

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council's LDF Draft Core Strategy

Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) Non-Technical Summary

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Purpose of this Report	2
1.2	Timeline	2
1.3	Purpose and Objectives of the Core Strategy	2
1.4	Structure of the Core Strategy	2
2	IIA Methodology	2
2.1	Overall Approach	2
2.2	Limitations and Uncertainties	2
3	Legislative and Planning Context	2
3.1	Requirement and Scope	2
3.2	Summary of the Review	2
4	Assessment of Alternatives	2
4.1	Policy Alternatives	2
4.2	Urban Extension Options	2
5	Economy and Employment Assessment Summary	2
6	Transport Assessment Summary	2
7	Education and Skills Assessment Summary	2
8	Health and Well-Being Assessment Summary	2
9	Biodiversity Assessment Summary	2
10	Pollution and Emissions Assessment Summary	2
11	Flood Risk Assessment Summary	2
12	Natural Resources Assessment Summary	2
13	Townscape Assessment Summary	2
14	Soil, Land Use and Geology Assessment Summary	2
15	Housing Assessment Summary	2
16	Landscape Assessment Summary	2
17	Historic Environment Assessment Summary	2
18	Accessibility / Community Facilities Assessment Summary	2
19	Population and Equality Assessment Summary	2
20	Conclusions and Supporting Detail	2

20.1	Summary of Mitigation Recommendations	2
20.2	Summary of Monitoring Recommendations	2
20.3	Next Steps	2
	Appendix A Abbreviations	2

Jacobs Engineering U.K. Limited

This document has been prepared by a division, subsidiary or affiliate of *Jacobs Engineering U.K. Limited* ("Jacobs") in its professional capacity as consultants in accordance with the terms and conditions of Jacobs' contract with the commissioning party (the "Client"). Regard should be had to those terms and conditions when considering and/or placing any reliance on this document. No part of this document may be copied or reproduced by any means without prior written permission from Jacobs. If you have received this document in error, please destroy all copies in your possession or control and notify Jacobs.

Any advice, opinions, or recommendations within this document (a) should be read and relied upon only in the context of the document as a whole; (b) do not, in any way, purport to include any manner of legal advice or opinion; (c) are based upon the information made available to Jacobs at the date of this document and on current UK standards, codes, technology and construction practices as at the date of this document. It should be noted and it is expressly stated that no independent verification of any of the documents or information supplied to Jacobs has been made. No liability is accepted by Jacobs for any use of this document, other than for the purposes for which it was originally prepared and provided. Following final delivery of this document to the Client, Jacobs will have no further obligations or duty to advise the Client on any matters, including development affecting the information or advice provided in this document.

This document has been prepared for the exclusive use of the Client and unless otherwise agreed in writing by Jacobs, no other party may use, make use of or rely on the contents of this document. Should the Client wish to release this document to a third party, Jacobs may, at its discretion, agree to such release provided that (a) Jacobs' written agreement is obtained prior to such release; and (b) by release of the document to the third party, that third party does not acquire any rights, contractual or otherwise, whatsoever against Jacobs and Jacobs, accordingly, assume no duties, liabilities or obligations to that third party; and (c) Jacobs accepts no responsibility for any loss or damage incurred by the Client or for any conflict of Jacobs' interests arising out of the Client's release of this document to the third party.

1.1 Purpose of this Report

This document is a Non-Technical Summary of the findings of the **Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA)** of the Rotherham Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD). Jacobs is conducting four assessments in order to inform the development of the Core Strategy. These are:

- **Sustainability Appraisal (SA) / Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)** – assesses impacts of the Core Strategy across a range of environmental, social and socio-economic issues;
- **Health Impact Assessment (HIA)** – assesses impact of the Core Strategy on the health and well-being of the population and ability to access health-related facilities and services. This also, addresses equalities issues and thus has some overlap with an Equalities Impact Assessment;
- **Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA)** – assesses the impact of the Core Strategy on equalities issues, in particular disadvantaged or excluded groups of people. EqIA helps identify where we can best promote equality of opportunity; and
- **Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening** – assess the potential for the Core Strategy to significantly affect a European nature conservation site, and determine the need for a full Appropriate Assessment.

This report will assist anyone participating in the consultation on the Core Strategy.

1.2 Timeline

The SA scoping stage was initially completed in March 2006, after statutory consultation. It determined the scope of the assessment, as well as the background information – the social, economic and environmental baseline – used to inform the assessment.

The SA Scoping Report was updated in January and February 2011 in order to consult on a more current baseline situation and context review, including new and updated information since 2006. Consultation with the statutory consultees ended on 30th March 2011. Changes were made as a result of comments received, and the Scoping Report re-published in summer 2011.

The assessment of Core Strategy Strategic Options, high-level Policy Directions and initial draft Objectives was completed in January 2007, and was summarised in an SA report entitled ‘Rotherham Borough Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report’. These assessment results and the results of consultation in 2007 were then fed back into the development of the DPD, and policies were developed (as found in the current 2011 Core Strategy document).

Additional options as presented in the May 2009 ‘Core Strategy Revised Options’ report were assessed, and the results reported in the report of the same month, ‘Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of Core Strategy Revised Options’. This assessment was focused on Options for Growth, Rotherham Town Centre Spatial Options and

Urban Extension Options. Again, these assessment results and the results of the 2009 consultation were fed back into the further development of the Core Strategy.

We have produced this IIA Report in February, March and April 2011. This document also serves as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) 'environmental report' as required under the SEA Regulations¹.

1.3 Purpose and Objectives of the Core Strategy

The Rotherham Local Development Framework (LDF) serves to guide the way in which built development occurs in the borough, with regard to its relationship with communities and the surrounding environment. The Core Strategy is the central document of the LDF. The Core Strategy sets out the vision and objectives for development in the borough, and includes those policies which are needed to achieve the vision and objectives as sustainably as possible.

Future plans will set out further detail on the implementation of the LDF. Rotherham's DPDs will include a Sites and Policies DPD as well as a Proposals Map. Other key strategies and plans for development include the South Yorkshire / Sheffield City Region LTP (the LTP3 is currently at the consultation stage), and the Barnsley, Rotherham and Doncaster Joint Waste Plan.

The Core Strategy is underpinned by a Vision and Strategic Objectives. These are:

VISION:

Rotherham will provide a high quality of life and sense of place. It will be prosperous, with a vibrant, diverse, innovative and enterprising economy and have the best in architecture, urban design and public spaces. Regeneration of the Town Centre will offer urban living and a new civic focus. Rotherham will promote biodiversity and a high quality environment where neighbourhoods are safe, clean, green and well maintained, with good quality homes and accessible local facilities and services. It will aspire to minimise inequalities and create strong, cohesive and sustainable communities.

OBJECTIVES:

Objective 1: Scale of future growth: By the end of the plan period, sufficient new homes and employment opportunities and a choice of development sites will have been provided to meet the borough's projected needs against locally-derived targets for house building and provision of employment land.

Objective 2: Green Belt: In implementing the plan's spatial strategy over the plan period, the wider aims of national Green Belt policy will have been safeguarded while a Borough-wide review will have informed the phased release of limited areas of Green Belt land in the most sustainable locations for growth to meet future needs.

Objective 3: Sustainable locations: By the end of the plan period, the majority of new development will have been located in sustainable urban locations, close to transport interchanges and within transport corridors. Wherever viable and most sustainable, previously developed land will have been used first. Car dependency and the need to travel will have been reduced by the promotion of higher housing

¹ Formal title: *The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004*

densities and mixed use developments in appropriate locations, travel planning and public transport improvements.

Objective 4: Retail and service centres: By the end of the plan period, the plan's "town centre first" approach to development decisions will have improved the economic viability and vibrancy of Rotherham Town Centre as the borough's principal location for business, commerce, culture, leisure and civic activities. The plan will have supported the aim of providing a community stadium as close to Rotherham town centre as possible. The implementation of a retail and settlement hierarchy will have steered new development to appropriate centres to sustain and, where appropriate, extend retail, leisure, employment and community services. Smaller local centres will have been sustained to continue provision for local daily needs.

Objective 5: Landscape and settlement identity: Implementation of the plan's policies over the plan period will have helped promote the continuing management, protection and enhancement of the borough's distinctive historical features and landscape character. While allowing for growth of certain settlements to implement the plan's spatial strategy, wherever possible, the identity and setting of individual settlements will have been maintained and enhanced.

Objective 6: Design: By the end of the plan period, new development built to sustainable design standards will have contributed to the creation of safe, accessible, and well managed places, buildings and public spaces. The design of new development will have contributed to and enhanced the distinctive townscape and character of heritage features within communities.

Objective 7: Provision for housing: By the end of the plan period, implementation of the plan's policies will have helped improve the housing stock in areas of low housing demand. Development of new housing will have provided a wide choice of type, tenure and affordability, including provision for gypsies and travellers. Any established need for affordable housing in specific rural communities will have been met.

Objective 8: Provision for employment: By the end of the plan period, the borough's economy will be more modern, diverse and enterprising and will have moved closer to a low-carbon economy. Implementation of the plan's policies will have helped provide a wide range of accessible job opportunities in the borough. The regeneration and improvement of existing employment sites will have been complemented by the creation of local and rural employment opportunities.

Objective 9: Local transport connections: By the end of the plan period, the proportion of trips made by walking and cycling will have increased. Public transport interchanges and bus services between local communities will have been improved. Implementation of the plan's policies will have helped to secure improved information technology networks to enable increased "teleworking", along with the development of live/work housing and mixed use schemes in appropriate locations.

Objective 10: Greenspaces, sport and recreation: By the end of the plan period, the borough's network of green infrastructure will have been identified, protected and enhanced. Implementation of the plan's policies will have protected and enhanced the borough's network of accessible sport and recreation facilities and helped improve the health of Rotherham's population.

Objective 11: Community well-being: By the end of the plan period, implementation of the plan's policies will have helped to reduce crime levels and minimise the potential results of terrorist activity by improving the design of new

development. The potential risk to nearby populations from hazardous installations will have been minimised by the designation and enforcement of appropriate stand off zones. Decisions on the location and type of development will have helped to reduce pollution levels in the borough's air, land and water and will have taken account of the borough's legacy of former coal mining activity.

Objective 12: Biodiversity/ geodiversity: By the end of the plan period, the borough's significant biodiversity and geodiversity sites will have been identified, designated, protected and enhanced. The geodiversity, habitat, greenspace, woodland and water eco-systems of the wider environment will have been protected, enhanced and managed by implementation of the plan's policies. The borough's best and most versatile agricultural land will have been protected, wherever possible, to promote local food production.

Objective 13: Minerals: By the end of the plan period, the borough's mineral reserves will have been identified and managed to provide for the needs of the construction industry. In tandem with this, the use of recycled and secondary sources, sustainable site waste management practice and the use of sustainable building materials will have been increased by implementation of the plan's policies. Sources of local building materials will have been safeguarded for conservation of the borough's built heritage.

Objective 14: Waste management: By the end of the plan period, a strategic waste management facility will have been provided to deal with the borough's forecast needs. Implementation of the plan's policies, or those of joint plans covering the borough, will have promoted a reduction in waste levels by utilising waste as a raw material for industry and energy production and by encouraging increased recycling rates.

Objective 15: Managing the water environment: By the end of the plan period, implementation of the plan's policies to regulate development will have protected and enhanced the borough's water environment and contributed to the wider integrated management of water catchments. The risks of pollution of rivers and water resources, depletion of water supplies, flooding and harm to biodiversity and leisure interests will have been minimised by implementation of the plan's policies.

Objective 16: Carbon reduction and renewable energy: By the end of the plan period, the borough's carbon footprint will have been reduced from current levels. Implementation of the Plan's policies will have secured an increased proportion of energy generation via renewable and low carbon means and will have promoted energy efficiency, energy conservation and the use of sustainable construction techniques.

Objective 17: Infrastructure delivery: By the end of the Plan period, the necessary utility infrastructure to support new development will have been provided in appropriate locations. Local community services will have been provided or existing services enhanced in keeping with the scale of planned new development in each community.

1.4 Structure of the Core Strategy

The Core Strategy contains the following chapters:

- 1 Introduction,
- 2 Rotherham now,

- 3 Challenges and opportunities,
 - 4 Our vision and strategic objectives,
 - 5 Setting a local housing target,
 - 6 Spatial strategy,
 - 7 Key diagram,
 - 8 Core policies,
 - 9 Monitoring and implementation, and
- Appendices.

