be required in order to protect the floodplain in some locations.
	Does it take account of all types of flooding?	++	The Core Strategy is likely to include a policy taking into account all types of flooding and will be informed by an up to date Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2. The potential location for cross boundary development will also be informed by a Level 2 SFRA.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Score	Overall Implications of the Core Strategy
	Are opportunities to reduce the risk of flooding in existing developed areas in the LDF?	+	The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 looks at all areas of the Borough and determines where flooding occurs in existing developed areas. The potential locations for cross boundary development have no further impact upon this decision making criteria.
	Does it promote Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems where appropriate?	++	Although much of Redditch Borough's soils are particularly impermeable and generally not suited to traditional SUDS, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment concludes that much of Redditch to the north in the urban area is suited to SUDS. The Core Strategy is therefore likely to require SUDS as part of proposals where appropriate. The potential locations for cross boundary development could have an effect on the achievement of this decision making criteria.
To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres and the quality of and equitable access to, local services and facilities, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio-economic status or educational attainment	Will proposals enhance the provision of local services and facilities?	++	The Core Strategy must place Redditch Town Centre at the top of the Hierarchy of Centres in an effort to enhance the provision of main Town Centre uses. Strategic sites within and adjacent to Redditch Town Centre also must aim to enhance service provision and facilities. In terms of District Centres, the redevelopment of the District Centres built during the New Town era should also help to achieve this decision making criteria. This redevelopment would enhance the provision of local services and facilities and improve the vitality and viability of the District Centres. Infrastructure considerations should feature throughout the Core Strategy and also necessary services and facilities would need to be requested so that they are provided where they are needed. The potential locations for cross boundary development could enhance the provision of local services and facilities as part of the development where it is needed.
	Will it contribute to rural service provision across the Borough?	++	The Core Strategy should set out a Hierarchy of Centres to include the District Centre of Astwood Bank, which is the only service centre in the Borough's rural areas so appropriate provision would be encouraged in this District Centre. The rural area of Redditch is small and service provision is not poor because of the accessibility to Redditch urban area. The potential locations for cross boundary development will not contribute to this decision making criteria.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Score	Overall Implications of the Core Strategy
	Will it enhance accessibility to services by public transport?	+ +	The Core Strategy will need to set out a Development Strategy which aims to guide development to places which are more accessible as preferable places for development, where sustainable modes of travel are available, which includes public transport. Other aspects relating to sustainable transportation must also be included in the Core Strategy. There is an opportunity for improvements to improve and integrate public transport links at some of the potential locations for cross boundary development particularly where a critical mass of development in one location is achieved.
Safeguard and strengthen landscape and townscape character and quality	Will it safeguard and strengthen landscape and townscape character and quality?	+ +	The landscapes around Redditch Borough are very important and any inappropriate proposals which do not implement necessary mitigation measures need to be resisted. The Landscape Character Assessment for Worcestershire has been completed and must inform a landscape protection policy to be set out in the Core Strategy. The potential locations for cross boundary development have been determined with regard to the Worcestershire Landscape Character Assessment, although all potential locations have landscape impacts.
To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Will it help to safeguard the Borough's biodiversity and geodiversity?	+	The Issues and Options document did not present any issues concerning biodiversity or geodiversity because there were no locally distinctive issues warranting its inclusion; however the importance of the green corridors in and around the Borough is likely to warrant biodiversity and geodiversity elements to be included in a green infrastructure policy and on a strategic site specific basis. This content will need to be informed by up to date assessments of the Borough's Special Wildlife Sites and concept statements for the provision of Green Infrastructure on strategic sites. The achievement of this decision making criteria should also be a matter relevant to all development, in line with national planning policy. The potential locations for cross boundary development would have an effect on the achievement of this decision making criteria because all sites are greenfield sites which include areas of biodiversity that would require mitigation measures to ensure continued protection and enhancement.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Score	Overall Implications of the Core Strategy
	Will it protect sites and habitats designated for nature conservation?	+	Any sites and habitats designated for nature conservation are already protected through national planning policy therefore there is no need for the Core Strategy to repeat this guidance. These sites and habitats are managed through controls outside of Planning legislation. The potential locations for cross boundary development do not contain any sites designated for nature conservation but until detailed sites are progressed the actual effects on such sites would need to be determined.
To improve the health and well being of the population and reduce inequalities in health	Will it improve access to health facilities across the Borough?	+ +	The Core Strategy would need to identify locations within the Borough that could be safeguarded for health related purposes and this is likely to be at the Alexandra Hospital. By increasing the provision of healthcare facilities, access is also likely to improve therefore the support for new or improved primary health care facilities should be ensured where appropriate within a Core Strategy policy. Redevelopment of the former new town District Centres will also include redeveloped health facilities. The potential locations for cross boundary development are not in close proximity to the Alexandra Hospital. The need for health facilities associated with potential cross boundary development should be explored at a more detailed planning stage.
	Will it help to improve quality of life for local residents?	+ +	There are a number of factors that could have an influence on the quality of life of Redditch's residents. Infrastructure would need to be a continuing theme throughout the Core Strategy especially where this would directly or indirectly promote quality of life as well as policies on transportation, open space, development strategy, pollution and the natural environment and landscape. The provision of affordable housing would also benefit this decision making criteria. Development on greenfield sites would not achieve this objective, particularly large scale developments so careful mitigation on such sites would need to be applied through strategic site policy. The potential locations for cross boundary development have no further impact upon this decision making criteria and would all be equally have an effect.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Score	Overall Implications of the Core Strategy
	Will it promote healthier lifestyles?	+	Although the Core Strategy is limited in the impact it can have on promoting healthier lifestyles, there are a number of measures which the Core Strategy can employ to indirectly achieve this, for example appropriate consideration of open space provision and infrastructure provision. The potential locations for cross boundary development have an impact on this decision making criteria as sites with better access to relevant open spaces will have a more positive effect .
	Does it mitigate against noise pollution?	?	Noise pollution increases are very likely as a result of the cumulative impact of development. Mitigation measures are essential to reduce or eliminate this pressure. The Core Strategy must therefore consider how all forms of pollution, including noise, can be incorporated into the strategy and developments mitigate against this where there are potential problems. The preferred location for cross boundary growth has no further impact upon this decision making criteria.
	Does it mitigate against light pollution?	?	Light pollution increases are very likely as a result of the cumulative impact of development. Mitigation measures are essential to reduce or eliminate this pressure. The Core Strategy must therefore consider how the impact of all forms of pollution, including light can be reduced. The potential locations for cross boundary development have no further impact upon this decision making criteria.
Provide decent affordable housing for all, of all the right quality and tenure for local needs, in clean, safe and pleasant local environments	Will it provide opportunities to increase affordable housing levels within urban and rural areas of the Borough?	+ +	The Core Strategy must set out the Affordable Housing need and requirements for the Borough, reflecting the findings of the South Housing Market Assessment and the forthcoming Redditch Housing Market Assessment. The potential locations for cross boundary development have no further impact upon this decision making criteria.
	Will it provide affordable housing access to a range of housing tenures and sizes?	+ +	The Core Strategy should include an affordable housing policy and make reference to the appropriate housing tenures and sizes sought within the policy contained in the forthcoming Redditch Housing Market Assessment. The potential locations for cross boundary development have no further impact upon this decision making criteria.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Score	Overall Implications of the Core Strategy
