



Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan

Proposed Modifications

Sustainability Appraisal
(of Proposed Modifications to the Revised
Deposit Draft)

September 2006

Sustainability Appraisal of Proposed Modifications to Herefordshire UDP

CONTENTS

PART A – GENERAL APPROACH

Page

1. Introduction

1

Purpose of report

1

Scope of Sustainability Appraisal for Proposed Modifications to UDP

1

Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

1

Variation of methodology from earlier stages

1

PART B – APPLICATION TO PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

2

2. Stage 5 – Proposed Modifications (September 2006), Policy Changes

2

Policy impact matrices

2

Impact summaries (by topic chapter)

2

3. Stage 5 – Appraisal of Proposed Significant Modifications

6

Introduction

6

Findings (by topic chapter)

6

Strategic overview on the Plan's sustainability level

9

4. Conclusions

9

Appendices:

10

1. Sustainability criteria for Proposed Modifications stage of UDP

10

2. Impact matrices for UDP policies and proposals

12

References

34

PART A – GENERAL APPROACH

1. Introduction

Purpose of report

- 1.1 This report forms a further key stage in the overall sustainability appraisal of the UDP. Previous stages have dealt with the strategic development options (stage 1), site proposals (stage 2), the policies and proposals embodied in the Deposit Draft UDP (stage 3) and revisions to the deposit draft (stage 4). It assesses the sustainability impacts of the proposed modifications to the Revised Deposit UDP following directly from the Inspectors Report (March 2006) into the UDP Public Inquiry held in 2005. It should be read in conjunction with the Proposed Modifications and Statement of Decisions and Reasons report.

Scope of Sustainability Appraisal for Proposed Modifications to UDP

- 1.2 At this stage of the appraisal report only the significant changes in the Proposed Modifications to the Revised Deposit UDP have been assessed, together with any cumulative effects or repercussions of the changes on the overall sustainability of the Plan. It may therefore need to be read in conjunction with some parts of previous stage reports appraising the Deposit Draft UDP. The general background in Part A of the September 2002 stage report – dealing with the Agenda 21 framework, application of sustainability in the UDP, plus the methodology – is common to all of the appraisal stages in the UDP and is not repeated in this update. However, the policy impact matrices in Part B are shown again in full for all policies; only those modifications that show significant changes, either positive or negative to planning policies or are important for the understanding of the policy in the pre-text are highlighted. Therefore, like previous reports, any variations in sustainability ratings can be contrasted against cases where there are no variations.

Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

- 1.3 Since the Deposit Draft UDP was published in September 2002, the Government has been developing further guidance on sustainability appraisals and strategic environmental assessment (SEA), in furtherance of the European Directive 2001/42/EC on SEAs. Initial guidance emerged in Autumn 2002, further practical guidance on its application in planning authorities in October 2003, and topic-based guidance emerged during 2004 (guidance on SEAs in transport planning was published for consultation in January 2004). Furthermore, a consultation document on the draft regulations for implementation of the directive was issued by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), (now the DCLG – Department for Communities and Local Government) in February 2004. The SEA approach came into force in July 2004. [A report on the implications of the Autumn 2002 ODPM guidance for the UDP was presented to the Council's Planning Committee on 10th January 2003.]
- 1.4 The SEA Directive applies to plans whose formal preparation began after 21st July 2004 and also to those already in preparation by that date, but which would not be adopted by 21st July 2006. The UDP was started in 1998 and should be adopted in Spring 2007 and therefore is subject to the SEA Directive. However, although the UDP does fall within the remit of the SEA Directive and Regulations, the Council made a formal determination in December 2005 under Regulation 6 of these that, to carry out an SEA of the UDP was not feasible. The considerations regarding the strategic environmental assessment of the UDP can be viewed on the Forward Planning pages of the Council's web site at www.herefordshire.gov.uk.

Variation of methodology from earlier stages

- 1.5 For consistency with the earlier stages of appraisal, the overall methodology has been maintained. However, as this stage applies only to the proposed modifications, the presentation of the policy impact matrices differs in that, while all the rows giving the individual policy appraisals are shown, those policies and proposals that have had an additional sustainability appraisal carried out on them, are highlighted with grey tone. The sustainability criteria used for the approach are unchanged from previous appraisals but are included in Appendix 1 for reference.