2 IIA Methodology

2.1 Overall Approach

In order to understand the potential sustainability effects of the Core Strategy, it was first necessary to analyse the potential effects of proposed Urban Extensions. Following consultation on the Urban Extension options in 2009, the Council decided to revisit this aspect of the Core Strategy. An assessment of a wider range of Urban Extension options was done, identifying the potential significant effects on the environment and society. The full findings are laid out in matrices within Appendix C of the full technical IIA Report.

IIA Topics have been used as chapters in this report, and each of the IIA Objectives have been listed and considered within each topic. Each of the policies of the Core Strategy has been 'screened' for their relevance within each topic. Policies have been screened by:

- the nature of the physical development proposals within them and how this can influence society (including the economy) or the environment;
- the potential for physical development to result from implementing the policies;
- the mitigating nature of the policies in terms of leading to requirements for such 'risk controls' as better site selection, better design and layout, better integration with the surrounding environment and infrastructure, project-level assessment or developer contributions; and
- the enhancing nature of policies in terms of how they direct development to achieve greater benefits than would otherwise be achieved.

The full details of policy screening can be found in each topic chapter of the full technical IIA Report.

Against the backdrop of 'preferred' Urban Extensions, the policies have been assessed for their risks of significant negative effects, and opportunities for significant beneficial effects. The assessment accounts for the policies of the Core Strategy which have already been developed to avoid or manage any risks, or to

enhance opportunities. This report only provides the textual analysis of potential effects, however the full tables can be found in the full technical IIA Report.

At the end of each assessment section, the key residual risks and opportunities are listed, alongside the overall likely significant effects of the Core Strategy.

2.2 Limitations and Uncertainties

The following problems and limitations of the data were encountered during the IIA:

- certain 'ideal' indicators not available to inform assessment (replacement data used, or inferred);
- consistency between data sources;
- availability of historic data;
- availability of up-to-date information;
- it has not always been possible to analyse information in a way which optimises its value e.g. by geographic area or by different communities or groups. For example, environmental data is often collected at national or regional level and it has not always been possible to collate at a more localised level;
- it was not always possible to represent complex regional and national inter-linkages in the baseline data collation; and
- as the baseline situation in Rotherham is ever-changing, data can quickly become out-of-date.

Also, IIA / SEA is based on a number of standard assumptions, which begin with the assumption that the legally enforced standards for protection of the environment are absolute, and for all intents and purposes, fully successful. Assumptions also include a standard set of typical development controls required by planning policy, and which are assumed to be universally applied to planning applications of all types. Appendix D of the full technical IIA Report includes typical construction hazards, and the common measures which are assumed to be in place as mitigation for construction impacts.

IIA / SEA must also make assumptions about how the Core Strategy's policies are implemented. Whilst this IIA assumes that all policy will be implemented to its practicable fullest (both as stated and equally upon each planning application), it recognises likely areas where (from experience) there tend to be 'trade-offs' of accepting negative impacts for the sake of the benefits of development. This is reflected in each assessment, and in the residual risks and opportunities identified.

3.1 Requirement and Scope

It is both a requirement of SEA and an important part of the IIA that we identify the other strategies and plans (written by various bodies and organisations) with which the Core Strategy interacts. The purpose is to ensure that the Core Strategy takes into account statutory requirements and other operations and actions which are planned or proposed to occur in the foreseeable future.

The context review was conducted as part of the scoping stage of the IIA and SA, which was described in Section 1.1, and it is reported in full in the updated Scoping Report of 2011, which can be found on the Council’s website.

There are very many documents of relevance to protecting and improving the environment and society, and it is not possible for context reviews to include them all. It is therefore important that context review is limited to those which either have direct (often government-led) influence over spatial planning, or which result in clearly identifiable operations and actions which might be affected or improved by the Core Strategy.

3.2 Summary of the Review

The results of the context review can be found in the Scoping Report, and a summary of the documents’ key links with the Core Strategy is provided below. The key links and themes identified can be broadly summarised into the following areas and categories:

- in order to protect the social and natural environment, spatial planning should aim to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to prepare for the impacts of climate change;
- the importance of openness and fairness in decision-making, and the part assessments such as SA, SEA, HIA and EqIA play in providing high-quality information to the public;
- protecting and enhancing the historic and natural environment;
- sustainable consumption and use of natural resources, including water, waste prevention and recycling;
- choosing sustainable locations for development, including good walking / cycling access to local services and facilities, good public transport access, and making the most efficient use of the existing road network;
- the instrumental nature of housing and ‘best practice’ in spatial planning for urban renewal and tackling social and economic decline;
- protecting and enhancing open spaces, walking and cycling networks, and recreational opportunities;
- improving access to services and facilities, including healthy food, health services and essential amenities; and
- achieving economic prosperity.

In addition, some of the more specific messages for the Core Strategy are:

- the need for more affordable housing with a mix of tenures to meet the needs of the existing population;
- the importance of prioritising the long-term improvement and prosperity of Rotherham Town Centre;
- prioritising the development of brownfield land;
- achieving high energy-efficiency and water-efficiency in development, and being sensitive to the water resource availability of the catchments in the borough;
- the need to address anticipated growth in waste production, and to treat different types of waste within accessible, urban locations close to where waste is generated;
- the need for development to support Rotherham’s visitor economy;
- an opportunity to integrate with the South Yorkshire Forest Plan, provide sport and recreation facilities and reclaim derelict land; and
- to integrate biodiversity into development planning, alongside encouraging the involvement of residents in conservation and management.

4 Assessment of Alternatives

This Non-Technical Summary provides a brief summary of the policy alternatives assessment, and the Urban Extension alternatives assessment. Further details on Core Strategy development can be found in Chapter 5 of the full technical IIA Report.

4.1 Policy Alternatives

The development and consideration of different ways of approaching Core Strategy policy has evolved over several years. The early development of the Core Strategy began with considering three broad approaches to development in the borough. These options are summarised in Table 4-1 below.

Table 4-1: Strategic Options Considered Early in Core Strategy Development

Option	Description
Baseline Position: UDP	<p>New housing and industrial development has been spread throughout the borough but often on the edge of settlements.</p> <p>Major housing built at Bramley, Swallownest, Maltby, Dinnington and at the Cortonwood and Treeton former colliery sites. A lot of greenfield sites (those sites that have not been used before) have been built on.</p> <p>Nearly all industrial development is on reclaimed "brownfield" land (that has been used before). Waste disposal relies on landfill sites. Sites at Waverley and Aldwarke also identified.</p> <p>Some of the big name shops have moved away from Rotherham to Retail World and Meadowhall. Rotherham town centre has suffered because of this but new shops have been built at the Rotherham Interchange and Effingham Street.</p> <p>The UDP has policy for the protection of the Green Belt, landscape, and wildlife habitats.</p>

Option	Description
<p>Option A: Responding to Market Forces</p>	<p>Major new development likely at Manvers, Retail World, Waverley and Dinnington.</p> <p>Housing would be spread throughout the borough. Possible use of Green Belt sites for new housing. Largely build on greenfield sites (those sites that have not been used before). Small number of affordable houses provided.</p> <p>New industrial development would develop out-of-town centre sites, near to motorway junctions and close to major transport routes that are attractive to industry.</p> <p>Retail World, Meadowhall and other retail parks with plenty of parking continue to be attractive to the big name stores. Major leisure activities will not necessarily be in town centres.</p> <p>Some Green Belt sites may be built on in the most desirable areas. Protection of the environment is not a priority. There is little commercial value in protecting wildlife for its own sake. Renewable energy schemes funded by grants.</p>
<p>Option B: Matching Needs with Opportunities</p>	<p>The most sustainable communities have been identified, (e.g. support a range of activities and are close to major transport interchanges), but it is unlikely that all settlements will grow. The priority is to develop in the main urban areas.</p> <p>New housing would be in main centres, such as Rotherham urban area, where vacant or under used sites could be built on. Also some new housing is expected in Dinnington, Maltby and Wath.</p> <p>Industry, shops and offices will be in the most sustainable communities. New high technology industries will be targeted, such as at the Advanced Manufacturing Park at Waverley.</p> <p>Rotherham town centre and other key town centres such as Wath, Swinton, Maltby and Dinnington will include shopping and leisure activities. Leisure facilities will be supported in the most sustainable communities.</p> <p>Some Green Belt sites may be built on but only to support sustainable communities. Protection of valuable wildlife sites and habitats. Land that has been used before will be a priority but the most important thing is to support sustainable communities. Renewable energy schemes will be supported to meet local need.</p>
<p>Option C: Managing the Environment as a Key Resource</p>	<p>Focus new development in all urban centres and most local communities. No clear focus on specific communities as proposed in Option B.</p> <p>New houses will be built to high density (the number of houses on a given piece of land) within the main urban centres and near to good public transport facilities. New communities (such as Waverley). Sites in the Green Belt or greenfield sites will not be developed. Housing renewal schemes will be considered in all areas.</p> <p>This option will provide local jobs for people and reduce the need to travel to work. All brownfield sites to be used. New industries reusing waste and recycling rubbish will be promoted. Quarries will not be extended.</p> <p>Major investment in public transport and managing traffic to reduce car use. Possibly introduce road tolls and provide fewer parking spaces to encourage less car use and more travel by public transport. Encourage use of the car for a number of different tasks in one journey.</p> <p>Shopping and leisure will be supported in all town and local centres close to transport interchanges. No more retail parks or their expansion.</p> <p>No development on Green Belt or greenfield sites, look at expanding the Green Belt. Protection of Green Belt, the countryside and wildlife for its own sake. Try to reduce pollution by having less development. Have more renewable energy schemes.</p>

The full assessment of these options can be found in the 2007 report 'Rotherham Borough Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Report'. A summary of the report's key conclusions is below.

Baseline Position: UDP

[T]he predicted effects of the UDP were quite varied. Some of the particularly adverse effects would in fact be avoided or mitigated by current planning policy and guidance. If the UDP were updated to incorporate these changes long term sustainability could be enhanced. The long term cumulative effect of the UDP using cumulative counts of effects is neutral.

Option A: Responding to Market Forces

Under this option economic growth is encourage with minimal controls and safeguards. As a result pressure would be put on existing transport infrastructure, increasing congestion and delays. This option would also help to stimulate development. However without any environmental and social safeguards the medium to long term effects could be significantly adverse. For example, the effectiveness of the planning system to protect and enhance biodiversity would be constrained; likewise there would be no control of housing development which would be more likely to select easy to develop greenfield sites instead of using brownfield site and addressing the quality of existing housing in the borough.

Option B: Matching Needs with Opportunities

This option is particularly beneficial for employment opportunities over the short to long term by promoting economic growth in locations where they can be accessed by the greatest number of people. It also addresses the needs of the market and the economy whilst at the same time providing the necessary environmental and sustainability safeguards.

Although no negative effects were identified, a number of uncertain effects were. For example, by trying to balance the economic and environmental needs of the borough it is difficult to assess whether the environmental objectives are likely to be adversely affected.

Option C: Managing the Environment as a Key Resource

By making the environment the main issue, this option provides major safeguards and enhancements, benefiting the environmental and sustainability SA Objectives in particular. Despite these safeguards there are three long term adverse effects. The long term effect on education and skills occurs because the option is unlikely to create the 'step change' in the South Yorkshire economy because it does not attempt to attract the larger entrepreneurs and industrialists. Although the option addresses environmental and developmental sustainability it could adversely affect the establishment of a sustainable local economy. This could have knock-on effects for the sustainability of local communities.

The preferred Strategic Option was not a clear-cut selection of any one single option. Instead, combinations of options were used to inform the Council's approach to sustainability under different topics. However, it is worth noting that Option B performed best overall, and was selected for addressing many of the Core Strategy's policy directions.

The only topics for which Option B was not deemed the best solution (including in combination with other options) were 'biodiversity and geodiversity', 'waste', 'settlement/ neighbourhood built quality', 'landscape quality / historic assets' and 'community cohesion / involvement / pride'.

Elements of Option A were deemed to be only appropriate for addressing the topics of 'economic growth' and 'creativity, innovation, sound science', and under these topics elements of Options B and C would also be incorporated.

Elements of Option C were selected as being appropriate for most topics, usually in combination with Option B. Option C was selected as the sole preferred option for those topics for which Option B was not the best solution: 'biodiversity and geodiversity', 'waste', 'settlement/ neighbourhood built quality', 'landscape quality / historic assets' and 'community cohesion / involvement / pride'.

The only topics in which Option C was not specifically selected are: 'employment opportunities', 'education and skills', 'pollution', 'affordable housing' and 'Rotherham external image and perceptions'.