	Does it seek to provide high quality, well-designed residential environments?	+ +	The Core Strategy must aim to resolve the issue of crime and anti social behaviour and the most productive way of ensuring this is through design considerations. Also as part of the vision and the spatial portrait the aim for a high quality residential environment should be pursued in line with the requirements of PPS3. The potential location for cross boundary development is not within Redditch Borough.
	Are opportunities to increase the amount of construction and demolition waste that is reused incorporated into the LDF?	+ +	The reuse of construction and demolition waste is not considered an issue with any locally distinctive options for Redditch and so was not included in the Issues and Options document; however the Core Strategy must address the issue in line with national planning guidance. Therefore opportunities to increase the reuse of construction and demolition waste needs to be encouraged in the Core Strategy. The potential locations for cross boundary development have no further impact upon this decision making criteria.
To raise the skills levels and qualifications of the workforce	Will it provide opportunities to further develop educational and attainment facilities within the Borough?	+ +	Before any significant development commences, the necessary infrastructure (which would include educational facilities) would need to be available to accommodate the increased pressure on services that would occur from additional residents. The Core Strategy will need to ensure that sufficient delivery of infrastructure. The potential locations for cross boundary growth have no further impact upon this decision making criteria but is likely to require the supply of additional educational facilities or may not require new facilities where there is sufficient existing provision.
Reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour	Does it seek to provide high quality well designed environments?	+ +	The Core Strategy must aim to resolve the issue of crime and anti social behaviour and the most productive way of ensuring this is through design considerations. Also as part of the vision and the spatial portrait the aim for a high quality environment should be pursued. The potential locations for cross boundary development would have very little effect on this decision making criteria although some locations would be more suitable than others to be able to achieve this.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Score	Overall Implications of the Core Strategy
	Does it promote mixed development that encourages natural surveillance?	+ +	The Core Strategy must aim to resolve the issue of crime and anti social behaviour and the most productive way of ensuring this is through design considerations. Natural surveillance must be promoted in the Core Strategy for all relevant development sites. The potential locations for cross boundary development could all involve a mix of uses to achieve this decision making criteria.
Conserve and enhance the architectural, cultural and historic environment heritage and seek well-designed, resource efficient, high quality built environment in new development proposals	Does it provide opportunities for sustainable construction?	+ +	The Core Strategy is likely to include a requirement for meeting the Code for Sustainable Homes standards and other sustainable construction methods to be achieved for non residential development. The potential locations for cross boundary development have no further impact upon this decision making criteria.
	Will it enhance the Borough's Conservation Areas?	+	Conservation Areas form part of the historic environment which is likely to be afforded general protection in line with national planning guidance. The potential locations for cross boundary development have no further impact upon this decision making criteria.
	Will it help safeguard the Borough's Listed Buildings?	+	Listed Buildings form part of the historic environment which is likely to be afforded general protection in line with national planning guidance. The potential locations for cross boundary development have no further impact upon this decision making criteria.
	Does it improve the quality of the built environment?	+ +	There are a number of ways that the Core Strategy should improve the quality of the built environment, for example through the redevelopment and regeneration of the New Town era District Centres, general protection for elements of the historic environment, and design policies. The potential locations for cross boundary development have no further impact upon this decision making criteria although some locations would be more suitable than others to be able to achieve this.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Score	Overall Implications of the Core Strategy
Ensure efficient use of land through safeguarding of mineral reserves, the best and most versatile agricultural lands, land of Green Belt value, maximising use of previously developed land and reuse of vacant buildings, where this is not detrimental to open space and biodiversity interest	Will it safeguard the Borough's mineral resources?	Ø	Although there are no mineral resources that have been identified within Redditch Borough, the WMRSS requests that Local Planning Authorities include policies on minerals which have not previously been discovered. Although the RSS is now revoked, this guidance is not refuted. Because it is uncertain whether there are any future mineral reserves in any location, it is not possible to determine whether any progress towards safeguarding the Borough's mineral reserves can be made but the Core Strategy should ensure that the RSS policy guidance is continued. The potential locations for cross boundary development have no further impact upon this decision making criteria.
	Will it maximise the use of Previously Developed Land?	+	The Issues and Options document identified the PDL shortage in Redditch Borough as a significant local issue. The Core Strategy is likely to include a policy on making the most efficient use of land which will include maximising PDL and density. The preferred location of cross boundary growth is not PDL; this is necessary as sufficient PDL is not available to accommodate the required level of growth.
	Will it protect the Borough's open spaces of recreational and amenity value?	++	The Issues and Options document identified an issue between maintaining the high levels of open space in Redditch Borough and the pressure for development as a result of the WMRSS requirements. The Core Strategy is likely to require the maintenance of the provision of open space based upon its evidence in the open space needs assessment. The potential locations of cross boundary development should allow for recreation and amenity land of high value to be retained and to be provided within the development.
	Will it preserve the openness of the Green Belt?	+	The Core Strategy should continue to maintain that the Green Belt should remain open and protected from inappropriate development in line with national guidance. The potential locations for cross boundary development all involve development on the Green Belt so the achievement of this decision making criteria could be negatively affected.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Score	Overall Implications of the Core Strategy
	Will it help to protect the Borough's agricultural land from adverse developments?	+	The Core Strategy should continue to maintain that the Green Belt should remain open and protected from inappropriate development in line with national guidance. By implication, because much of the agricultural land in the Borough falls within the Green Belt, it would be protected from any inappropriate developments in line with national guidance. The potential locations for cross boundary development will result in the loss of agricultural land so the achievement of this decision making criteria could be negatively affected.
	Does it provide opportunities for sustainable construction?	+ +	The Preferred Draft Core Strategy is likely to include a policy on the Code for Sustainable Homes and other sustainable construction methods for non residential development in an appropriate policy. Elements of sustainable construction are also likely to form part of the sustainability criteria policy. The preferred location for cross boundary growth has no further impact upon this decision making criteria.
Promoting resource efficiency and energy generated from renewable energy and low carbon sources	Will it encourage opportunities for the production of renewable and low carbon energy?	+ +	The Issues and Options document presented issues on climate change and renewable energy. The Core Strategy would need to reflect the renewable energy targets as set out in the WMRSS. There is no contradictory evidence to suggest any deviation from these requirements. Because some of the potential locations for cross boundary development would concentrate development in a single large development area, the opportunities for integrating renewable and low carbon technologies could be maximised.
	Will it promote greater energy efficiency?	+ +	The Core Strategy should require that development delivery appropriate standards against the Code for Sustainable Homes and that other sustainable construction methods for non residential development are achieved. The potential locations for cross boundary development have a potential effect on this decision making criteria as longer travel distances to key facilities and the town centre would have a negative effect.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Score	Overall Implications of the Core Strategy
	Will it encourage opportunities to achieve energy efficiency measures above the minimum standard, as defined by the Code for Sustainable Homes?	- -	The Core Strategy should require that development delivery appropriate standards against the Code for Sustainable Homes and that other sustainable construction methods for non residential development are achieved. The Core Strategy would need to reflect the energy efficiency measures as set out in the WMRSS, although this is revoked, there is no evidence to suggest any deviation from these requirements. The potential locations for cross boundary development have no further impact upon this decision making criteria.