PART B – APPLICATION TO PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS

2. Stage 5 – Proposed Modifications (September 2006) – Policy Changes

Policy impact matrices

- 2.1 The established sustainability criteria and impact matrix methodology from previous stages has been applied to the Proposed Modifications to the UDP policies. As before, the impact matrices each cover one major topic in the UDP and the broad findings are described here. Section 3 analyses those identified as significant in more detail.
- 2.2 Although a relatively large number of policies and proposals have been modified, including modifications to the proposal maps, the extent of these modifications are often minor (e.g. factual updates and word changes) and imply no or only minor detectable change to the sustainability ratings. Even where the policy modification is significant, the effect on sustainability ratings may or may not be affected. Furthermore, where ratings are already high (either << or >>), policy modification in the same sustainability direction (lower or higher) clearly cannot register any change in the rating. The analysis that follows highlights those policies that have had a sustainability appraisal review (including the review of associated proposal maps) in light of the Proposed Modifications. This review may not have changed the overall sustainability of the policy from previous stages, however is considered significant enough, in terms of the overall Plan, to be analysed. Appendix 2 details the Policy Impact Matrix.

Impact summaries (by topic chapter)

Topic – Development requirements – Flood Risk (Chapter 4)

- 2.3 The only modification proposed in this chapter relates to the flood risk policy DR7, which now has added text that tightens the requirements of developers in terms of flood prevention measures, with the likes of early Environment Agency involvement and flood risk assessment. There is also an element of strengthening the policy wording for greater clarity. These modifications do not however alter the overall impact of this policy on the sustainability criteria. It may be possible that these improvements do provide an increased cumulative positive impact on development and associated issues.

Topic – Housing (Chapter 5)

- 2.4 The housing policy modifications relate to:
- Updated and increased housing targets and provision resulting from the Inspector's recommendations, recent planning appraisals and the rejection of the Inspector's recommendation in respect of Bullinghope, policy S3
 - Settlement boundary updates for policy H1
 - Word changes for greater clarity to policy H2 supporting text
 - Reinstatement of housing allocation, Land at Holmer to policy H2
 - Deletion of policy H3 and paragraphs 5.4.32 to 5.4.36
 - Reconfiguration of factual data in supporting text and deletion of some wording to policy H4
 - Strengthening of supporting text to policy H5 with particular regard to recreational facilities
 - Reconfiguration of factual data in supporting text to policy H6
 - Alteration of policy H7 wording for greater clarity
 - Alterations to wording regarding the density of new housing in town centres to policy H15
 - Minor alteration of policy H16 wording and supporting text
 - Additional wording to policy H19 to strengthen open space requirements
- 2.5 The rejection of the Inspector's recommendation to delete Bullinghope, although not a modification, is mentioned here due to its overall impact on other policies and sustainability outcomes. The ratings for policy H2 Hereford City and the market towns: housing allocation have changed for four criteria, travel demand and distance; modal shift from cars; brownfield/Greenfield land and landscape character. The first three have had their sustainability ratings down graded slightly. However, the proposal will benefit economic and social aspects for example the criteria; regeneration; employment opportunities, housing need and social inclusion. This is discussed

further in Section 3 along with the identified significant modifications, from the list of modifications above, which have had a sustainability appraisal review. These include the Holmer reinstatement, policy H2 and the deletion of policy H3. Additionally, although the majority of the modifications listed have not been assessed as significant enough individually to mention in Section 3, collectively these modifications will impact on the sequential approach due to the strengthening of policy wording, amongst other issues of sustainable development. The following paragraphs summarise those issues not identified as significant but considered necessary to be reviewed at a strategic level.