A further stage of policy alternatives and assessment was carried out in 2007. Nine Policy Directions were created out of the preferred Strategic Options. Details on the Policy Directions can be found in the January 2007 document 'Core Strategy Preferred Options' which is available on the Council's website. More information can be found in the full technical IIA Report.

4.2 Urban Extension Options

In 2009, the development of the Core Strategy required the consideration of options for possible Urban Extensions within the borough. Those considered included:

- Bassingthorpe Farm.
- Waverley.
- Bramley/Wickersley.
- Dinnington (West and East).
- Brampton/West Melton/Wath.
- Wales/Kiveton Park.

The Council received over 6,000 comments and representations from the consultation on this phase of the Core Strategy's development. As a result of these and in order to bolster the Council's decision-making, further Urban Extension options were assessed in 2011.

An assessment of a wider breadth of feasible options has been undertaken. The following options were assessed:

- Bassingthorpe Farm,
- Rawmarsh North,
- Wath East,
- Ravenfield Common,
- Maltby Southwest,
- Dinnington East,
- Dinnington West,
- Kiveton Park and Wales South,
- Kiveton Park and Wales North,
- Aston North, and

- Thorpe Hesley.

The findings are laid out in matrices within Appendix C of the full technical IIA Report.

The selection of the Council's preferred Urban Extensions has taken account of a wide range of information. Over the last three years, the Council has undertaken considerable work to assess over 700 potential development sites throughout the borough. A significant number of these sites are on greenfield land and are covered by Green Belt policy designation, which has led to the need for a localised Green Belt Review (including amendment to the Green Belt for the Urban Extensions) to meet the identified local targets.

In determining a local housing target, the Council has had regard to the population and household projections prepared by the Office of National Statistics, and consideration has been given to the suitability and deliverability of housing and employment land throughout the borough to meet these targets. As a number of potential sites have been put forward for consideration, the Council has assessed all of these sites using standard criteria. The Council has taken account of a number of constraints likely to affect the sustainability of the site, including its location in relation to existing services, facilities and other social infrastructure. Capacity for over 33,000 homes has been identified.

This Sustainability Appraisal has applied the baseline information for each potential Urban Extension (i.e. the options) to provide detailed assessment and commentary.

During the consultation, the Council will be seeking views on all of the Urban Extension options assessed (not just the preferred options), and also all of the sites surveyed. There may need to be some new housing or employment land released on greenfield Green Belt sites that are potentially suitable for development, but are not necessarily the most suitable to meet the local housing needs as identified in the growth strategy.

The preferred Urban Extension options are currently: Bassingthorpe Farm, Wath East, Ravenfield Common, Dinnington East, Kiveton North and Kiveton South. None of the options were considered entirely non-viable from a sustainability perspective, though the full extent of the original Ravenfield Common option would have required extensive mitigation to ensure it reflected sustainability considerations appropriately. This site, however, has been reduced in size.

The following IIA recommendations have been taken on board:

- development will be focused around existing settlements to help facilitate maintenance of a 'sense of place', though this will require a number of elements of 'good practice' design;
- at Bassingthorpe Farm, a green wedge will be maintained between new and existing development for the purposes of avoiding complete coalescence, recreation / amenity and access to the countryside, and biodiversity (amongst other benefits);
- at Bassingthorpe Farm and Wath East, greenspace and allotments will be maintained and kept separate from the extensions;
- Ravenfield Common has been reduced substantially in size from the full area put forward, will avoid the Listed Building, and be accessed from existing roads – namely Moor Lane South;
- Kiveton South avoided and preserved the majority of Kiveton Pit-Top candidate Local Wildlife Site; and

- at Kiveton, sites adjacent to the Conservation Area and near or west of the M1 have not been selected as part or parts of Urban Extensions.

The assessment of policies addresses the potential risks of negative impacts common to all of these sites, as well as opportunities. In the selection of these preferred sites, one impact which was not avoided and cannot be reduced significantly is that the Dinnington East sites are in area of the highest soil quality in the borough. This option was chosen regardless of this issue due to other potential benefits.

5 Economy and Employment Assessment Summary

5.1 Preliminary Assessment

Policy CS6 allocates land to meet the needs of employers and contribute towards economic well-being. A number of other policies promote new employment opportunities and opportunities that have the potential to improve the economy. There is a risk that new employment opportunities will not be located in accessible locations, however policies CS1, CS3 and CS13 are likely to assist in ensuring development is located to appropriate locations. A number of policies particularly CS13, CS30 and CS33 promote improvements to the transport infrastructure in Rotherham. This can improve access to employment opportunities and can attract new businesses and workers through better linkages between areas of Rotherham, and beyond.

The employment rate is still below the national average and parts of the borough have a high unemployment rate and a high proportion of benefit claimants. It is therefore considered that the policies promoting new employment, for example within the tourism and renewable energy sector, present an opportunity for the borough. These policies can also help to develop a resilient economy, protecting its viability. Economic growth and new employment opportunities may assist in improving employment rates for those in deprived areas. Provision of new local employment opportunities through Policy CS28 and CS29, may also assist in addressing deprivation through increasing local employment rates.

Housing provision, as well as provision of community and education facilities, form an important component of the strategy, particularly in contributing to the development of sustainable and well balanced communities. Provision of sufficient and affordable housing to meet the needs of Rotherham's population can help to retain skilled workers and has the possibility to attract new people to the area. This could increase skills levels and indirectly could attract new businesses. A number of policies promote enhanced public realm, streetscapes and living environments. These policies have the potential to enhance the function and vibrancy of town or district centres, with opportunities to attract new businesses and workforce to the area.

5.2 Key Residual Risks and Opportunities

The key residual risks are those which will remain despite the mitigating policies already developed and standard controls which are likely to be enforced. The key residual risks and opportunities are summarised below.

- New employment opportunities through the provision of new development;
- Opportunity to provide infrastructure to meet the needs of businesses of all sizes, and therefore provide employment opportunities;
- Improved transport linkages between areas of Rotherham and beyond, encouraging an efficient, effective, safe and sustainable integrated transport system can potentially attract new businesses and employees;
- Potential to address pockets of high unemployment rates in Rotherham by improving the links between housing and employment;
- Supports the development of a resilient economy and facilitates future growth;
- Provision of sufficient housing of a diverse mix of sizes and tenures to meet the needs of Rotherham’s population can help to retain workforce and has the possibility to attract new people to the area;
- Potential to retain the workforce through improved facilities; and
- Opportunities to enhance the function and vibrancy of town or district centres.

Given high relative deprivation in the borough, the combined effects of the settlement hierarchy, Urban Extensions and policies are considered likely to be slightly beneficial in the short term (not necessarily benefiting the most deprived areas specifically), improving to moderately beneficial in the medium term and major beneficial in the long term as new developments become fully operational and accumulate. The certainty is low, because the interrelationship between new development and the economy is complex and ever-changing, and therefore the long-term effects cannot be accurately predicted.

Summary of Residual Effects		
Short	Med.	Long
+	++	+++
Certainty:		L

5.3 IIA Recommendations

5.3.1 Further Mitigation to Reduce Risk or Enhance Opportunities

There are no mitigation or enhancement recommendations this stage.

6 Transport Assessment Summary

6.1 Preliminary Assessment

A number of policies within the Core Strategy promote improved access to services, facilities and employment through transport infrastructure improvements.

Improvements to sustainable transport modes through walking, cycling and public transport improvements are also identified by the Core Strategy. Improved

attractiveness of provision for pedestrians and cyclists through Policy CS8, CS13, CS20, CS28, CS30 and CS33 can aid in the promotion of active transport. CS13 further promotes sustainable transport through encouraging travel planning.

Sustainable freight transport is also addressed through Policy CS22. This promotes transfer of freight to canal and the rail network and aims to minimise the impact of road based freight.

There is a risk however that these policies may not directly improve access for the disabled as there is no direct reference to ensuring access for those with a disability.

There is also a risk that policies promoting new development, for example housing and employment allocations may put pressure on the transport network. The strategic road network in Rotherham (including the A633 and A630) is vulnerable to congestion and diversion from the M1. However, there is the potential that policies that promote improvements to the existing infrastructure and the provision of development in accessible locations will mitigate these risks. CS4 aims to ensure that the key route and motorway network will provide efficient access between Rotherham, Urban Centre, Principal Settlements and the regional and national road network. This policy also promotes bus priority measures and park and ride initiatives.

6.2 Key Residual Risks and Opportunities

The key residual risks are those which will remain despite the mitigating policies already developed and standard controls which are likely to be enforced. The key residual risks and also the opportunities are summarised below.

- All policies relating to new development are anticipated to result in increasing traffic levels in the long term, which could put pressure on the existing transport network despite mitigating policies;
- Risks to access for the disabled;
- Opportunities for improvements to accessibility, and increasing the proportion of residents living in the sub-region who have good accessibility; and
- Opportunities for improvements to the sustainable transport network through public transport, walking, cycling and freight improvements.

The combined effects of the settlement hierarchy, Urban Extensions and policies on transport are considered likely to be slightly beneficial in the medium and long term, as new developments become fully operational and accumulate. The certainty is moderate, because whilst the policies and potential development locations themselves are likely to create positive change, they can be implemented in a variety of ways. The long-term picture may include various factors which can increase car usage (such as increased wealth), and effectiveness for both new and existing residents will depend upon strong multi-modal transport systems and good interconnectivity.

Summary of Residual Effects		
Short	Med.	Long
0	+	+
Certainty:		M

6.3 IIA Recommendations

6.3.1 Further Mitigation to Reduce Risk or Enhance Opportunities

There are no mitigation recommendations this stage. As a potential enhancement, it was identified that Policy CS22 could be improved by identifying modal transfer to canal and rail is a priority over road freight transport, however on consideration, the Council has not felt that this is realistic / achievable in an LDF context. The LDF will, however, aspire to improve modal shift of freight.

7

Education and Skills Assessment Summary

7.1 Preliminary Assessment

Education and training is important to develop the skills of the population, including young and old. The Core Strategy provides a number of policies that promote education and training, particularly Policy CS29 Improving Skills and Employment Opportunities. This policy also promotes access to these facilities as well as local employment opportunities. Most minority ethnic groups have young populations; as such it is important to ensure that suitable opportunities are provided for all. Policy CS3 should assist in ensuring development is provided in the most appropriate locations.

A number of policies provide for improving public transport and walking/cycling opportunities within Rotherham. Policy CS13 looks to focus on transport investment to make places more accessible. In addition to this, Policy CS30 relates to improving access and priority to public transport as well as local road improvements for pedestrians and cyclists. In addition, a number of other policies aim to improve transport infrastructure provision. Improved transport options have the potential to increase accessibility to education and training opportunities.

Other benefits associated with better access to and provision of education and facilities can include opportunities for the economy of the borough through a more highly skilled workforce and the retention of skilled workers.

Housing allocations and provision have the potential to negatively affect the capacity of educational facilities. Policies include CS1, CS2, CS5 and CS16. However, it is likely that Policies CS1, CS28 and CS29 will ensure that there is enough infrastructure of the correct type to support the educational needs of new residents and others.

7.2 Key Residual Risks and Opportunities

The key residual risks are those which will remain despite the mitigating policies already developed and standard controls which are likely to be enforced. The key residual risks and also the opportunities are summarised below.

- Opportunities to promote access to education and learning facilities;
- Opportunities to provide improved training and educational facilities;

- Opportunities for secondary effects on the economy and retention of skilled workers; and
- Risks to the capacity of educational facilities through new housing development.

The combined effects of the settlement hierarchy, Urban Extensions and policies are considered likely to be slightly beneficial in the medium and long term, as new developments become fully operational and accumulate. The certainty is moderate, because whilst the policies and potential development locations themselves are likely to create positive change, they can be implemented in a variety of ways. Effectiveness will depend upon good adaptation (including capacity) of the various educational and training facilities to new residents, as well as good sustainable transport links to them.

Summary of Residual Effects		
Short	Med.	Long
0	+	+
Certainty:		M

7.3 IIA Recommendations

7.3.1 Further Mitigation to Reduce Risk or Enhance Opportunities

No further changes to the Core Strategy have been considered necessary at this stage.

8 Health and Well-Being Assessment Summary

8.1 Preliminary Assessment

The World Health Organisation defines health as "a state of complete physical, mental and social well being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity" (WHO, 1948).

Many factors that affect health are covered through other considerations such as improving education and skills, income, housing, employment, air quality, transport, water and waste disposal.

The accompanying Health Impact Assessment provides a full assessment of the potential effects on health associated with the Core Strategy. The document provides baseline information, details of relevant policies for health and well being as well as detailed tables identifying the risks and opportunities of the Core Strategy policies. A summary of this document is provided below.