Appendix E - SA of Joint Consultation Development Options

Between 1st February 2010 and 15th March 2010 Redditch Borough Council collaborated with neighbouring Bromsgrove District Council to produce a consultation document outlining options and a redraft of preferred policy for:

- i) the development of Redditch related growth in Bromsgrove
- ii) the development strategy for development within Redditch Borough

The Redditch related growth to be accommodated in Bromsgrove was allocated to the Council's through the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy Phase Two Revision Report of the Panel (September 2009). There were options for accommodating this growth, but work completed to date helped to narrow down the options. SA of these options will helped to determine which options should be consulted on, and also helped to determine which option, or combination of options would be more sustainable.

The Development Strategy for Redditch needed to be altered since the Preferred Draft Core Strategy stage because the RSS development allocations for Redditch Borough were higher than thought. The identified SHLAA sites cannot at that time accommodate all of this, and the capacity of the three ADRs would also not be enough. Because of this there was a need to rethink how Redditch delivered the development requirements a re-draft to the policy was needed. Going through this SA exercise will assess the sustainability of the revised approach. It is also possible to assess some alternative approaches, and following advice in PPS3 and the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy Phase Two Revision Report of the Panel (September 2009) the option of a new settlement in the Borough has been assessed. No other alternative options exist which can be assessed at that time.

ii. SA of development strategy for development within Redditch Borough - updated

For the purpose of assessing the sustainability of the redrafted policy, an SA assessment of all large sites likely to have effects on sustainability need to be assessed. Assessing the sustainability of individual sites is not generally required at this level of plan making however the nature of Redditch circumstances where there are limited development options makes this exercise worthwhile. Following this first assessment of sites, there is an SA assessment helping to filter out other alternatives and the cumulative effects of the implications of the redrafted policy is predicted. These sites include:

- Brockhill Area of Development Restraint;
- Webheath Area of Development Restraint;

- A435 Area of Development Restraint;
- Land to the rear of the Alexandra Hospital;
- Brockhill Green Belt;
- Foxlydiate Green Belt.

These scores have been updated to inform the Preferred Draft Core Strategy redraft for November 2010 consultation, based upon comments received at consultation stage and updated evidence base.

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Brockhill ADR	Webheath ADR	A435 ADR	Land to the Rear of Alex	Brockhill Green Belt	Foxlydiate Green Belt
To manage waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy: reduce, reuse, recycle, compost, recovery, disposal	Will it reduce the production of waste and manage waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy?	Significantly	The achievement of this objective is not affected by scale or location of development. All sites have the potential to contribute to a small extent and the Core Strategy could generally encourage achievement of this objective.						
		To a small extent		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No							
		Unknown							
Reduce causes of and adapt to the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases?	Significantly	The assessment is linked to criteria to reduce the need to travel, where there would be lower emissions from vehicles for shorter journey times and the potential for introducing low carbon technology. Brockhill ADR scores significantly well because it is well located for Redditch Town Centre. Land to the Rear of the Alexandra Hospital, Brockhill Green Belt and Foxlydiate Green Belt is a little further away from the Town Centre but still scores positively. The Webheath ADR an A435 ADR score poorly due to their distance from the town centre. The Core Strategy could generally encourage achievement of this objective.	✓					
		To a small extent					✓	✓	✓
		No			✓	✓			
		Unknown							
		Significantly							

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Brockhill ADR	Webheath ADR	A435 ADR	Land to the Rear of Alex	Brockhill Green Belt	Foxlydiat Green Belt
	Does it promote patterns of spatial development that are adaptable to and suitable for predicted changes in climate?	To a small extent	None of the development sites advocate development at locations which would specifically be affected by climate change. Flood risk, which would have the most significant potential to impact on the development, can be accommodated within open space areas on all of the development options examined.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No							
		Unknown							
To reduce the need to travel and move towards more sustainable travel patterns	Will it reduce the need to travel?	Significantly because of its location	This can be assessed in two ways. The first is if the site is within the urban area, near to a transport interchange, near to multi-modal access or within the Town Centre. The second relates to the potential for new and alternative public transport infrastructure to be provided.						
		Extensively through its transport provision		✓					
		To a small extent because of its location						✓	
		To a small extent through its transport provision			✓	✓	✓		✓
		No							
	Will it provide opportunities to increase sustainable	Yes	This can be assessed in two ways. The first is if the site is within the urban area, near to a transport interchange, near to multi-modal	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Possibly							
		No							