- 2.6 The Inspector in his report has stated that identified potentially suitable sites at Broomy Hill, Hereford; Land off Yazor Road and north of Whitecross School, Hereford; Land at Whitecross Road, Hereford; and Land at Merrivale, Ross-on-Wye will delay the adoption of the UDP, if considered for inclusion. Therefore he has supported the Council's decision not to allocate them in the UDP. They will be considered for inclusion as part of the forthcoming Local Development Framework. Importantly though, the Inspector recommends that these sites should count towards the strategic housing requirement and therefore are considered to have an impact on sustainability for the purposes of this review.
- 2.7 The Inspector has also increased the strength of the overall strategy of the Plan with regards to the location of development, confirming "The highest number of houses on allocated sites would be achieved in Hereford, then the market towns and finally the main villages." (Inspector's Recommendation 3.18/4)
- 2.8 This strengthening of the sequential approach is demonstrated by Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) 11 identifying "...Hereford as one of the five sub-regional foci where longer-term strategic development should be located" (Inspector's Recommendation 3.18/5). This further supports sustainability objectives by confirming, "...the market towns should not generally ... accommodate growth from the Major Urban Areas of the West Midlands..." (Inspector's Recommendation 3.18/5) and thereby also limiting rural growth to that required to meet local needs and/or support the retention of local services.
- 2.9 Modifications to policy H15 suggest some relaxation of the minimum densities in town centres and adjoining sites from at least 50 dwellings per hectare to between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare. This modification could potentially affect the balance of a range of environmental, social and economic criteria. This could be, for instance, through increased pressure on other sites if housing numbers are to be maintained. However, given the relatively small number of dwellings likely to be involved, these effects are minor and as such do not alter the sustainability ratings. Likewise, the addition of wording in respect to the character of an area informing the choice of density is not significant and does not alter the matrix ratings.

Topic – Employment (chapter 6)

- 2.10 The policy modifications relate to:
- Amendment to employment land requirement in policy S4
 - Deletion of Land at Chapel Road, Rotherwas from policy E1
 - Deletion of land north of the B4355, Kington (2.4ha) (including land west of Barton Lane 0.85ha) from policy E3
 - Deletion of sentence and addition of a new sentence to paragraph 6.4.29 regarding Model Farm, Ross-on-Wye, policy E3
 - Extension of Hereford settlement boundary to incorporate land west of Beech Business Park, Policy E3
 - Deletion of safeguarded employment land at land off Yazor Road and north of Whitecross School policy E5 to allow for potential residential development
 - Deletion of land at Whitecross Road for safeguarded employment land, policy E5 to allow for potential residential development
 - Addition of a new policy with regards to Military Developments, policy E17
- 2.11 The rejection of the Inspectors recommendation to delete employment land at Rotherwas supports the retention of the Bullinghope residential land, as outlined above, where there are clear transport and economic links furthering sustainability objectives. Other Modifications from the Inspector's Recommendations assessed as being significant, as listed above, are: the extension of the Hereford Settlement boundary to incorporate Beech Business Park, the deletion of land off Yazor road and north of Whitecross School and deletion of land at Whitecross Road, both for potential residential

development and the addition of policy E17 for Military Development. Collectively the implications of these modifications do have a significant impact on sustainability for employment purposes and indirectly on housing, although the sustainability ratings on the matrix remain unchanged. These main modifications are discussed further in Section 3.

Topic – Town centres and retail (Chapter 7)

- 2.12 The modifications here relate to:
- Addition of Barons Cross Road to list of local shopping centres in paragraph 7.3.2 for policy S5
 - Addition of Belmont to list of neighbourhood shopping centres in paragraph 7.3.2 for policy S5
 - Minor word alteration to policy TCR9 and supporting text
 - Minor amendment to wording of supporting text to policy TCR19R
 - Minor additional wording to policy TCR19R to broaden criterion 5 to include ground water
 - Additional wording to the end of several supporting text paragraphs with regards to the need for a flood risk assessment in accordance with policy DR7 and PPG25 to assist in delivering policies on the regeneration of Hereford and with particular reference to Edgar Street Grid, policies TCR19R – TCR26R
 - Additional supporting text and minor amendments to policy TCR22R
 - Deletion of supporting text and policy TCR24R
- 2.13 All of the modifications in the town centres and retail chapter are minor and as such are unlikely to affect the sustainability ratings of the matrix. As a result no reference is made to these modifications in the town centres and retail topic in Section 3. With regards to policy TCR24R mentioned above, the Inspector concluded that the concerns of the objectors, in his opinion, had been “considered as part of the development control process or have been overtaken by events” (Inspector’s report paragraph 7.27.4).