8.2 Key Residual Risks and Opportunities

The key residual risks are those which will remain despite the mitigating policies already developed and standard controls which are likely to be enforced. The key residual risks and also the opportunities are summarised below.

- Construction of new development across the borough will affect local people, whether through the stress of uncertainty and coping with the changes, or through having to make the time for community engagement and input into planning, or through construction land clearance, noise, traffic and emissions from construction plant (vehicles and equipment). Various elements of planning and construction 'best practice' can minimise this effect, but the effect is uncertain at this stage.
- New housing development and associated localised population growth could impact on levels of open space and recreational land available.
- Increasing population growth and policies which promote road travel could have a detrimental impact on air quality and noise emissions.
- Development will help to protect or contribute to securing a healthy and safe environment which can improve the general health of local communities.
- Improved existing and development of new recreational, leisure, health and other community facilities can also help improve general health and potentially reduce health inequalities.
- Potential opportunities to enhance quality of life and thereby aiding general health are brought about by better access to open space and green infrastructure which can also encourage physical activity.
- Improved transport links from local communities to main centres by a variety of travel modes including walking and cycling can help reduce health inequalities in accessing facilities and also improve physical activity levels.
- Reducing the risk of flooding provides opportunities to protect against any deterioration in the general health of local and regional communities including vulnerable groups and older people.
- Major opportunities are presented for new development to meet the needs of Rotherham's areas of highest deprivation.
- The regeneration of Rotherham including Rotherham Town Centre will provide potential opportunities to help to address deprivation by enhancing the public realm and promoting sustainable urban living.
- Provision of an adequate number and mix of housing including affordable housing will present opportunities for people to stay in Rotherham and could reduce poverty levels, so helping to address deprivation issues.
- Opportunities exist to enhance people's living environment and so help tackle deprivation through better provision of, and access to open space and green infrastructure.
- Providing sufficient transport links by a variety of travel modes between local communities and main centres can help address deficiencies in access to services and facilities for deprived areas.
- Opportunities exist for new residents through directing development to locations which have good access to services and facilities including mental health services.

- Improving transport links by a variety of different travel modes to main centres from local communities can help all people, including those with mental health issues, to access appropriate services and facilities.
- Potential opportunities for developers to contribute to providing new and / or improved services and facilities including those for health.
- There is the potential for risks to local communities including vulnerable groups, older people and young children and youth. This is because there is the potential new housing and localised increases in population (alongside property) could create new targets for criminals using poorly designed spaces to hide and for access and egress.
- Potential opportunities exist to reduce crime levels in certain areas, such as through high-quality master planning which integrates well into surrounding areas, and uses 'secured by design' principles.
- Promoting development which protects or contributes to securing a healthy and safe environment including minimising opportunities for crime provides long term opportunities to continue in reducing crime in the borough.
- Directing development to the most sustainable and accessible locations in Rotherham can provide people with disabilities better opportunities for access to services and facilities.
- Provision of a mix of housing types and tenure including affordable housing can help meet the needs of people with disabilities.
- Maintaining and improving transport links between local communities and main centres by a variety of different transport modes can increase access to essential services and facilities for those with disabilities.
- Major opportunity to reduce obesity levels through improving links to existing and developing new walking and cycling routes and facilities thereby encouraging greater levels of physical activity and in the long term, presenting opportunities to reduce obesity levels.
- Further major opportunity is possible by enhancing existing and creating new leisure and recreational facilities in main centres of Rotherham. In conjunction with this, improved transport links including active travel can help people access these services and so can therefore help, in the long term, reduce obesity in the local community and amongst young people.
- An overall opportunity for people to make healthier lifestyle choices and indirectly reduce obesity could occur through Policy CS23 which encourages developers to contribute to securing a healthy and safe environment.
- Locating development in appropriate locations with good access to facilities and services presents opportunities for local communities to lead healthier lifestyles.
- Opportunities for improved education can help people, particularly young people, to learn about the risks of smoking, drinking and drug taking etc which could help to reduce levels.
- Indirect opportunities exist through the enhancement of existing and provision of new facilities and services in Rotherham which could provide more activities for people to undertake as opposed to drinking and drug-taking.

- Opportunities for enhancement to existing and provision of new health facilities to cater for increases in population as a result of new development. This could also benefit existing local communities.
- Improving transport links from local communities to main centres by a variety of travel modes can provide opportunities for people to access health services and facilities with greater ease.

The combined effects of the settlement hierarchy, Urban Extensions and policies on health and well-being are considered likely to be slightly adverse in the short term (due to the potential disruption and stress caused to existing residents during planning and construction), and slightly beneficial in the medium and long term, as new developments become fully operational and accumulate, alongside their various benefits. The certainty is low, because there will be both positive and negative effects of new development, and professional judgement has been used. Effectiveness will depend upon a wide variety of factors, including various project-level considerations that approach health and well-being in a holistic manner.

Summary of Residual Effects		
Short	Med.	Long
-	+	+
Certainty:		L

8.3 IIA Recommendations

8.3.1 Further Mitigation to Reduce Risk or Enhance Opportunities

Policy CS15 could be enhanced by expanding the objectives for improved services and leisure in Rotherham Town Centre to include sports and health facilities and/or health-related businesses (e.g. gyms). Policy CS15 could further be enhanced to provide for increased health facilities including addiction clinics where there is a need.

The policies which promote good transport links by a variety of travel modes from local communities to main centres could go further to also ensure that the needs of people with disabilities and mobility issues are catered for which can provide opportunities for greater independence.

Policy CS16 could be enhanced further to provide a certain percentage of specialist housing for people with mobility issues or other disabilities.

Further emphasis could be made in the Core Strategy to addressing 'secured by design' principles.

A significant proportion of young people are considered to be obese in Rotherham. There could therefore be a further commitment in the Core Strategy to providing specific facilities for young people to undertake physical activity.

9.1 Preliminary Assessment

Biodiversity can be defined as the total variety of living organisms on earth, including all species of plants, animals and their associated habitats. It supports the vital benefits we get from the natural environment and contributes to our economy, our health and well-being, and it enriches our lives (Defra, 2008). Biodiversity is in decline across the world because of human activity, with 10-30% of animals threatened with extinction.

A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening exercise has been conducted in draft, and is yet to be confirmed by Natural England. It is felt that the Core Strategy is unlikely to have a significant effect on any internationally designated nature conservation sites. Key issues dealt with include the 'in combination' effect of recreational pressure distant European sites, and the presence of over-wintering Golden Plover within the borough, a bird species for which the South Pennine Moors Special Protection Area to the east and north-east of the borough is designated.

Despite the protective policies described below, it is possible that new development such as for housing, commercial uses, retail, transport infrastructure, mineral extraction, renewable energy, tourism and ancillary development could produce risks to Rotherham's biodiversity. Landtake and habitat fragmentation (through land use change) caused by human activity is a major contributor and threat to the loss of biodiversity. They reduce the total habitat area available for wildlife and often result in smaller isolated populations separated by unsuitable habitat.

In terms of the transport network the Core Strategy provides for the introduction of new link roads and other transport network improvements. In the long term, when considered in conjunction with rising traffic levels through new development, increasing traffic levels are likely. This would increase local air, light and noise pollution, which could result in indirect risks to the surrounding biodiversity. In addition, increasing traffic levels can cause a rise in road kill, which is particularly an issue for toads and otters (which are now showing a presence along the River Don) in Rotherham.

CS8 and CS24 aim to counteract all of the above risks by prioritising the protection of biodiversity and the wider environment.

Through investment attracted into development and into Rotherham generally, CS8, CS11, CS20, CS24 and CS28 have the potential to contribute to improved habitat quality and management. This will depend upon a number of considerations, including the specific sites developed, the extent and nature of developer contributions and their integration into a wider green infrastructure network. Several aspects of Rotherham's biodiversity are considered unfavourable, declining and many designated sites are sensitive to differing forms of development and their ancillary effects. These policies will help to counteract the risks that development poses to biodiversity.

Transport policies promoting sustainable transport modes have the potential to encourage modal shift. This can reduce congestion in the short to medium term, thereby providing the opportunity to improve air quality and noise emissions on existing roads.

9.1.1 Key Residual Risks and Opportunities

The key residual risks are those which will remain despite the mitigating policies already developed and standard controls which are likely to be enforced. The key residual risks and also the opportunities are summarised below.

- There remains the risk of short- to medium-term negative impact to species and / or habitats during construction of new development (for example, habitat fragmentation and disturbance to species), particularly if there are concurrent large-scale developments;
- In combination with development nationwide, new development poses a long-term risk to habitats and wildlife through a range of direct and indirect impacts which may not be significant in isolation (and therefore may not be eliminated under Core Strategy policy), but may be significant across wider geographical areas and timescales;
- Recreational pressure on some habitats may not be entirely offset by local provision of green / open space, such as water recreation which offers a unique interest to existing and new residents;
- Opportunities to reduce regional, national and global conflicts with nature conservation through more sustainable use of natural resources (energy, waste and minerals); and
- Opportunities for increased green infrastructure and habitat creation, improved habitat quality and management.

The combined effects of the settlement hierarchy, Urban Extensions and policies are considered most likely to be slightly adverse in the short term (due to the loss of greenfield land to new development, and the potential effects of construction activities). This potential effect can be avoided or made negligible, however it is impossible to secure this through the Core Strategy and requires detailed project-level consideration. The effect in the medium term is likely to be neutral / negligible, whilst the benefits of habitat creation begin to come to fruition (as vegetation matures, etc.), but also any unforeseen or un-prevented operational impacts of new development begin to take effect. This could include, for example, ‘in combination’ effects of many developments (including from traffic) or habitats being damaged by local recreational pressure. Such potential effects should be monitored for, responded to and managed.

It is felt that the effect of the Core Strategy will be slightly beneficial in the long term, as even further new green infrastructure fully matures and policies on the sustainable use of nature resources take maximum effect. The certainty is low, because there will be both positive and negative effects of new development, and professional judgement has been used. Effectiveness will depend upon a wide variety of factors, including further DPDs and SPDs, project-level considerations and the interrelationships amongst spatial planning, transport planning, waste and minerals planning, flood risk management, water resource management and various other national, regional and local planning activities.

Summary of Residual Effects		
Short	Med.	Long
-	0	+
Certainty:		L

9.2 IIA Recommendations

9.2.1 Further Mitigation to Reduce Risk or Enhance Opportunities

At the project level (design and construction), standard controls should be implemented with regards air quality and discharges to water in addition to ecological assessments. Ecological assessment should be undertaken which inform and influence the design, and lead to incorporated habitat enhancement.

10

Pollution and Emissions Assessment Summary

10.1 Preliminary Assessment

A variety of air pollutants have known or suspected harmful effects on human health and the environment. In most areas of Europe, these pollutants are principally the products of combustion from space heating, power generation or from motor vehicle traffic. Pollutants from these sources may not only prove a problem in the immediate vicinity of these sources, but can travel long distances (Defra, 2011).

Policies which promote new development including CS5 have the potential to increase traffic on Rotherham's roads which could result in capacity issues. In addition to this, Policies CS15 and CS19 promote tourism and improvements to Rotherham town centre which are likely to attract visitors to the area further putting pressure on road capacity. This can result in issues with congestion and associated air and noise pollution. Several mitigating policies aim to reduce the need to travel through guiding development to appropriate locations and also promoting walking and cycling as alternative forms of transport. These will help ensure that the potential for rises in air pollution and noise emissions are reduced so minimising impacts on human health.

CS27 promotes renewable energy development within Rotherham in all developments, unless it can be proved to not be feasible or viable.

All new development has the potential to affect water quality and soils depending on its location. Policy CS26 provides opportunities for protection of the value of the water environment. CS3 prioritises the use of brownfield land; this may assist in reducing levels of contaminated land in Rotherham.

10.1.1 Key Residual Risks and Opportunities

The key residual risks are those which will remain despite the mitigating policies already developed and standard controls which are likely to be enforced. The key residual risks and also the opportunities are:

- Increased housing and economic development both within the borough and cumulatively with other boroughs and districts could promote road travel, which could have a detrimental impact on air quality and noise emissions;
- New development is likely to lead to least some light pollution, as well as potential noise creation from commercial / industrial development, as well as residential development to a lesser extent;

- New development has the potential to impact on water quality and soil quality depending on location;
- Opportunities for increased renewable energy;
- Opportunities for the reduction in air pollution and noise emissions through reduced need to travel; and
- Opportunities to prioritise the use of brownfield land.