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Brockhill ADR	Webheath ADR	A435 ADR	Land to the Rear of Alex	Brockhill Green Belt	Foxlydiate Green Belt
	modes of travel?	Unknown	access or within the Town Centre. The second relates to the potential for new and alternative public transport infrastructure to be provided. This objective can be achieved on all sites because of a requirement for good accessibility to provision of sustainable modes of transport.						
	Does it focus development in existing centres, and make use of existing infrastructure to reduce the need to travel?	Significantly because it is within or adjacent to an existing centre	This assessment focuses on the requirement to create new communities. Brockhill ADR is assessed as significantly contributing to achieving this objective because of its location adjacent to the urban area and short distance to Redditch Town Centre. The Land to the Rear of the Alexandra Hospital site and Brockhill Green Belt contribute to a small extent because they are fairly near to existing infrastructure. Other sites would not contribute towards this objective therefore significant investment and transport policy need to be applied should these sites come forward.						
		Significantly because it is near existing infrastructure		✓					
		To a small extent because it is fairly near to an existing centre or existing infrastructure					✓	✓	
		No			✓	✓			✓
Develop a knowledge-driven economy, with the appropriate employment land, infrastructure and	Will it contribute towards urban and rural regeneration?	Yes	Contribution to urban and rural regeneration with a focus on a knowledge driven economy is one way of quantifying this.						
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Brockhill ADR	Webheath ADR	A435 ADR	Land to the Rear of Alex	Brockhill Green Belt	Foxydiat Green Belt
skills base whilst ensuring all share the benefits urban and rural									
	Will it provide opportunities for businesses to develop and enhance their competitiveness?	Significantly	This can be assessed by assessing if the sites will provide opportunities for businesses to expand, by contributing to employment use. The only site with no potential to contribute towards employment and hence this objective is the Webheath ADR.						
		To a small extent		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
		Unknown			✓				
	Will it support the shopping hierarchy?	Yes	This can be assessed by determining which sites could include an element of retail where there is a deficiency or where they could increase patronage to local shops. The Brockhill ADR site and Brockhill Green Belt site can contribute a local centre to meet the identified deficiency of retail in North Redditch. All other sites have the potential to achieve this to a small extent.	✓				✓	
		To a small extent			✓	✓	✓		✓
		No							
	Will it help to improve skills levels in the workforce?	Yes	This can be assessed by determining which sites could include measures to contribute towards enhancing workforce skills. None of the sites have the opportunity to achieve this.						
		To a small extent							
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Will it support tourism?	Yes	This can be assessed by determining which sites could include measures to contribute towards supporting tourism. None of the sites have the opportunity to achieve this.						
		To a small extent							
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Unknown							

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Brockhill ADR	Webheath ADR	A435 ADR	Land to the Rear of Alex	Brockhill Green Belt	Foxlydiat Green Belt
Promote and support the development of new technologies, of high value and low impact, especially resource efficient technologies and environmental technology initiatives	Does it encourage innovative and environmentally friendly technologies?	Yes	This can be assessed by determining which of the sites could include development including innovative and environmentally friendly technologies. There is a possibility of achieving this on some sites but this is uncertain on the Webheath and Foxlydiat sites.						
		To a small extent		✓		✓	✓	✓	
		No							
		Unknown			✓				✓
	Does it promote and support the development of new technologies, of high value and low impact?	Yes	This can be assessed by determining which of the sites could include development including new technologies of high value and low impact. There is a possibility of achieving this on some sites but this is uncertain on the Webheath and Foxlydiat sites.						
		To a small extent		✓		✓	✓	✓	
		No							
		Unknown			✓				✓
Protect and improve the quality of water, soil and air and water resources	Will it provide opportunities to improve or maintain water quality/water resource?	Yes	This will be a requirement for all sites to achieve.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		To a small extent							
		No							
		Unknown							
Ensure development does not occur in high-risk flood prone areas and does not adversely contribute to fluvial flood risks or contribute to surface water flooding in all other areas	Does it protect the floodplain from inappropriate development?	Yes - no impacts/not on or near the floodplain	This can be assessed by determining which sites are in/near or have impacts on the floodplain and which include mitigation measures against effects.	✓	✓			✓	✓
		Yes - positive mitigation measures in place				✓	✓		

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Brockhill ADR	Webheath ADR	A435 ADR	Land to the Rear of Alex	Brockhill Green Belt	Foxlydiat Green Belt
		No							
	Does it take account of all types of flooding?	Yes	All sites have been subject to robust SFRA with recommendation for full site specific FRA.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		To a small extent							
		No							
	Does it promote Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems where appropriate?	Yes	Development of SUDS schemes are a key design element of any new residential development and are expected to be employed at a detailed design stage.						
		No							
		Unknown		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres and the quality of, and equitable access to, local services and facilities, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio - economic status or educational attainment	Will proposals enhance the provision of local services and facilities?	Significantly	This can be assessed when determining which sites could include new services and facilities where there is a deficiency.	✓	✓			✓	
		To a small extent							
		No					✓		
		Unknown				✓			✓
	Will it contribute to rural service provision across the Borough?	Significantly	This can be assessed when determining which sites could include new services and facilities where there is a deficiency in the rural areas.						
		To a small extent							
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Unknown							
	Will it enhance accessibility to services by public	Yes	This can be assessed by determining which sites would include measures to enhance accessibility to public transport. The	✓			✓	✓	
		To a small extent			✓	✓			

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Brockhill ADR	Webheath ADR	A435 ADR	Land to the Rear of Alex	Brockhill Green Belt	Foxlydiate Green Belt
	transport?	No	Brockhill sites and Land to the Rear of the Alexandra Hospital have opportunities to achieve this to a significant extent. Other sites could achieve this objective to a small extent.						
		Unknown							✓
Safeguard and strengthen landscape and townscape character and quality	Will it safeguard and strengthen landscape and townscape character and quality?	Yes	The impact on landscape, townscape and the current urban form is a key consideration for any of the sites. All sites would necessitate development into medium and high sensitivity to changes in the landscape.						
		To a small extent							
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Unknown							
To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Will it help to safeguard the Borough's biodiversity and geodiversity?	Yes - not related to sites of biodiversity or geodiversity interest	The avoidance of areas of high quality natural habitats will maximise the potential for sites of nature importance to be retained. All sites have the potential to mitigate against negative effects and the opportunity to enhance biodiversity and geodiversity.						
		To a small extent - mitigation measures in place		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No							
		Unknown							
	Will it protect sites and habitats designated for nature conservation?	Yes - not related to sites designated for nature conservation	This can be assessed by determining which sites are related to designated sites and if sites have the opportunities to conserve and enhance sites for nature conservation.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Brockhill ADR	Webheath ADR	A435 ADR	Land to the Rear of Alex	Brockhill Green Belt	Foxlydiate Green Belt
		To a small extent - mitigation measures in place							
		No							
		Unknown							
	Will it help to achieve targets set out in the Biodiversity and Geodiversity Action Plans?	Yes	This can only be assessed if it is known what measures to ensure targets in the Worcestershire and Redditch BAP are to be implemented as part of any development scheme.						
		No							
		Unknown		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
To improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health	Will it improve access to health facilities across the Borough?	Yes - it is close to a health facility	This can only be assessed if the site has the opportunity to improve access to health facilities. Access to health facilities is generally poor for all sites and there are no known commitments from developers of the sites to improve this.						
		Yes - mitigation measures in place							
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Unknown							
	Will it promote healthier lifestyles?	Significantly	All sites will promote healthier lifestyles to a small extent because provision for open space will be required of all development sites.						
		To a small extent		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No							
		Unknown							
	Does it mitigate against noise	Yes	The effects of noise pollution varies between the sites and the measures						
		No							