Topic – Transport (Chapter 8)

- 2.14 The policy modifications relate to:
- Deletion of Withington from policy T4
 - Minor wording amendments, for clarity, to supporting text of policy T7
 - Deletion of A49 Ross Road to A465 Abergavenny Road scheme from policy T10 and associated supporting paragraph 8.8.12
 - A new general paragraph on Hereford Outer Distributor Road, although not added to policy T10
 - Minor wording amendment to supporting text for policy T10
 - Deletion of paragraph 8.8.13 and amendment to paragraph 8.8.14 regarding A4103 Roman Road, Tillington Road – Stretton Sugwas, policy T10
- 2.15 None of the above modifications are significant enough to alter the overall sustainability ratings matrix and as such no further reference is made to these in the transport topic in Section 3. It is accepted however, that at a localised level the removal of the A49 to A465 road scheme will have an impact on sustainability. It is also noted in line with what the Inspector has concluded, that as a substitute for the A49 – A465, the Hereford Outer Distributor Road, will need to be considered for the future infrastructure of the City. However, as it is unlikely to be delivered in this plan period, it should not be linked to policy. This scheme maybe considered as part of the LDF process and as such will be subject to Development Plan Documents and associated Sustainability Appraisal in line with the SEA Directive.

Topic – Natural and historic heritage (Chapter 9)

- 2.16 The policy modifications relate to:
- Removal of reference to areas or landscapes least resilient to change in policy LA2 and associated paragraphs throughout the Plan and changes to paragraph 9.4.10 to clarify the approach to landscape character
 - Minor word alteration in policy LA2 and associated paragraph
 - Amend policy NC4 to clarify the policy, in particular in relation to mitigation and compensatory measures and linkages to other policies

- Removal of HBA9 designation at land west of Suckley Lane, Pembridge addition of HBA9 designation to run along the brook at land at Brookside, Cradley and removal of HBA9 designation from land between St Katherines and Huntingdon, Cradley

2.17 The most significant modifications here relate to policy LA2, NC4 and HBA9. Although significant modifications, it is not considered that they alter the sustainability ratings of the matrix. These policies are more site-specific and the sustainability of these is likely to alter at a more local level. It is likely that a site-specific sustainability appraisal may be necessary if an application is made affecting these particular areas to ensure that adverse impacts are avoided or where appropriate mitigated. Nevertheless these significant modifications are discussed further in Section 3.

Topic – Recreation, sport and tourism (Chapter 10)

2.18 The policy modifications relate to:

- Deletion of criterion 3 in policy RST13 with regards to future agricultural activities
- Additional criterion to policy RST14 with regards to flood plains

2.19 The modifications are generally minor in nature, although do have a clarifying and strengthening capacity to each of the policies concerned. No sustainability ratings have changed for policy RST13 although with the strengthening of the flood plain element of policy RST14, the rating has changed for the flood risk sustainability criteria from > to >> (moving marginally towards sustainability to moving significantly towards sustainability). Section 3 discusses this change in more detail with reference to the Inspectors Report.

Topic – Minerals (Chapter 11)

2.20 The policy modifications relate to:

- Amendments to primary and secondary constraints for minerals development for both supporting text and policy wording to policy M3, criteria for new aggregate mineral workings

2.21 The modification re-organises some of the constraints from primary to secondary and initially would appear to weaken the policy. However, with the addition of mitigation measures to a satisfactory level being expressed, the weakening is avoided. The sustainability rating of the criteria remains unchanged.

Topic – Waste (Chapter 12)

2.22 The policy modifications relate to:

- Amendments to primary and secondary constraints for waste developments for both supporting text and policy wording to policy W1, new waste management facilities

2.23 The modifications to policy W1 align this policy with M3 above, mainly by re-organising primary and secondary constraints into a more logical order and putting greater emphasis on the need for mitigation. This and the other minor modifications avoid any weakening of the policy through the clarification of the constraints listing order and therefore no alteration to the sustainability ratings is considered necessary.

Topic – Community facilities and services (Chapter 13)

2.24 The policy modifications relate to:

- Additional paragraph in policy CF2 regarding the use of sustainable foul drainage systems

2.25 The modification to incorporate the possibility of the use of sustainable foul drainage systems into developments, where the Environment Agency agree, will allow greater flexibility for applicants and developers. Generally it would be considered that sustainability ratings would have improved towards sustainability, however the ratings already given are appropriate for policy CF2 as a whole and therefore no change to the rating is considered necessary.