The combined effects of the settlement hierarchy, Urban Extensions and policies are considered most likely to be slightly adverse in the short, medium and long term, due to the potential effects of construction activities in the short term, and the added local traffic and other overall transport and commercial activity in the medium and long term. This potential effect can be avoided or made negligible, however it is impossible to secure this through the Core Strategy alone, and requires both detailed project-level consideration and a targeted multi-modal approach to transport borough-wide and sub-regionally.

The certainty is low, because there will be both positive and negative effects of new development, and professional judgement has been used. Effectiveness will depend upon a wide variety of factors, including further DPDs and SPDs, project-level considerations and the interrelationships amongst the LDF, LTP3, future LTPs and waste management planning (amongst even further considerations). The amount of renewable energy capacity secured in proportion to increased demand for energy will also be a key consideration.

Summary of Residual Effects		
Short	Med.	Long
-	-	-
Certainty:		L

10.2 IIA Recommendations

10.2.1 Further Mitigation to Reduce Risk or Enhance Opportunities

There is the potential for the inclusion of an overarching policy which aims to minimise, and work to reduce pollution (including air pollution, noise pollution, light pollution and soil contamination).

Either Policy CS24 or CS26 could be improved through including text requiring the protection and enhancement of both the natural geomorphology of watercourses and also water quality.

11 Flood Risk Assessment Summary

11.1 Preliminary Assessment

Approximately 10% of existing homes in England are located in areas at substantial risk of flooding. Climate change is considered likely to increase flood risk in the future. Flooding has implications for both the built and natural environment and it is therefore essential that flood risk is effectively managed.

A number of policies promote development, including housing, employment and new infrastructure, which could increase the risk of flooding if built in inappropriate locations. The areas at risk of flooding in Rotherham include neighbourhoods surrounding the town centre, a flood alleviation scheme is currently in place in response to the risk flooding poses to the town centre. Sources of flooding in Rotherham include river flooding, localised flooding, sewer and ground flooding.

A number of Core Strategy policies promote the reduction of flood risk associated with new development as well as existing flood risk issues. Policies CS12, 21, 28 and 31 seek to reduce the risk of flooding within the Rotherham Regeneration/Flood Alleviation Area. These policies promote new flood defence infrastructure and contributions towards new infrastructure as well as other mitigation measures to be incorporated into the design of new proposals to reduce risks from flooding to acceptable levels. In addition, schemes to promote natural flood management of the Don through Policy CS8, amongst other regionally important areas, have the potential to reduce flood risks.

Natural flood management is promoted through CS8 and CS24. This can have a number of benefits through increased capacity of rivers as a result of the creation of flood storage is suitable areas which results in reduced flood risks to settlements and development as well as benefits to biodiversity through the creation of new wetland habitats.

CS21, 26 and 28 look to reduce the risk of flooding through other mitigation measures such as infrastructure, Sustainable Urban Drainage systems (SUDs), limiting run off and limiting the use of culverting. Flood Risk Assessments for new development are also required through Policy CS21 and CS26. Policy CS19 and CS26 require that new development is in line with national planning guidance regarding flood risk and accompanying practice guidance.

11.1.1 Key Residual Risks and Opportunities

The key residual risks are those which will remain despite the mitigating policies already developed and standard controls which are likely to be enforced. The key residual risks and also the opportunities are summarised below.

- Opportunities to reduce flood risk through a number of measures including new flood defence infrastructure, natural flood management and mitigation measures including SUDs and reduced culverting; and
- Opportunities to reduce flooding through the requirement of Flood Risk Assessment for new development, and a requirement for new development to follow existing national planning guidance in relation to flooding.

The combined effects of the settlement hierarchy, Urban Extensions and policies are considered most likely to be neutral / negligible in the short term, and slightly beneficial in the medium and long term. This is due to the above opportunities, particularly within and around Rotherham Town Centre.

The certainty is high, because assuming that PPS25 is abided by, and that the Core Strategy policies are implemented as intended, the effects should be guaranteed. However, uncertainty regarding climate change and unusual weather could potentially have a negative influence on flood risk indicators, despite Core Strategy measures.

Summary of Residual Effects		
Short	Med.	Long
0	+	+
Certainty:		H

11.2 IIA Recommendations

11.2.1 Further Mitigation to Reduce Risk or Enhance Opportunities

No further changes to the Core Strategy have been considered necessary at this stage.

12 Natural Resources Assessment Summary

12.1 Preliminary Assessment

The prudent use of natural resources means ensuring that we use them wisely and efficiently, in a way that respects the needs of future generations. This means enabling more sustainable consumption and production and using non-renewable resources in ways that do not endanger the resource or cause serious damage or pollution (ODPM, 2005b).

It is anticipated that construction of the developments such as housing and employment will require significant amounts of construction materials. This will put increased pressure on resources within Rotherham. Policies CS25 promotes efficient consumption of mineral resources as well as substitutes and recycled materials. This should help to counteract the potential negative effects presented by new development to a certain extent.

In addition, new housing and employment development will increase production of waste, with the potential for associated adverse effects on existing landfill. There is the potential that there will need to be greater landfill provision to cater for this additional waste. The Core Strategy should promote policy requiring development to follow the waste hierarchy; there should be an emphasis for development proposals to encourage greater resource efficiency and more sustainable use of resources. Further details are set out in the recommendations provided below.

All policies relating to new development are anticipated to result in increasing traffic levels in the long term, which can put pressure on the existing transport network. There is the potential that this risk can be reduced through Policies CS1, CS3 and CS13 which focus on guiding development to sustainable locations and reducing the need to travel (particularly by the private car). In addition, Policy CS25 encourages sustainable transport of minerals.

Sustainable transport options are promoted through Policies CS4, CS28, CS22, CS25, CS30 and CS33. These policies promote sustainable transport options such as public transport improvements which may assist in reducing potential impacts on the road network.

Renewable energy Policy CS27, as well as the promotion of renewable energy through developer contributions (CS28) can reduce reliance on fossil fuels whose extraction, transport, storage and combustion require large amounts of land and use of finite resources. This creates the opportunity for greater resource efficiency and more sustainable use of resources.

Policies CS9, CS24 and CS26 seek to safeguard natural environment resources of the landscape, biodiversity and geodiversity and the water environment.

12.1.1 Key Residual Risks and Opportunities

The key residual risks are those which will remain despite the mitigating policies already developed and standard controls which are likely to be enforced. The key residual risks and also the opportunities are summarised below.

- There are risks through the promotion of new development requiring significant construction materials which could place demand on resources. CS25 promotes safeguarding of mineral reserves in addition to re-use and recycling of suitable minerals which may mitigate potential impacts.
- New housing and employment development have the potential to increase levels of waste putting pressure on landfill. By the long term, this pressure should be fully alleviated, if the BDR Joint Waste Plan objectives are met.
- Several policies promote the use of existing buildings, which can reduce the demand for minerals.
- Several policies promote locating development in sustainable locations, including with good access to services and facilities and with appropriate infrastructure, which can ensure residents (and others) have good access to household recycling and composting facilities.
- Policy CS26 promotes the inclusion of water efficiency measures within new development.

The combined effects of the settlement hierarchy, Urban Extensions and policies are considered most likely to be slightly adverse in the short and medium term (due to the need for substantial new minerals to facilitate construction of new development). It is felt that the effect of the Core Strategy will be neutral / negligible in the long term. The certainty is low, firstly because climate change will have a strong influence over the future water resource baseline, and there is much uncertainty as to its effects. There will also be both positive and negative effects of new development, and professional judgement has been used. Effectiveness will depend upon a wide variety of factors, including further DPDs and SPDs, project-level considerations and the interrelationships amongst spatial planning, waste and minerals planning, and water resource management.

Summary of Residual Effects		
Short	Med.	Long
-	0	0
Certainty:		L

12.2 IIA Recommendations

12.2.1 Further Mitigation to Reduce Risk or Enhance Opportunities

It is recommended that a Core Strategy policy is included that requires new development to seek the efficient long-term use of natural resources, including waste, soil, minerals, aggregates, energy, water and land (including high-quality agricultural land) and other raw materials. Whilst a Core Strategy does not need to specifically require that a sustainable design code / standard be met or to repeat other planning policy, it should make reference to these general provisions. The re-use/enhancement of existing buildings should be encouraged as well as the promotion of re-use, recovery and recycling of waste through the waste hierarchy and reduction of waste sent to landfill.

The Core Strategy should encourage all new development to incorporate small-scale waste management facilities and measures to reduce and recycle waste into development design. Development should consider the generation, treatment and disposal of waste and the location of waste management facilities in formulating proposals. Policies should express support for proposals which drive waste up the waste hierarchy, which would assist in mitigating the additional waste generated from new development.

13 Townscape Assessment Summary

13.1 Preliminary Assessment

A high level of protection should be given to most valued townscapes and the contribution they make to cultural, social and economic life. Good townscapes can improve the quality of settlements and neighbourhoods and increase local distinctiveness.

Specific features that contribute to the distinct identity of the borough and make a contribution to the townscape are protected through Policy CS10, including Roman ridge and settlements, motte and bailey castles, historic houses, historic parks and gardens, villages, Rotherham Minster, the Chapel on the Bridge, Wentworth Woodhouse Estate, Catcliffe Glassworks Cone and the Chesterfield Canal, the historic grain of the town centre and early 20th century developments. In addition, views and vistas associated with Rotherham Minster, the Chapel on the Bridge, Wentworth Woodhouse Estate and other significant buildings are protected.

A number of Core Strategy policies that promote new development including growth in housing, employment and new infrastructure/development have the potential to

put the townscape at risk. These policies have the potential to result in permanent long-term effects on townscape features in the vicinity of new development.

The main location for new growth is the Rotherham urban area with other principles settlements for growth also identified. These areas have a number of important townscape features, including Rotherham town centre conservation area. A number of policies, particularly those related to new housing, renewable energy, employment and retail development, have the potential to damage and effect the setting of features within these towns, depending on the location of new development, with associated adverse effects on the townscape. Policy CS11 seeks to protect the townscape through sustainable design is likely to mitigate potential effects on the townscape, however due to the requirement for new development; it is not possible for the policies to fully eliminate the risk. Policy CS10 also aims to protect the historic environment which can assist with the protection of the townscape. This policy particularly aims to protect the historic grain of the town centre, however the possibility of impacts from new development remains.

A number of policies also aim to enhance the public realm, particularly within Rotherham town centre, as well as green spaces. This is likely to result in overall benefits to the townscape environment.

13.1.1 Key Residual Risks and Opportunities

The key residual risks are those which will remain despite the mitigating policies already developed and standard controls which are likely to be enforced. The key residual risks and also the opportunities are:

- A combination of different types of new development can occur within a relatively small area, and therefore there remains a risk to the setting and character of townscape features;
- Opportunities to enhance the townscape through promoting sustainable design; and
- Opportunities to contribute to the distinct identity of the townscape within Rotherham.

The combined effects of the settlement hierarchy, Urban Extensions and policies on townscape are considered most likely to be slightly adverse in the short, medium and long term, due to the potential effects of construction activities in the short term, and the expansion of settlements in the medium and long term. This potential effect can be avoided or made negligible, however it is impossible to secure this through the Core Strategy alone, and requires detailed project-level consideration.

The certainty is low, because there will be both positive and negative effects of new development, and professional judgement has been used. Effectiveness will depend upon further DPDs and SPDs, and project-level considerations.

Summary of Residual Effects		
Short	Med.	Long
-	-	-
Certainty:		L

13.2 IIA Recommendations

13.2.1 Further Mitigation to Reduce Risk or Enhance Opportunities

Policy CS11 has the potential to be enhanced to require that major new developments including Urban Extensions apply high-quality master planning in accordance with established guidelines, such as CABE's 'Getting the big picture right: A guide to large scale urban design' (2010), CABE's 'Creating successful masterplans: A guide for clients' (2011) or the BRE's 'Delivering a sustainable masterplan' (2010). This could be consolidated with those elements of Policy CS8 which relate to masterplanning.

14 Soil, Land Use and Geology Assessment Summary

14.1 Preliminary Assessment

Soil is an essentially non-renewable² resource and can be considered as one of the UK's most important assets. Soil has an intrinsic value as part of the natural heritage, and the functional value of soil provides for a broad range of ecological goods and services.

This topic also considers land use, including agriculture, and use of derelict, vacant and underused land.

All policies promoting new development can pose a long-term risk to soils. Soils are sometimes stripped from a site prior to development, during and after which time their important environmental functions are lost and they may not be put to best use elsewhere. Even when stored temporarily during construction and later restored, soils can lose important attributes and never return to their previous quality. Soil erosion may also occur during the construction process.