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Brockhill ADR	Webheath ADR	A435 ADR	Land to the Rear of Alex	Brockhill Green Belt	Foxlydiat Green Belt
	pollution?	Unknown	needed will be unknown until planning applications are received. However particular measures will be needed where residential development could be located close to areas with existing high levels of noise, e.g. Brockhill ADR, Foxlydiat Green Belt, and A435 ADR.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Does it mitigate against light pollution?	Yes	Any extensions to the urban area will exacerbate light pollution issues. Mitigation measures would need to be considered at detailed design stage.						
		No							
		Unknown		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Provide decent affordable housing for all, of all the right quality and tenure for local needs, in clean, safe and pleasant local environments	Will it provide opportunities to increase affordable housing levels within urban and rural areas of the Borough?	Yes	The provision of affordable housing will be improved through the development of any of the sites considered.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No - residential development may not be appropriate for this site							
		No - there is no affordable housing provision							
		Unknown							
	Will it provide affordable housing access to a range of housing tenures and sizes?	Yes	The provision of affordable housing will be improved through the development of any of the sites considered. There are fewer competing costs elements such as contaminations or mitigation measures to overcome in bringing any of the large sites forward.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No - residential development may not be appropriate for this site							

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Brockhill ADR	Webheath ADR	A435 ADR	Land to the Rear of Alex	Brockhill Green Belt	Foxlydiat Green Belt
		No - there is no affordable housing access to a range of housing tenures and sizes							
		Unknown							
	Does it seek to provide high quality, well-designed residential environments?	Yes	Development at all of the sites would offer an opportunity to deliver a high quality, well designed residential environment.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No - residential development may not be appropriate for this site							
		No - high quality/well designed environment not to be incorporated							
		Unknown							
To raise the skills levels and qualifications of the workforce	Will it provide opportunities to further develop educational and attainment facilities within the Borough?	Yes	This can only be achieved if any of the sites had the opportunity to deliver educational facilities. None of the sites have the opportunity to achieve this.						
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Unknown							

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Brockhill ADR	Webheath ADR	A435 ADR	Land to the Rear of Alex	Brockhill Green Belt	Foxlydiate Green Belt
Reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour	Does it promote mixed development that encourages natural surveillance?	Yes - mixed use development and demonstrable natural surveillance	All relevant standards for designing out crime would be introduced as part of all proposals for residential development.						
		To a small extent - mixed use development		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No							
		Unknown							
Conserve and enhance the architectural, cultural and archaeological heritage and seek well-designed, resource efficient, high quality built environment in new development proposals	Does it provide opportunities for sustainable construction?	Yes	This can only be assessed at a detailed stage although sustainable construction techniques will be implemented as part of any development scheme.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No							
		Unknown							
	Will it enhance the Borough's Conservation Areas?	Site not in or adjoining Conservation Area	Conservation areas will not be affected by development on any of the sites.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Brockhill ADR	Webheath ADR	A435 ADR	Land to the Rear of Alex	Brockhill Green Belt	Foxlydiate Green Belt
		Adverse effect on Conservation Area							
		Improve or no affect							
		Unknown							
	Will it help safeguard the Borough's Listed Buildings?	Site not listed or adjacent to listed building(s)	Listed Buildings will not be affected by development on any of the sites with the exception of Brockhill ADR and Webheath ADR where listed buildings are on site which have the potential to be improved.			✓	✓	✓	✓
		Adverse effect on Listed Building(s)							
		Improve or no effect		✓	✓				
		Unknown							
	Does it improve the quality of the built environment?	Yes	The introduction of modern well design residential environments constructed to the latest code for sustainable homes standards offers the opportunity to ensure the best quality designs are employed.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No							
Ensure efficient use of land through safeguarding of mineral reserves, the best and most versatile agricultural lands, land of Green	Will it safeguard the Borough's mineral resources?	Yes	None of the sites would have an impact on mineral resources.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No							

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Brockhill ADR	Webheath ADR	A435 ADR	Land to the Rear of Alex	Brockhill Green Belt	Foxlydiate Green Belt
Belt value, maximising use of previously developed land and reuse of vacant buildings, where this is not detrimental to open space and biodiversity interest									
	Will it maximise the use of Previously Developed Land?	Yes - It is on PDL and at high density or mixed uses	None of the sites are located on Previously Developed Land.						
		To a small extent - it is on PDL							
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Will it protect the Borough's open spaces of recreational and amenity value?	Yes	None of the sites are on designated open space with the exception of the access to the Brockhill ADR. The Brockhill development would need to compensate for the loss of this open space as part of the rest of the development.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No							
	Will it preserve the openness of the Green Belt?	Not on/adjacent to Green Belt land	The three ADR sites can come forward in accordance with PPG2. The land to the rear of the Alexandra Hospital is adjacent to Green Belt in neighbouring Stratford District but there are no identified effects.						
		Yes - compliant with PPG2		✓	✓	✓	✓		

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Brockhill ADR	Webheath ADR	A435 ADR	Land to the Rear of Alex	Brockhill Green Belt	Foxlydiat Green Belt
		No - there would be harm to Green Belt land						✓	✓
	Will it help to protect the Borough's agricultural land from adverse developments?	Yes - not on agricultural land	There will be no loss of agricultural land on any of the ADR sites as they are no currently in agricultural use. The Foxlydiat Green Belt and Brockhill Green Belt sites have an effect because there would be a loss of agricultural land. There are no opportunities suggested by the developers of these sites to mitigate against the negative impact.	✓	✓	✓	✓		
		To a small extent - on agricultural land with mitigation measures in place							
		No - there would be harm to agricultural land						✓	✓
Promote resource efficiency and energy generated from renewable energy and low carbon sources	Will it encourage opportunities for the production of renewable and low carbon energy?	Yes – significant opportunity	This can be achieved on all sites.						
		Yes – Potential opportunity		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No							
	Will it promote greater energy efficiency?	Yes	This can be achieved on all sites although the actual effects will not be known until details in site masterplans are developed or planning permission is sought.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No							
		Unknown							
	Will it encourage opportunities to	Yes	This can only be assessed if it is known whether each option will incorporate						
		No							

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Brockhill ADR	Webheath ADR	A435 ADR	Land to the Rear of Alex	Brockhill Green Belt	Foxlydiate Green Belt
	achieve energy efficiency measures above the minimum standard, as defined by the Code for Sustainable Homes?	Unknown	measures to achieve above the minimum standard, as defined by the Code for Sustainable Homes. The Core Strategy should insure minimum standards of the Code for Sustainable Homes to be met, but the site specific opportunities have not been demonstrated by the developers of the sites.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

SA of Alternative Options

There are some alternatives to the re-drafted policy option to be assessed which have been developed into options to be assessed below. Three new Options have been added to this list of alternatives in light of the forthcoming 'localism' agenda and because of the implications of Local Authorities being able to determine their own levels of development.