3. Stage 5 – Appraisal of Proposed Significant Modifications

Introduction

- 3.1 The established sustainability criteria and impact matrix methodology from previous stages have been applied to the Proposed Modifications. Section 3 expands on section 2 in relation to the policy based issues assessing the Inspectors comments and discusses those specific sites affected by the modifications. Any modifications to the proposal maps have been included in this assessment. Section 3 now outlines the sustainability implications of the modifications to the policies, proposals and specific sites, although it should be noted that few amendments to sustainability have been made. Only those identified in section 2 above that were considered significant (whether a sustainability rating has changed or not) are discussed here. The section concludes with a strategic overview of the Plan's sustainability level, noting any cumulative impacts of the policies.

Findings

Housing

Holmer reinstatement

- 3.2 When allocating housing in the early stages of the UDP process (Deposit Draft UDP), the Holmer site was identified as a greenfield extension of Hereford. It was later decided to delete this allocation. Subsequently, the Inspector has assessed objectors' views that the Holmer site is accessible in sustainability terms and as a result he has recommended the reinstatement of the Holmer site. The Inspector supports the scale of development; it is a well-contained site, seen in an urban context with its surroundings. In terms of sustainability at the Holmer site, the ratings have been maintained through specifying that important natural and semi-natural features are retained and even enhanced in the layout, that reasonably high density is sought (subject to amenity considerations), that accessibility by means other than the private car is strongly promoted, and that detailed design of schemes and individual dwellings meets a wide range of environmental criteria.

Bullinghope allocation

- 3.3 The Council has rejected the Inspector's recommendation that the Bullinghope allocation should be deleted. To ensure certainty that the overall strategic housing requirement will be delivered, given the proximity of the end of the Plan period (2011) and the fact that several allocated sites are yet to come forward, it is considered that an additional allocation is required. It is acknowledged that the release of both Holmer and Bullinghope will result in additional development on greenfield land, however, the environmental impacts of an additional housing development, will to a degree, be offset by further housing opportunities, greater housing choice and affordable housing. The Bullinghope site sustainability appraisal was carried out at the Revised Deposit Stage and therefore does not require a subsequent review. At the same time it is recognised that both sites serve to support Hereford's sub regional role and that the Bullinghope allocation will assist in the implementation of related employment and transport proposals.

Policy H3 – managing the release of housing land

- 3.4 The deletion of policy H3, and the supporting text has no implications for sustainability as the time period taken in producing the Plan has overtaken the policy aim of managing the release of land for housing over the remainder of the Plan period.

Employment

Safeguarded employment land

- 3.5 Land off Yazor Road and north of Whitecross School has been recommended for removal from policy E5 by the Inspector. In his reasoning he mentioned the need to get the balance between increasing housing need, particularly in Hereford City, to meet housing requirements of the Regional Spatial Strategy and readily available employment land. With the redevelopment of Edgar Street Grid he acknowledged the likely increased employment need here. Although the Inspector considers that there is ample land safeguarded for employment in Hereford (40% of supply

compared with 30% of housing). In drawing to his conclusion recommending the removal of safeguarding from land off Yazor Road he commented on the Faraday Road site and its ideal proximity to the Edgar Street Grid regeneration site and the location of Sun Valley rendering plant for the purposes of employment land. Furthermore, in his recommendation to remove the safeguarding from land North of Whitecross School that this location “does not have the same relationship with the city centre” and therefore both sites would be better “...allocat(ed) for residential purposes” (Inspector’s Report paragraph 6.43.4 – 6.43.6). These sites are not however to be allocated in the UDP, as this process could slow the adoption of the UDP.

- 3.6 Land at Whitecross Road has also been recommended for removal from safeguarded employment land, policy E5 for the same reasons of “competing merits of housing and employment uses” (Inspector’s Report paragraph 6.44.1), see paragraph 3.5 above.