All proposed development within the Core Strategy will involve some landtake, leading to long-term risks to availability of good-quality agricultural land. The ALC assessment that this report is based on is somewhat indicative, and dates back to the 1970s. It is still important that development avoids the indicative Grade 2 agricultural land where possible, and that it is based on new, up-to-date detailed ALC assessments. Developers should be responsible for conducting these ALC assessments, determining whether soils are Grade 1, 2 or Sub-Grade 3a, and finding a sustainable re-use for soils which are to be disturbed. In such re-use, the properties which give 'best and most versatile' soils their quality should be maintained.

Policy CS24 promotes the protection and enhancement of geodiversity and has the potential to protect geodiversity from new development. There is the potential to enhance this policy to include the protection of designated geological sites and valuable soil resources. It is considered that whilst this policy aim to reduce associated effects on the geodiversity resource, effects are still likely to occur.

² Soil has both renewable and non-renewable components. Because of the non-renewable components, and because even for the renewable element, many impacts cannot be undone within human timescales, soil is considered non-renewable.

A number of policies (CS2, CS3, CS5, CS6, CS18 and CS19) promote development on previously used land, including CS5 prioritising brownfield sites for new housing development. These policies have the potential to assist in the remediation of contaminated land and minimising the use of greenfield land with higher associated impacts on soils and land use. Policies identified in Chapter 12 Flood Risk will assist in mitigating flood risk associated with the supply of previously developed land. Policy CS2 and CS5 do, however, also also require release of greenfield sites with risks as identified above.

14.1.1 Key Residual Risks and Opportunities

The key residual risks are those which will remain despite the mitigating policies already developed and standard controls which are likely to be enforced. The key residual risks and also the opportunities are:

- Opportunities to protect geodiversity from new development;
- Opportunities to promote the use of previously developed land and existing unused buildings; and
- There is the potential that new development will adversely impact on agricultural land, greenfield land and soils through landtake required.

The combined effects of the settlement hierarchy, Urban Extensions and policies are considered most likely to be permanently moderately adverse, including the short, medium and long term. This is due to the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land at Dinnington East Urban Extension. The certainty is high.

Summary of Residual Effects		
Short	Med.	Long
--	--	--
Certainty:		H

14.2 IIA Recommendations

14.2.1 Further Mitigation to Reduce Risk or Enhance Opportunities

With the selection of Dinnington East as a preferred Urban Extension, there is little opportunity to reduce this potential impact. There have been various trade-offs in choosing Dinnington East over other options.

Policy CS24 could be enhanced to include protection of RIGS and any geological SSSIs in Rotherham.

Policy CS24 could be enhanced to include protection of ‘best and most versatile’ soil resources in Rotherham, with the exception of Dinnington East. Whether in the Core Strategy or future DPDs, the LDF should recognise the responsibility of developers to conduct detailed ALC assessments, and propose soil mitigation.

Because it can be very challenging to find a sustainable re-use for the ‘best and most versatile soils’ removed from a development site, the Council could create a borough-wide Soils Strategy. This would direct developers to possible locations for

soil re-use, matching areas of potential demand with supply. It may also serve other functions.

15 Housing Assessment Summary

15.1 Preliminary Assessment

The Government is committed to improving the affordability and supply of housing in all communities, including rural areas. The Government's key housing policy is to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live.

New housing development has the potential to increase disparity between the most and least deprived areas in Rotherham. Suitable housing and affordable housing opportunities will be supported through Core Strategy Policy C16. Policy CS1 and CS3 and may assist in locating new housing development in the most appropriate areas, particularly CS3 which requires new development to meet the needs of areas of deprivation. CS13 may also assist in ensuring that new housing provision is accessible. The provision of housing opportunities and affordable housing also provides the opportunity for better social inclusion. Provision of a good mix of different housing types and tenures will help to retain people in communities and improve the sense of community.

There is also the risk that new housing development has the potential to decrease accessibility into and through a development for those without a car. Obtaining walking/cycling and public transport links to new housing development can be a challenge. This may be addressed through Policy CS3 and CS13. CS3 aims to maximise proximity and accessibility for new housing to service and employment centres. CS13 aims to promote accessibility of new development. In addition new provision of local transport opportunities through CS28, CS30 and CS33 may reduce this problem.

15.1.1 Key Residual Risks and Opportunities

The key residual risks are those which will remain despite the mitigating policies already developed and standard controls which are likely to be enforced. The key residual risks and also the opportunities are:

- Opportunities for increased housing opportunity, including the provision of affordable housing to meet local needs;
- Provision of a mix of different house types and tenures, including sufficient and affordable housing where it does not yet exist, will help to retain people in communities and improve their sense of community;
- Opportunities for better social inclusion through affordable housing provision;
- Risks that new housing development has the potential to increase disparity between the most and least deprived areas in terms of the quality of available infrastructure, greenspace, services and facilities; and
- New housing development has the potential to decrease accessibility into and through a development.

The combined effects of the settlement hierarchy, Urban Extensions and policies are considered most likely to be slightly beneficial in the short term, and moderately beneficial in the medium and long term. This is due to the combined benefits likely to be achieved through the various Urban Extensions and other sites throughout the borough. The certainty is moderate, as the net effect depends upon the way in which policies are implemented, including whether or not they ensure that disparities between existing and new residents are minimal.

Summary of Residual Effects		
Short	Med.	Long
+	++	++
Certainty:		M

15.2 IIA Recommendations

15.2.1 Further Mitigation to Reduce Risk or Enhance Opportunities

As stated in Chapter 14: Townscape, Policy CS11 has the potential to be enhanced to require that major new developments including Urban Extensions apply high-quality master planning, and this could also incorporate the masterplanning elements of Policy CS8. It could elaborate that such master planning should ensure that adjoining neighbourhoods are integrated into new residential areas such that they can benefit from such elements of new development as new greenspace, services and facilities.

16 Landscape Assessment Summary

16.1 Preliminary Assessment

Landscape results from the way that different components of our environment – both natural (the influences of geology, soils, climate, flora and fauna) and cultural (the historical and current impact of land use, settlement, enclosure and other human interventions) – interact together and are perceived by us.

A number of policies promote the provision of new development within Rotherham. The provision of new housing, employment, transport and other infrastructure will undoubtedly effect on the landscape resource in the area through land use change and associated potential adverse long-term permanent impacts on landscape character.

New development pressures may also affect the landscape character of Rotherham through unsympathetic development and land use change. A number of Areas of High Landscape value and other designated landscapes cover much of rural Rotherham. Risks to these features associated with the policies include development pressures from housing and employment land, wind farm developments, industry, new infrastructure to support growth, and pressures from

recreation. There is also the potential for effects on landscape through the release of greenfield sites for housing and employment uses.

Several policies aim to mitigate these risks. Policy CS9 aims to protect the landscape from new development and requires that all new development proposals will safeguard and enhance the quality, character, distinctiveness and amenity value of the boroughs landscapes. These include designated areas of High Landscape Value, National Character Areas and Local Landscape Character Areas. Policy CS7 aims to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development and CS11 seeks to respect and enhance landscape character. In addition, CS27 requires renewable energy development to ensure no significant harmful effects on the character of the landscape. It is considered that whilst these policies aim to reduce associated effects on the wider landscape resource, effects are still likely to occur.

16.1.1 Key Residual Risks and Opportunities

The key residual risks are those which will remain despite the mitigating policies already developed and standard controls which are likely to be enforced. The key residual risks and also the opportunities are:

- Because of the many uncertainties in the location, pattern, layout and detailed design of development, there remains a risk of negative effects to landscape character;
- Risks to landscape character through land use change;
- Opportunities to safeguard designated landscapes; and
- Potential risks to the landscape through the release of greenfield sites.

The combined effects of the settlement hierarchy, Urban Extensions and policies are considered most likely to be slightly adverse in the short, medium and long term, due to the potential effects of construction activities in the short term, and the impact of new development (including knock-on / ancillary development) in the medium and long term. This potential effect can be avoided or made negligible, however it is impossible to secure this through the Core Strategy alone, and requires detailed project-level consideration.

The certainty is low, because there will be both positive and negative effects of new development, and professional judgement has been used. Effectiveness will depend upon further DPDs and SPDs, and project-level considerations.

Summary of Residual Effects		
Short	Med.	Long
-	-	-
Certainty:		L

16.2 IIA Recommendations

16.2.1 Further Mitigation to Reduce Risk or Enhance Opportunities

No further changes to the Core Strategy have been considered necessary at this stage. It has been taken into consideration that selecting Urban Extension options

in less sensitive landscapes (e.g. Dinnington West) might avoid some significant negative landscape impacts with high-quality mitigation in place, however there have been various trade-offs in choosing the preferred options over other options.

17

Historic Environment Assessment Summary

17.1 Preliminary Assessment

The Historic Environment relates to the legacy of physical artefacts and intangible attributes of a group or society that are inherited from past generations, maintained in the present and bestowed for the benefit of future generations. It includes buildings and historic places, monuments, artefacts (etc.) and less tangible aspects such as historic landscapes. It serves as a framework for the evolution and development of our built environment.

Policies CS10 and CS11 aim to protect, enhance and manage the historic environment and protect and enhance the distinctive features of Rotherham.

Specific features that contribute to the distinct identity of the borough are protected through Policy CS10, including Roman ridge and settlements, motte and bailey castles, historic houses, historic parks and gardens, villages, Rotherham Minster, the Chapel on the Bridge, Wentworth Woodhouse Estate, Catcliffe Glassworks Cone and the Chesterfield Canal, the historic grain of the town centre and early 20th century developments. In addition views and vistas associated with Rotherham Minster, the Chapel on the Bridge, Wentworth Woodhouse Estate and other significant buildings are protected.

A number of Core Strategy policies that promote new development including growth in housing, employment and new infrastructure/development have the potential to put the historic environment at risk. These policies have the potential to result in permanent long-term effects on cultural heritage/historic landscape features in the vicinity of new development. CS1 identifies the spatial strategy for directing new growth.

The main location for new growth is the Rotherham urban area with other principal settlements for growth also identified. These areas have a number of historic features and several are identified as ‘at risk’, including Rotherham Town Centre Conservation Area. A number of policies, particularly those related to new housing, renewable energy, employment and retail development, have the potential to affect the integrity (through damage and destruction) and setting (through visual effects or change in land use) of features within these towns, depending on the location of new development. These policies are likely to mitigate potential effects on historic environment features, however due to the requirement for new development, it is not possible for the policies to fully eliminate the risk to the historic environment. Policy CS10 does aim to protect the historic grain of the town centre, however the possibility of impacts from new development remains.

Furthermore, the growth in population associated with new housing development and employment allocations (particularly related to strategic sites and growth areas) is likely to result in increased traffic volumes. There is therefore the potential for noise/vibration and air quality risks to the integrity of sensitive historic environment features within proximity to existing and proposed transport routes.

17.1.1 Key Residual Risks and Opportunities

The key residual risks are those which will remain despite the mitigating policies already developed and standard controls which are likely to be enforced. The key residual risks and also the opportunities are:

- A combination of different types of new development can occur within a relatively small area, and therefore there remains a risk to the setting of historic features (which should be balanced against the potential benefits identified below);
- Adverse effects to the setting and integrity of historic environment features and historic landscapes as a result of new development pressures (unknown sensitivities);
- Adverse indirect effects on the integrity of historic environment features through increased traffic volumes associated with new development;
- Opportunities to create inward investment which benefits the historic environment;
- The creation of vibrant town and local centres, including Rotherham Town Centre, may enhance features such as Rotherham Bridge and Our Ladies' Chapel;
- Opportunities to enhance the historic environment through promoting sustainable design; and
- Opportunities to contribute to the distinct identity of the borough.

The combined effects of the settlement hierarchy, Urban Extensions and policies are considered most likely to be slightly adverse in the short, medium and long term, due to the potential effects of construction activities in the short term, and the impact of new development (including knock-on / ancillary development) in the medium and long term. This potential effect can be avoided or made negligible, however it is impossible to secure this through the Core Strategy alone, and requires detailed project-level consideration.

The certainty is low, because there will be both positive and negative effects of new development, and professional judgement has been used. Effectiveness will depend upon further DPDs and SPDs, and project-level considerations.

Summary of Residual Effects		
Short	Med.	Long
-	-	-
Certainty:		L

17.2 IIA Recommendations

17.2.1 Further Mitigation to Reduce Risk or Enhance Opportunities

No further changes to the Core Strategy have been considered necessary at this stage.