- **Option 1** - To extend the Webheath Area of Development Restraint into the southwest Green Belt (including some element of cross boundary development).
- **Option 2** - To develop a brand new settlement in the southwest Green Belt to accommodate all of Redditch's development needs.
- **Option 3** - Extend the existing settlements (Astwood Bank and/or Feckenham) into the Green Belt to accommodate all of Redditch's development needs.
- **Option 4** - Develop all of the available open space within the Borough to accommodate all of Redditch's development needs.
- **NEW Option 5** - No cross boundary development (loss of 3000 dwellings and Xha Employment Land to meet Redditch's needs) and no replacement development within Redditch.
- **NEW Option 6** - No cross boundary development but to extend the Webheath Area of Development Restraint into the southwest Green Belt to accommodate all of Redditch's development needs.
- **NEW Option 7** - Continue to progress cross-boundary development in line with the RSS Panel Report recommendations

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
To manage waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy: reduce, reuse, recycle, compost, recovery, disposal	Will it reduce the production of waste and manage waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy?	Significantly	This is not affected by scale or location of development. This could be assessed by identifying if there are any constraints to achieving this growth strategy in terms of collection of household recycling waste or industrial or commercial waste. Infrastructure consultation with the Council waste department confirms that there are no know waste collection issues and no issues with recycling facilities being provided.							
		To a small extent		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No								
		Unknown								
Reduce causes of and adapt to the impacts of climate change	Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases?	Significantly	The assessment is linked to criteria to reduce the need to travel, where there would be lower emissions from vehicles for shorter journey times and the potential for introducing low carbon technology, as well as other potential effects on greenhouse gas emissions. Option 1 to extend Webheath ADR and Option 6 and Option 7 would involve potential increases in emissions because of the scale of development. Option 7 to a lesser extent because of proximity to town centre and sustainable							
		To a small extent								
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Unknown								

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
			<p>transport modes. Option 2 of a new settlement in Redditch would involve a more pronounced negative effect because it is a slightly greater distance from the urban area and because of the scale of development. Option 3 of extending rural settlements would have the same very negative effect on this objective again because of distance and scale of development. Option 4 of developing on open space would perform better because of potential links to sustainable transport but developing Redditch's open spaces would have a higher negative impact on greenhouse gas emissions as well as the negative impact from the scale of development. Option 5 would involve less land take and potentially more opportunities for access to sustainable transport but would still not achieve a positive effect without mitigation measures to actually reduce emissions.</p> <p>Option 6 would have a very negative effect on the objective</p>							

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
			because of travel distances and emissions effects.							
	Does it promote patterns of spatial development that are adaptable to and for predicted changes in climate?	Significantly	Is the growth option allowing for accessibility to more sustainable forms of transport, for example, near to Transport Interchanges and bus routes? All options would not achieve this objective because of the potential distances from sustainable transport and climate change effects.							
		To a small extent								
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Unknown								
	Will it provide opportunities to increase sustainable modes of travel?	Yes	This can be assessed in two ways. The first is if the growth option is within the urban area,							✓
		Possibly					✓		✓	
		No		✓	✓	✓				

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
		Unknown	<p>near to a transport interchange, near to multi-modal access etc. The second relates to the potential for new and alternative public transport infrastructure to be provided. Options 1, 2, 3, and 6 would involve costly, possibly prohibitive infrastructure. Option 4 has more opportunity to increase usage of sustainable modes of travel because of the focus in the urban area. It is not clear what effect Option 5 would have on achieving this objective because patronage would not be increasing and no large scale opportunities would be available to achieve the objective. Developers of cross boundary sites associated with Option 7 have demonstrated that this objective could be achieved by implementing various sites.</p>					✓		
	Does it focus development in existing centres, and make use of existing infrastructure to reduce the need to travel?	Significantly because it is within or adjacent to an existing centre	This can be assessed by understanding the relationships of the growth option existing centres. None of the growth							

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
		Significantly because it is near existing infrastructure	options has the potential to achieve this objective.							
		To a small extent because it is fairly near to an existing centre or existing infrastructure								
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Will it provide opportunities for businesses to develop and enhance their competitiveness?	Significantly	This can be assessed by assessing if the growth option will provide opportunities for businesses to expand, by contributing to employment use. All options would be capable of achieving this to some extent. Option 5 would have less of a positive effect on this because employment land availability would be less.	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
		To a small extent						✓		
		Unknown								
	Will it support the shopping hierarchy?	Yes	This can be assessed by determining if growth options							
		To a small extent		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
		No	could include an element of retail where there is a deficiency or where they could increase patronage to local shops. All options have the opportunity to include retail to a small extent. It is not clear if this would support the shopping hierarchy because of the retail being outside of a defined centre in the retail hierarchy. Patronage to local shops would not be achieved with Option 1, 2, 5, 6 and 7 to the same extent as options 3 and 4. Option 7 has the added opportunity to provide for retail needs in North Redditch, where an identified deficiency exists.							
	Will it help to improve skills levels in the workforce?	Yes	This can be assessed by determining which of the growth options could include measures to contribute towards enhancing workforce skills. None of the options have the specific opportunity to achieve this however this could change as options are progressed.							
		To a small extent								
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Will it support tourism?	Yes	This can be assessed by determining which of the growth options could include measures to							
		To a small extent								
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
		Unknown	contribute towards supporting tourism. None of the sites have the specific opportunities to achieve this however this could change as options are progressed. Option 4 and Option 7 have greater opportunities to achieve this objective than other options because of potential links to existing tourist attractions at Arrow Valley Countryside Centre, Abbey Stadium, Redditch Town Centre, Bordesley Abbey and Forge Mill Needle Museum.							
Promote and support the development of new technologies, of high value and low impact, especially resource efficient technologies and environmental technology initiatives	Does it encourage innovative and environmentally friendly technologies?	Yes	This can be assessed by determining which of the growth options could include development including innovative and environmentally friendly technologies. This can be achieved at most growth options, but to a lesser extent with Option 4 and Option 5 as the available open spaces in the urban area are more constrained in terms of their size and location.	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
		To a small extent					✓	✓		
		No								
		Unknown								
	Does it promote and support the development of new technologies, of high	Yes	This can be assessed by determining which of the growth options could include	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
		To a small extent					✓	✓		
		No								