Employment sites

- 3.7 Land west of Beech Business Park has been recommended by the Inspector to be included within the Hereford settlement boundary by means of an extension. This will allow for the expansion of a local business (Ravenhill Farm Services) under policy E6, to remain in Hereford rather than move to a neighbouring county, thereby safeguarding employment land under policy E5. The Inspector, in his conclusion does not consider that such action will materially affect “the character or appearance of the area” (Inspector’s Report paragraph 6.15.5). He further recommends that this should not lead to further expansion of the business park into open countryside but should enable “negotiated landscaping on the western boundary of the site” (Inspector’s Report paragraph 6.15.7). This extension to the settlement boundary is unlikely to have a significant impact on the sustainability rating. However, with improved local roads to the business park it could, in future, become a more desirable business location. If this situation prevails the employment policies of the Plan, should be strictly accorded with to ensure the least adverse environmental impacts.

New Policy – Military Development

- 3.8 The Inspector has recommended that a new policy at the end of the employment chapter be added under policy E17 for Military Development, at Sterling Lines, Credenhill. This addition is linked to the recommendation for the removal of reference to areas or landscapes least resilient to change, under policy LA2 (see section below on natural and historic heritage). With regards to land at Sterling Lines, Credenhill, recognition of the importance of the planned military development and the “atypical nature of the site in landscape terms” (Inspector’s Report paragraph 9.4.11) i.e. the national importance of the area, resulted in a new policy E17 being drafted. An appraisal of the impacts of the policy has been added to Appendix 2.

Allocated town centre and retail sites

- 3.9 As mentioned in section 2, none of the modifications for town centre and retail sites are significant and do not alter the sustainability ratings of the matrix and as such no further comments are made here.

Transport infrastructure schemes

- 3.10 As mentioned in section 2, none of the modifications for transport infrastructure schemes are considered significant and do not alter the sustainability ratings of the matrix and as such no further comments are made here.

Natural and historic heritage

- 3.11 The Inspector concluded that a great deal of confusion and misinterpretation surrounded policy LA2, and reference to land least resilient to change, and for this reason he recommends for this wording to be deleted from policy LA2. It could be argued that because policy LA2 has deleted reference to areas least resilient to change that a negative impact on the sustainability rating could have been assessed. However, with respect to the conclusions of the Inspector and the “continually misused and misunderstood” concept of the policy and the fact that other policies and legislation safeguard the countryside from development it is considered that there is no need to alter the sustainability matrix (Inspector’s Report paragraph 9.4.2).

- 3.12 The Inspector has accepted that clearer recognition is needed for policy NC4, sites of local importance, between the various levels of protection given to designated sites. The modification is accepted as clarifying and in some respects strengthening the policy in terms of mitigation and compensatory measures. However, no alteration to the sustainability matrix is considered necessary.
- 3.13 Policy HBA9 refers to the protection of open areas and green spaces. Modifications have been made with regards to land west of Suckley Lane, Pembridge; land at Brookside, Cradley; and land between St. Katherines and Huntingdon, Cradley. Firstly, land west of Suckley Lane, Pembridge, the Inspector concluded that the land was not particularly “valued locally” (Inspectors Report paragraph 9.44.2) or considered to be “an important open area or green space” (Inspectors Report Paragraph 9.44.2) and therefore the land was more appropriate for housing development opportunities. Secondly, land at Brookside, Cradley, the Inspector concluded that although the land was not suitable for development, the brook was ideal as a boundary to the policy HBA9 designation. Finally, land between St Katherines and Huntingdon, Cradley, the Inspector concluded that its removal from policy HBA9 is necessary as the area of land, although familiar to the residents of Cradley, does not over ride the suggestion of allocation under this policy. The area is considered to be more akin with the built development, however the Inspector does appreciate that other development constraints may exist in this particular area. It is considered that the addition and deletions of these sites from policy HBA9, although significant in themselves, has an overall neutral effect on the sustainability ratings of the matrix.

Recreation, sport and tourism

- 3.14 The Inspector concluded that criterion 3 of policy RST13 was not needed with regards to agricultural activities. He considered that the remaining criterion and the purpose of the policy, to ensure development in rural areas is appropriate in scale and does not harm the character of the countryside, was sufficient guidance to ensure that agricultural development would not be affected. This modification is not deemed significant enough to alter the sustainability rating.
- 3.15 However, the strengthening of policy RST14 for static caravans, chalets, camping and touring caravan sites, to add an additional criterion with regards to ensuring that all new developments are outside of the flood plain, does require a sustainability rating amendment. It has changed from > to >> (moving marginally towards sustainability to moving significantly towards sustainability) due to this strengthening of policy.