17.2.2 Monitoring

The ‘buildings at risk’ register should be monitored for those sites which are at risk of harm from air pollution, and consideration should be given to a relevant proportion of developer contributions for developments over a wide area (given likely journey patterns) towards their repair and maintenance.

18 Accessibility / Community Facilities Assessment Summary

18.1 Preliminary Assessment

Good accessibility and the provision of community facilities can assist in improving participation, community cohesion and encouraging pride within the community. This can also improve the quality of life of the community.

Several policies promote better accessibility. A number of communities in Rotherham, particularly those in deprived areas tend to make a greater proportion of their journeys by bus and walking, and a lesser proportion by national rail, underground, taxi, driving or cycling. Improving access to public transport and other sustainable transport provision is likely to benefit all communities, particularly those with limited access to a car. A number of policies (CS1, CS2, CS3 and CS13) also aim to promote new development in accessible locations which will also assist in increasing accessibility. Communities may benefit through increased access to services, community facilities, health services, employment opportunities and the creation of high-quality areas through Policies CS11, CS12, CS15, CS20 and CS28 promoting improvements to the public realm and green spaces. These policies can contribute towards a higher quality of life and improved community environment, particularly in deprived areas. In addition, an improved public realm also has the potential to benefit those with disabilities. Measures to improve access for disabled people include footway improvements, better pedestrian crossing provision, de-cluttering of the streets and raised kerbs etc.

The policies that promote improvements to the public realm and transport however do not specifically identify interventions that may benefit the disabled. There is the potential to enhance these policies accordingly.

There are a number of risks in that new development may not be located in areas which provide suitable access for those without access to a car. In addition Community facilities and centres may not be directed to the most important areas. Policies CS1, CS3 and CS13 may go some way to address these issues.

18.1.1 Key Residual Risks and Opportunities

The key residual risks are those which will remain despite the mitigating policies already developed and standard controls which are likely to be enforced. The key residual risks and also the opportunities are:

- Increased access to community services and facilities, employment opportunities, education and health;
- Opportunities for locating new development in appropriate, accessible areas;
- Streetscene enhancements can assist in improving the community environment;

- Streetscene and public realm enhancements may not directly improve accessibility for the disabled; and
- Risks that community/religious centres required by deprived communities may not be directed to the most important areas.

The combined effects of the settlement hierarchy, Urban Extensions and policies are considered likely to be slightly beneficial in the short term, improving to moderately beneficial in the medium and long term as new developments become fully operational and accumulate. The certainty is moderate, because Core Strategy policies could be implemented in a number of ways, which can lead to negligible effects against the current baseline, or even major beneficial effects.

Summary of Residual Effects		
Short	Med.	Long
+	++	++
Certainty:		M

18.2 IIA Recommendations

18.2.1 Further Mitigation to Reduce Risk or Enhance Opportunities

The Core Strategy could further promote new community centres and other facilities.

Policies promoting enhancements to public realm and the creation of high quality places have the potential to be enhanced to include text relating to the provision of measures to improve access for the disabled.

Policies promoting accessibility should include text to ensure that appropriate access for the disabled is ensured.

19 Population and Equality Assessment Summary

19.1 Preliminary Assessment

National legislation provides a key requirement to promote equality of opportunity, good relations between people of different racial groups, and positive attitudes towards disabled persons, while eliminating unlawful discrimination.

‘Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society’ is one of the objectives of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy.

The detailed Equalities Impact Assessment can be found in the appendices and provides a full assessment of the potential equalities impacts associated with the Core Strategy. The document provides a summary of the key outcomes.

19.1.1 Key Residual Risks and Opportunities

The key residual risks are those which will remain despite the mitigating policies already developed and standard controls which are likely to be enforced. The key residual risks and also the opportunities are:

Opportunities

- Increased access for communities to community services and facilities, employment opportunities, education and health facilities;
- Increased provision of community services and facilities, places of worship, employment opportunities, education and health facilities;
- Improved provision of training and education facilities with the opportunity to reduce language barriers;
- Improved public realm and green spaces have the opportunity to improve quality of life, particularly in deprived areas;
- Opportunities to assist in addressing deprivation through directing new development to appropriate areas;
- A number of Core Strategy policies have the potential to improve accessibility. This is likely to result in benefits to men and women;
- Improved housing opportunities, including affordable housing;
- Opportunities to work towards reducing crime rates, increasing safety and reducing hate crime;
- Opportunities for provision of improved midwifery care, health visiting services and young peoples' clinics, particularly in deprived areas;
- Opportunities to improve the streetscape and encourage safer streets;
- Opportunities to increase accessibility for those with disabilities and reduce difficulties in provision of disabled access;
- Opportunities for improved public transport, walking and cycling;
- Opportunities for the promotion of active and healthy lifestyles;
- Opportunities to improve the provision of sufficient accommodation land for the gypsy and traveller population;
- Opportunities for provision of improved childcare opportunities;

Risks

- Risks that services, facilities and accommodation required by different groups may not be directed to the most important areas;
- Risks that new community and social developments will not include elements tailored towards the requirements of Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transsexual (LGBT) people;
- New housing could potentially not be designed well for all stages of life, in particular older people (e.g. by the Lifetime Homes standard);
- Transport improvements may not directly improve access for the disabled;
- Gypsy and Traveller accommodation may not be directed to appropriate / more sustainable locations, with the potential to create greater inequalities;
- New housing development has the potential to increase disparity between the most and least deprived areas;

- New housing development has the potential to decrease accessibility into and through a development; and
- Risks that access improvements will not directly benefit those with disabilities.

Given high relative deprivation in the borough and the high importance of addressing equalities issues, the combined effects of the settlement hierarchy, Urban Extensions and policies are considered likely to be slightly beneficial in the short term (not necessarily benefiting the most deprived areas specifically), improving to moderately beneficial in the medium term and major beneficial in the long term as new developments become fully operational and accumulate. The certainty is low, because the interrelationship between new development and equality is complex and ever-changing, and therefore the long-term effects cannot be accurately predicted.

Summary of Residual Effects		
Short	Med.	Long
+	++	+++
Certainty:		L

19.2 IIA Recommendations

19.2.1 Further Mitigation to Reduce Risk or Enhance Opportunities

It is recommended that the LDF ensure robust and thorough application of Policy CS3 in particular, but also CS14, ensuring that new development proposals are directed to areas where services and facilities are needs, and that they consider the community service and facility needs of nearby areas. The future Sites and Policies DPD and other plans of the LDF should be consistent with these policies.

Policies on accessibility and provision of community facilities should be enhanced by future DPDs and SPDs to specify improved accessibility for the Gypsy and Traveller community to local services and facilities. It should be clarified how this might be viable and achievable, such as whether a borough-wide developer contribution is appropriate, or if their needs must be linked to specific locations for development.

The requirement for detailed masterplanning under Policy CS2 could be enhanced by requiring that such master plans demonstrate high-quality engagement with the public and the needs of surrounding neighbourhoods have been considered. Such master plans could be adopted as SPDs within Rotherham’s LDF, and subjected to Equalities Impact Assessment in accordance with legislation. This would improve community engagement, address this IIA’s residual risks and conclusions, and help ensure the views of hard-to-reach groups are taken into account.

Policy CS28 could require that the needs of neighbouring communities should be considered, with the aim of increasing equality more widely in the area. This could apply to transport infrastructure, as well as to greenspace, green infrastructure and any new services and facilities.

The future implementation of Policies CS23 and CS28, such as through future, more detailed policy in DPDs or SPDs, can be more specific about the types of community services and facilities which Rotherham needs, including (as applicable) midwifery care, mental health services, health visiting services and possibly baby-changing or

breast-feeding facilities in town and local centres. These detailed requirements should be developed in consultation with various stakeholders, including the NHS and the public. Reference should be made to Rotherham’s performance indicators for maternity and pregnancy.

Policies promoting enhancements to transport, public realm and the creation of high-quality places have the potential to be enhanced to include text relating to the provision of measures to improve access for the disabled.

The Core Strategy could include in policy (such as Policy CS16 or CS11 on sustainable design) reference to housing meeting the needs of people throughout their lifetimes. This can then be further elaborated upon by future DPDs and SPDs.

20 Conclusions and Supporting Detail

20.1 Summary of Mitigation Recommendations

The IIA has concluded that in the majority, the Core Strategy policies are capable of addressing all risks of negative sustainability impacts, and achieving net benefits. The following improvements have been recommended and are being incorporated into the LDF in the following ways.

Table 20-1: How IIA Policy Recommendations are Being Addressed by the LDF

Key IIA Recommendations	How Addressed by the LDF
Incorporate access for disabled people and meeting the needs of those with mobility issues into policy.	This is covered by other legislation and will therefore not be covered by a specific LDF Policy, however the issue will be addressed in the supporting text to Policy CS13 to make this clear
Escalate the transfer of freight to rail and canal as the priority over strategic road development in Policy CS22.	Not considered feasible. Whilst this might be a long-term aspiration of the LDF, it is not realistic to achieve the infrastructure improvements required to ignore other modes of transport.
Policy CS15 could aim to increase and improve health facilities in Rotherham Town Centre	This will be incorporated into Core Strategy policy.
Place additional emphasis on ‘secured by design’ principles within policy	This will be incorporated into Core Strategy policy.
Incorporate the protection and enhancement of water quality into Policy CS26.	This will be incorporated into Core Strategy policy.
Policy on sustainable design should address efficient use of natural resources including waste, soil, minerals, aggregates, energy, water, land (including high-quality agricultural land) and other raw materials. This should at least be mentioned, even if mainly addressed by other DPDs and SPDs.	This is largely already covered by the proposed Core Strategy policies or included within supporting text. However further consideration will be given to addressing any gaps identified.
Policy on sustainable design should	Consideration will be given to incorporating

Key IIA Recommendations	How Addressed by the LDF
<p>address waste management, such as incorporation of waste segregation and collection facilities into design.</p>	<p>these issues into LDF Policy although it is noted that the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide (which we may adopt as SPD) has a section (N3.7) that deals specifically with waste recycling and collection. Better Places to Work (currently Best Practice Guidance, 2002) has a section (5.7) which talks about waste stores as an integral design feature. Justification text to Policy CS11 mentions BREEAM and whilst not explicitly stated in the justification, one of its performance indicators includes waste.</p>
<p>There should be a policy which requires detailed Agricultural Land Classification assessment of sites in Grade 2 or 3 agricultural land, to inform development and minimise the loss of 'best and most versatile' soils (Grades 1, 2 and 3a).</p>	<p>Consideration of agricultural Land Classification has been taken into account in the consideration of new sites for development. This will be incorporated into Core Strategy policy.</p>
<p>Policy CS24 could be enhanced to include protection of designated geological sites in Rotherham.</p>	<p>Part b of this policy is already considered to cover geological sites therefore the supporting text will be amended to make this clear.</p>
<p>The requirement for detailed masterplanning under Policy CS2 could be enhanced by requiring that such master plans demonstrate high-quality engagement with the public and that local community views and comments have been taken into account.</p> <p>Such master plans could be adopted as SPDs within Rotherham's LDF, and subjected to Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment in accordance with legislation (as well as HIA and EqIA if desired). This would improve community engagement, address this IIA's residual risks and conclusions, and help ensure consistency with the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Detailed masterplanning is referred to in the reasoned justification to this policy, and further consideration will be given to taking forward the preparation of master plans to guide future development opportunities in the broad locations and on other large sites.</p> <p>Consideration will also be given to developing an appropriate policy to cover this issue in greater detail in the preparation of the Sites and Policies DPD. Whilst Sustainability Appraisal is not always a statutory requirement in the preparation of an SPD, consideration will be given to the need to undertake this work.</p>
<p>It would be valuable for Policy CS23 to require developers to adhere to 'secured by design' principles.</p>	<p>Consideration will be given to this matter and further research undertaken before finalising the most appropriate way forward on this issue.</p>
<p>Policies on accessibility and provision of community facilities should be enhanced by future DPDs and SPDs to specify improved accessibility for the Gypsy and Traveller community to local services and facilities. It should be clarified how this might be viable and achievable, such as whether a borough-wide developer contribution is appropriate, or if their needs must be linked to specific locations for development.</p>	<p>Consideration will be given to taking this forward through the preparation of further DPDs and SPDs, including the preparation of appropriate policies to be included within the upcoming Sites and Policies DPD.</p>
<p>The future implementation of Policies CS23 and CS28, such as through future, more detailed policy in DPDs or SPDs, can be more specific about the types of community services and facilities which</p>	<p>Consideration will be given to researching this issue further to determine the spatial implications of the proposals and to consider how appropriate it is to reference and manage this issue, within any future DPDs and SPDs.</p>

Key IIA Recommendations	How Addressed by the LDF
<p>Rotherham needs, including (as applicable) midwifery care, mental health services, health visiting services and possibly baby-changing or breast-feeding facilities in town and local centres. These detailed requirements should be developed in consultation with various stakeholders, including the NHS and the public. Reference should be made to Rotherham’s performance indicators for maternity and pregnancy.</p>	
<p>Policy CS28 could require that the needs of neighbouring communities should be considered, with the aim of increasing equality more widely in the area. This could apply to transport infrastructure, as well as to greenspace, green infrastructure and any new services and facilities.</p>	<p>Once an appropriate over-arching strategic policy is in place and an Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been prepared, then the appropriateness of any future developer contributions to delivering infrastructure will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Developer contributions are sought at the planning application stage to meet the needs arising from any new development or to compensate for any adverse impact of the development on local amenity or resource. Further preparation of the policy will be informed by an assessment of existing capacity and demand for new infrastructure within local communities.</p>
<p>The Core Strategy could include in policy (such as Policy CS16 or CS11 on sustainable design) reference to housing meeting the needs of people throughout their lifetimes. This can then be further elaborated upon by future DPDs and SPDs.</p>	<p>Within the reasoned justification to Policy CS11, reference is made to requiring a proportion of new homes to be built to Lifetime Homes standards. Consideration will be given as to whether there is a need to further elaborate on this policy and to including further policies in any future Sites and Policies DPD or SPDs.</p>

20.2 Summary of Monitoring Recommendations

Table 21-3 below summarises the IIA (and statutory SEA) monitoring recommendations specific to the Core Strategy.