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
	value and low impact?	Unknown	development including new technologies of high value and low impact. This can be achieved at most growth options, but to a lesser extent with Option 4 and Option 5 as the available open spaces in the urban area are more constrained in terms of their size and location.							
Protect and improve the quality of water, soil and air and water resources	Will it provide opportunities to improve or maintain water quality/water resource?	Yes	This will be a requirement for all growth options to achieve.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		To a small extent								
		No								
		Unknown								
Ensure development does not occur in high-risk flood prone areas and does not adversely contribute to fluvial flood risks or contribute to surface water flooding in all other areas	Does it protect the floodplain from inappropriate development?	Yes - no impacts/not on or near the floodplain	This can be assessed by determining which growth options are potentially within/near or have impacts on the floodplain and which include mitigation measures against effects. Options 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 would all potentially be unable to achieve this objective. Options 5 and 6 have opportunities to achieve this objective with mitigation measures or availability and deliverability of unconstrained sites from a flood risk perspective.							✓
		Yes - positive mitigation measures in place						✓		✓
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
	Does it take account of all types of flooding?	Yes	All growth options would include sites where a full site specific	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		To a small extent								

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
		No	FRA would be required which would ensure that this objective is achieved.							
	Does it promote Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems where appropriate?	Yes	Development of SUDS schemes are a key design element of any new residential development and are expected to be employed at a detailed design stage which would ensure that this objective is achieved.							
		No								
		Unknown		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
To improve the vitality and viability of Town and District Centres and the quality of, and equitable access to, local services and facilities, regardless of age, gender, ethnicity, disability, socio - economic status or educational attainment	Will proposals enhance the provision of local services and facilities?	Significantly	Inclusion of new services and facilities is uncertain until growth options are progressed at a detailed design stage. It is known that facilities requiring enhancement are generally located at North Redditch so Option 7 is more likely to achieve this objective than other options.							
		To a small extent								
		No								
		Unknown		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Will it contribute to rural service provision across the Borough?	Significantly	This can be assessed by understanding the relationship between the growth option and							
		To a small extent			✓	✓				
		No		✓			✓	✓	✓	✓

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
		Unknown	potential opportunity to develop additional services or contribute to enhancing the provision of services in Astwood Bank/Feckenham. Only Option 2 and Option 3 have the possibility of potentially achieving this objective if the growth option was well placed to link to these settlements.							
	Will it enhance accessibility to services by public transport?	Yes	This can be determined by assessing how accessible the growth option locations would be							
		To a small extent					✓	✓		✓
		No		✓	✓	✓			✓	

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
		Unknown	to public transport and if they are capable of creating/sustaining new provision and access to provision. Option 1, 2, 3, and 6 would not achieve this objective because of their remoteness from existing public transport and no confirmation from developers that the objective can be achieved. Option 4 could potentially achieve this because of the locations throughout Redditch's urban area. Option 5 could also potentially achieve this to a small extent. Option 7 could achieve this to a small extent because there is confirmation from developers that the objective can be achieved and because of the distance and accessibility to Redditch Town Centre.							
Safeguard and strengthen landscape and townscape character and quality	Will it safeguard and strengthen landscape and townscape character and quality?	Yes	The impact on landscape, townscape and the current urban form is a key consideration for any of the growth options. All of the growth options with the exception of Option 5 would involve greenfield development to expand Redditch's urban area into locations with high to medium							
		To a small extent						✓		
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
		Unknown								

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
			sensitivity to landscape change, so these would not achieve this objective. Option 4 would involve open space development, but open space is an integral part of the town's structure and landscape, which would be damaged if this option is progressed. Option 5 could achieve this to a small extent.							
To conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	Will it help to safeguard the Borough's biodiversity and geodiversity?	Yes - not related to sites of biodiversity or geodiversity interest	This is a requirement of all growth options. Some Options have the potential to have effects on biodiversity and geodiversity, for example in areas where there is generally a concentration of SWS, SSSI, LNR etc, and measures would need to be in place to avoid these effects and enhance biodiversity generally. Options 1,					✓		✓
		To a small extent - mitigation measures in place		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
		No								

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
		Unknown	2, 3, 4 and 6 would involve growth options in locations with a concentration of biodiversity assets so potential to achieve this objective is needed and is potentially possible. Option 6 would not involve an impact on biodiversity or geodiversity. Option 7 has the potential to include sites with no impact on biodiversity and geodiversity.							
	Will it protect sites and habitats designated for nature conservation?	Yes - not related to sites designated for nature conservation	Some of the growth options could offer the potential for introducing ecologically diverse and high quality features. This is a requirement of all growth options. Some Options have the potential to have effects on sites and habitats designated for nature conservation. Options 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 would involve growth options in locations with a concentration of sites and habitats for nature conservation. Option 6 would not involve an impact on sites and habitats designated for nature conservation. Option 7 has the potential to include sites with no impact on sites and habitats for					✓		✓
		To a small extent - mitigation measures in place		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
		No								
		Unknown								

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
			nature conservation.							
	Will it help to achieve targets set out in the Biodiversity and Geodiversity Action Plans?	Yes	This can only be assessed if it is known what measures to ensure targets in the Worcestershire and Redditch BAP are to be implemented as part of growth options. Because the options are not site specific, the achievement of this objective is unknown.							
		No								
		Unknown		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
To improve the health and well-being of the population and reduce inequalities in health	Will it improve access to health facilities across the Borough?	Yes - it is close to a health facility	This can be assessed by determining if the growth option has opportunities to include health related facilities within the development or whether it will enhance health facilities in some way. Options 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7 may require some health facility to be provided but there is no confirmation from developers that this objective can be achieved. Option 4 would involve development within Redditch urban area which has some locations which are accessible for health facilities but other open							
		Yes - mitigation measures in place								
		No								
		Unknown		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
			space sites have poor access so it is unknown if this objective can be achieved. Option 5 would involve less development so would create less demand for new health facilities but it is unclear where or how existing deficiencies would be addressed so it is unclear how this objective would be achieved.							
	Will it promote healthier lifestyles?	Significantly	This can be assessed by determining if there are opportunities to encourage healthier lifestyles such as accessibility to relevant leisure facilities, open space provision etc. With the exception of Option 4 all of the options have opportunities to incorporate relevant Green Infrastructure to enable achievement of this objective. Option 4 would involve significant loss of Redditch's open space and would have a detrimental effect on the achievement of this objective.							
		To a small extent		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
		No					✓			
		Unknown								
	Does it mitigate against noise pollution?	Yes	Any increase in the number of dwellings and employment land	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No								

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
		Unknown	from the existing baseline will exacerbate noise pollution issues. Mitigation measures would need to be considered at detailed design stage so all options would achieve this objective.							
	Does it mitigate against light pollution?	Yes	Any increase in the number of dwellings and employment land will exacerbate light pollution issues. Mitigation measures would need to be considered at detailed design stage so all options would achieve this objective.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No								
		Unknown								
Provide decent affordable housing for all, of all the right quality and tenure for local needs, in clean, safe and pleasant local environments	Will it provide opportunities to increase affordable housing levels within urban and rural areas of the Borough?	Yes	The provision of affordable housing will be improved through the development of any of the options.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No - residential development may not be appropriate for this site								
		No - there is no affordable housing provision								
		Unknown								
	Will it provide affordable housing access to a range of housing tenures and sizes?	Yes	The provision of affordable housing including the provision of a range of housing tenures and sizes will be improved through the development of any of the options.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No - residential development may not be appropriate for this site								

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
		No - there is no affordable housing access to a range of housing tenures and sizes								
		Unknown								
	Does it seek to provide high quality, well-designed residential environments?	Yes	Development at all of the options offers an opportunity to achieve this objective however the details about the extent of this are not clear for these options. Option 4 by developing on Redditch's open spaces would damage the quality of existing residential areas so would not achieve this objective.							
		No - residential development may not be appropriate for this site								
		No - high quality/well designed environment not to be incorporated					✓			
		Unknown		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
To raise the skills levels and	Will it provide opportunities to further develop	Yes	This can be assessed if it can be determined whether the options							
		No		✓				✓		

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
qualifications of the workforce	educational and attainment facilities within the Borough?	Unknown	can provide educational facilities where it is needed. Option 1 and Option 5 would not require an enhancement as there would be sufficient capacity for educational facilities but would not directly achieve further achievement of this objective. All other options would achieve the objective to some extent because provision of facilities would be required but no confirmation on their delivery.		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Reduce crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour	Does it promote mixed development that encourages natural surveillance?	Yes - mixed use development and demonstrable natural surveillance	All relevant standards for designing out crime would be introduced as part of proposals within all development options however the details of the implementation of this is unclear. All options could include an element of a mix of uses.							
		To a small extent - mixed use development		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No								
		Unknown								
Conserve and enhance the architectural,	Does it provide opportunities for sustainable construction?	Yes	Sustainable construction techniques will be implemented as part of any development	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No								

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
cultural and archaeological heritage and seek well-designed, resource efficient, high quality built environment in new development proposals		Unknown	scheme within any of the options.							
	Will it enhance the Borough's Conservation Areas?	Site not in or adjoining Conservation Area	Conversation areas will not be affected either positively or negatively by development within Options 1, 4, 5, 6 or 7. Option 3 would potentially negatively affect Feckenham conservation area and its setting. Option 2 may have an effect on Feckenham conservation area to a lesser extent but unless detailed site boundary and impacts of development put forward are established, the effects are unknown.	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓
		Adverse effect on Conservation Area				✓				
		Improve or no affect								
		Unknown			✓					
	Will it help safeguard the Borough's Listed Buildings?	Site not listed or adjacent to listed building(s)	All of the options are in locations where there are existing listed buildings. The extent of the impact on the listed buildings is not fully known until a detailed planning application is submitted but all adverse effects can be							
		Adverse effect on Listed Building(s)								
		Improve or no effect		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
		Unknown	avoided.							
	Does it improve the quality of the built environment?	Yes	Development at all of the options offers an opportunity to achieve this objective however the details about the extent of this are not clear for these options. Option 4 by developing on Redditch's open spaces would damage the quality of the built environment so would not achieve this objective.	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
		No					✓			
Ensure efficient use of land through safeguarding of mineral reserves, the best and most versatile agricultural lands, land of Green Belt value, maximising use of previously developed land and reuse of vacant buildings, where this is not detrimental to open space and biodiversity interest	Will it safeguard the Borough's mineral resources?	Yes	This can be assessed if it is known whether there are mineral reserves to be safeguarded, if efficiencies can be achieved by higher densities, if higher quality agricultural land is vulnerable, if vacant buildings can be brought back into use and where open space isn't compromised. None of the options would compromise achievement of this objective.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No								
	Will it maximise the use of Previously Developed Land?	Yes - It is on PDL and at high density or mixed uses	This can be assessed if it is known whether there are mineral reserves to be safeguarded, if							

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
		To a small extent - it is on PDL	efficiencies can be achieved by higher densities, if higher quality agricultural land is vulnerable, if vacant buildings can be brought back into use and where open space isn't compromised. None of the options can achieve this because none are PDL.							
		No		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Will it protect the Borough's open spaces of recreational and amenity value?	Yes	This can be assessed if it is known whether there are mineral reserves to be safeguarded, if efficiencies can be achieved by higher densities, if higher quality agricultural land is vulnerable, if vacant buildings can be brought back into use and where open space isn't compromised. Option 4 would involve significant development on open spaces and would not achieve this objective.	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
		No					✓			
	Will it preserve the openness of the Green Belt?	Not on/adjacent to Green Belt land	This can be assessed if it is known whether there are mineral reserves to be safeguarded, if efficiencies can be achieved by higher densities, if higher quality agricultural land is vulnerable, if vacant buildings can be brought back into use and where open space isn't compromised. All options involving green belt land				✓			
		Yes - compliant with PPG2								
		No - there would be harm to Green Belt land		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
			would need to be progressed in line with PPG2 Green Belts.							
	Will it help to protect the Borough's agricultural land from adverse developments?	Yes - not on agricultural land	This can be assessed if it is known whether there are mineral reserves to be safeguarded, if efficiencies can be achieved by higher densities, if higher quality agricultural land is vulnerable, if vacant buildings can be brought back into use and where open space isn't compromised. There will be a loss of agricultural land for all development options pursued.				✓	✓		
		To a small extent - on agricultural land with mitigation measures in place								
		No - there would be harm to agricultural land		✓	✓	✓			✓	✓
Promote resource efficiency and energy generated from renewable energy and low carbon sources	Will it encourage opportunities for the production of renewable and low carbon energy?	Yes – significant opportunity	This can be assessed if it is known whether the option would encourage the production of renewable and low carbon energy. All options could achieve this to some extent although details will only be known at planning application stage.							
		Yes – potential opportunity		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No								
	Will it promote greater energy efficiency?	Yes	This can be assessed if it is known to what extent energy efficiency will be promoted. All options could achieve this to some extent although details will only be known at planning application stage.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		No								
		Unknown								
		Yes								

SA Objectives	Decision Making Criteria	Assessment Criteria	Comments	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6	Option 7
	Will it encourage opportunities to achieve energy efficiency measures above the minimum standard, as defined by the Code for Sustainable Homes?	No	This can only be assessed if it is known whether each option will incorporate measures to achieve above the minimum standard, as defined by the Code for Sustainable Homes. The details of this would be unknown until detailed planning application stage.							
		Unknown		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