Table 20-2: Recommendations for IIA Monitoring

IIA Topic	Baseline Indicators	Additional Indicators to Monitor Significant Risks and Opportunities
<p>Economy and Employment</p>	<p>Gross Value Added (GVA) and GVA per head Number of companies in Rotherham with an Environmental Management System Percentage of people of working age in work Percentage of children and all working age people living in workless households Investment relative to GDP: (i) total investment and (ii) social investment</p>	<p>Location of jobs in proximity to residents Number of vacant businesses in town and local centres Number of new retail and other commercial developments approved</p>

IIA Topic	Baseline Indicators	Additional Indicators to Monitor Significant Risks and Opportunities
	Diversity of economic sectors represented	
Transport	<p>No. and length of congested road routes (AM and PM peak times)</p> <p>Patronage levels of rail and bus services</p> <p>'Standing room only' time on rail and bus services</p>	<p>No. new developments approved contrary to highways officer advice</p> <p>Number of developments within 1 km of motorway / trunk road junctions</p> <p>Number of developments sited so as to reduce the need to travel (proximity to services and facilities)</p> <p>Number of developments supported by high-quality inter-settlement bus, train or other public transport routes</p> <p>% of trips (by journey type) per person by transport mode: walking and cycling, private motor vehicles, and public transport and taxis</p>
Education and Skills	<p>Percentage of people aged 19-21 with at least an NVQ level 2 qualification or equivalent</p> <p>Percentage of adults engaged in adult education activities</p> <p>Level of literacy in adult population</p> <p>Level of numeracy in adult population</p> <p>Number of adults completing courses at adult education centres in Rotherham</p>	<p>Proportion of people aged 16-74 within 30, 60 and 90 minute travel time thresholds of education / further education facilities by public transport and car</p> <p>Percentage of schools which are over-capacity</p>
Health and Well-Being	<p>Proportion of households not living within 300m of their nearest natural green space</p> <p>Proportion of households within agreed walking/cycling distance of key health services</p> <p>Life expectancy and healthy life expectancy for men and women, or % with a disability or long-term, limiting illness</p> <p>Death rates from circulatory disease and cancer for people under 75 years</p> <p>Prevalence of obesity in 2-10 year olds</p> <p>How children get to school walking and cycling, private motor vehicles and public transport and taxis</p>	<p>Proportion of households within 30, 60 and 90 minute travel time thresholds of key services and facilities, such as pharmacies, GP surgeries and/or hospital</p> <p>Capacity of (or waiting times at) GP surgeries / health centres</p> <p>Number of trips per person by transport mode: walking and cycling, private motor vehicles, and public transport and taxis</p>

IIA Topic	Baseline Indicators	Additional Indicators to Monitor Significant Risks and Opportunities
Biodiversity	<p>Status of over-wintering Golden Plover</p> <p>Status of BAP priority species</p> <p>Status of BAP priority habitats</p> <p>% BAP habitats and species as stable or increasing</p> <p>Achievement against national and local BAP targets</p> <p>% of SSSIs by land area in favourable or 'favourable recovering' condition</p> <p>Proportion (%) of designated LWSs in positive management</p> <p>Proportion of land managed as areas for carbon sequestration (e.g. woodland management)</p>	<p>Number of development schemes which are supported by detailed over-wintering bird analysis in Golden Plover habitat areas (Todwick, North Kiveton, Treeton Dyke, Thrybergh-Kilnhurst and West Melton-Old Moor)</p> <p>Area of greenspace and new green infrastructure provided by developments from the LDF</p> <p>Area of other new habitats provided by developments from the LDF</p> <p>Number of developments with adverse effects on designated sites</p> <p>Number of developments in designated sites</p> <p>Proportion of development on greenfield sites</p> <p>Proportion of development on brownfield sites</p> <p>Proportion of new development in wildlife corridors</p>
Pollution and Emissions	<p>Number and extent of AQMAs in Rotherham</p> <p>Number and extent of AQMAs along key inter-borough routes surrounding Rotherham</p> <p>Area of sensitive habitats exceeding critical loads for acidification and eutrophication measured as (i) acidity and (ii) nutrient nitrogen</p> <p>Annual emissions of greenhouse gases (by sector)</p> <p>Rotherham's domestic energy consumption</p>	<p>Number of developments within 1 km of motorway / trunk road junctions</p> <p>Number of developments sited so as to reduce the need to travel (proximity to services and facilities)</p> <p>Number of developments supported by high-quality inter-settlement bus, train or other public transport routes</p> <p>Number of developments along AQMA road routes (e.g. routes likely to be used by new residents)</p> <p>Number of developments likely to contribute to increased levels of UK national air quality pollutants (other than transport)</p>
	<p>Proportion of alternatively fuelled vehicles in the borough</p> <p>Number of sites being used to assist in climate mitigation and adaptation, e.g. soft flood defences</p> <p>Homes installing microrenewables</p> <p>The percentage of river lengths of good chemical or biological quality</p> <p>Percentage of waters restored to Good Ecological Status</p>	<p>No. planning applications for renewable micro-renewables and successful installations</p> <p>Number of installed megawatts of renewable energy capacity</p> <p>Average Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) rating of housing</p> <p>% developments with Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)</p> <p>Percentage of housing stock meeting particular CfSH and BREEAM standards</p>

IIA Topic	Baseline Indicators	Additional Indicators to Monitor Significant Risks and Opportunities
	<p>Number of substantiated water pollution incidents</p> <p>Percentage of developments in Rotherham with Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)</p>	<p>Percentage of offices, retail and industrial buildings meeting BREEAM standards</p> <p>Number of new developments built to achieve carbon neutrality</p>
Flood Risk	<p>Number of incidents of buildings flooded by coastal, fluvial and drainage sources</p> <p>Proportion of transport network protected against future flood risk</p>	<p>Percentage of new development permitted in floodplains</p> <p>Number of developments built contrary to EA advice</p> <p>Households registered for flood warnings as a percentage of total number of households at risk of flooding</p>
Natural Resources (Other than Fossil Fuels)	<p>Per capita consumption of water</p> <p>Area where there is an unsustainable abstraction from groundwater</p> <p>Area where there is an unsustainable abstraction from surface waters</p> <p>% recycling/composting borough-wide</p> <p>Waste arisings by sector</p> <p>Waste arisings by disposal</p> <p>Total (i) household waste and (ii) household waste recycled or composted per person per year (kg)</p> <p>Proportion of construction and demolition waste that is re-used and recycled</p>	<p>Number of grey water recycling schemes</p> <p>Number of new developments incorporating waste segregation / collection facilities into design</p> <p>Proportion of aggregates used from secondary and recycled aggregates</p> <p>Number of buildings meeting particular CfSH and BREEAM standards</p>
Townscape	<p>No. and extent of distinct (not conjoined) settlements by type (e.g. small village, large village, town)</p> <p>% of residents who are satisfied with their area as a place to live</p> <p>No. of TPO trees</p>	<p>Number of development schemes accompanied by detailed master plans and public realm design</p> <p>Number of developments approved without townscape conditions</p> <p>Net addition / loss of TPO trees to new development</p>
Soil, Land Use and Geology	<p>Area of ALC Grade 2 and 3 land in Rotherham</p> <p>Area of ALC Grade 4 and 5 land in Rotherham</p> <p>Number and extent of RIGS sites in Rotherham</p>	<p>Percentage of new houses built on previously developed land per year</p> <p>Area of soil lost to impermeable surfaces</p> <p>Area of contaminated land remediated</p> <p>Area of proposed new development on greenfield sites</p> <p>Number of developments approved within or adjacent to RIGS sites</p>
Housing	<p>Proportion of Local Authority homes which are non-decent</p> <p>Proportion of outstanding unfit private sector dwellings</p>	<p>No. housing completions and demolitions</p> <p>% housing mix by size / tenure</p>

IIA Topic	Baseline Indicators	Additional Indicators to Monitor Significant Risks and Opportunities
	Numbers on Local Authority waiting list Number of rough sleepers Number of households in temporary accommodation Average house price	Affordable housing completions
Landscape	% of Landscape Character Areas needing character reconstruction, restoration or improvement Hectares of land given over to development (not only LDF) each year Percentage of borough covered by Areas of High Landscape Value	Number of development schemes accompanied by detailed landscape design and improvements Number of developments built contrary to Natural England advice Number of developments approved without landscape / townscape conditions
Historic Environment Accessibility / Community Facilities	Number and extent of designated sites in the borough, including Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens and Conservation Areas Condition of designated sites, such as / including number of designated sites on the 'buildings at risk' register Percentage of residents who are satisfied with their area as a place to live. Number of day visitors to Rotherham Index of Multiple Deprivation 'geographical barriers' score	Number of Scheduled Monuments, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens and Conservation Areas subject to planning applications Number of archaeological sites identified / discovered through planning proposals (Also number adversely affected) Number of designated sites adversely affected by planning proposals by type Number of designated sites on the 'buildings at risk' register which are at risk of harm from air pollution Proportion of households within 30, 60 and 90 minute travel time thresholds of key services and facilities, such as corner shops, supermarkets, post offices, pharmacies and doctor and/or hospital
Population and Equality	Population and population of working age Population age profile Ethnic diversity Percentage of young people remaining or returning to Rotherham to live and work Number of complaints about poor access to services and facilities Number of complaints about highway (e.g. footpath) accessibility from disabled persons Index of Multiple Deprivation overall score	Number of accessibility and community infrastructure / service / facility complaints pertaining to new developments

20.3 Next Steps

The IIA Report and this Non-Technical Summary will be consulted upon with the statutory consultees and the public (along with other stakeholder organisations) alongside the draft Core Strategy. Consultation is an important part of developing the Core Strategy and carrying out the assessment. Following this, all responses received will be collated and incorporated as appropriate into our decision-making for finalising the Core Strategy. The consultation on the Core Strategy is running concurrently, and you can provide feedback on the Core Strategy as well as the IIA Report.

After adoption of the Core Strategy, an SEA Statement must be produced in order to document how the IIA / SEA and consultation on the IIA has influenced the development of the Core Strategy. It will also set out the final monitoring commitments. This will be done at the earliest practicable opportunity upon adoption of the Core Strategy.

Appendix A Abbreviations

PCPA	Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
AAP	Area Action Plan
ALC	Agricultural Land Classification
BME	Black and Minority Ethnic
CLG	(Department of) Communities and Local Government
DGQ	Decision Guiding Question
DPD	Development Plan Document
EqIA	Equalities Impact Assessment
GAT	RMBC Rapid G eneral A ppraisal T ool
GIS	Geographic Information System
HIA	Health Impact Assessment
IIA	Integrated Impact Assessment
LCA	Landscape Character Assessment / Area
LDF	Local Development Framework
LLSOA	Lower-Level Super Output Area
ODPM	Office Deputy Prime Minister
RIGS	Regionally Important Geological (and Geomorphological) Site
RMBC	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
RSS	Regional Spatial Strategy
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SEA	Strategic Environment Assessment
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
UDP	Unitary Development Plan