Minerals and waste

- 3.16 In the Inspector’s reasoning within policy M3 on the primary and secondary constraints listing, for minerals development, he considered that a “...logical ordering of the constraints” (Inspector’s Report paragraph 11.10.3) in terms of separating international, national and regionally important issues (deemed to be primary constraints) from those of a lesser regional or local importance (i.e. secondary constraints) will assist in clarifying the policy and complying with government guidance. This accepted modification has not had an impact on the sustainability rating because of additional wording with regards to mitigation. In the policy this allows for secondary constraints to be satisfactorily mitigated against and in some circumstances could enable the improvement of some sites or species of local importance, ancient semi-natural woodland or access roads; for example.
- 3.17 The Inspector concluded that clarification was needed with regards to mitigation measures, if the application was to affect one or more primary constraints. If so, reference should be made to mitigation being required for both primary and secondary constraints. Similarly with policy M3 above, the Inspector did not consider that a weakening of the policy would result from the distinction between internationally, nationally and regionally important sites and species than those from lesser regional or local importance and as such recommended the amendment to the list of primary and secondary constraints, in both the supporting text and policy wording. In addition this accords with government guidance and the Inspector’s comment that “The amended policy gives strong protection to land affected by secondary constraints, requiring adverse impacts on, for example people and communities and natural and cultural assets to be satisfactorily mitigated. Planning permission would be refused if satisfactory mitigation could not be achieved. In particular, adverse visual impact on landscape character would be a specific secondary constraint.” (Inspectors Report paragraph 12.2.6). Sustainability ratings have not been affected by these

modifications because the mitigation element has balanced out any sustainability issues relating to the reorganising of the constraints list.

Community facilities

- 3.18 The council seeks to avoid septic tank drainage in line with circular 3/99 and delivers foul drainage development through policy CF2. The Inspector considered that, although he accepted the council's view on this, that there was a place for "natural wastewater treatment system(s)" (Inspectors Report paragraph 13.2.1) in Herefordshire. "Their use would be consistent with policy S1 and the encouragement given to sustainable urban drainage systems for surface water." (Inspectors Report paragraph 13.2.1). This provides an alternative option, so long as the Environment Agency are in agreement with the treatment proposals. As an alternative option, the policy change does not significantly alter the sustainability rating.

Strategic overview on the Plan's sustainability level

- 3.19 As noted in the sustainability appraisal for the Deposit Draft UDP, identifying the interactions and cumulative impacts of all the policies and proposals in a policy document as diverse and complex as the UDP is not straightforward. Application of sustainability criteria at the outset and sustainability appraisals throughout the process cannot on its own ensure that the eventual site-based land use and development proposals that ensue from the policies are as sustainable as possible. Other factors in the UDP decision process may intervene, such as land availability, deliverability, political preferences, etc. The resultant changes to the Plan are therefore a composite of policies and proposals with variable sustainability ratings. To a degree, the outcome represents a statement of the best possible scenario, taking into account all salient factors including the sustainability ratings.
- 3.20 Given the limited shift in the policies and proposals between the two versions of the Plan, the cumulative impacts on the overall sustainability rating of the Plan are not greatly different. The main modifications to the Plan include the reinstatement of the Holmer housing allocation and an agreement to include Bullinghope alongside this allocation, reduction in the employment land provision from 150ha to 100ha; the creation of a new Military Development policy at Sterling Lines Credenhill; the strengthening of policy RST14 in respect of chalets, caravan sites etc outside of flood plains; and strengthening of flood risk policy wording (policy DR7). Considering the cumulative impacts of these and all the modifications listed in section 2, allows a certain amount of positive recognition that with negotiation and consultation that further positive sustainable outcomes can be achieved. It is recognised that in terms of housing land allocations at Hereford, the inclusion of both Holmer and Bullinghope sites will alter the sustainability ratings. However, given Hereford's sub regional role, the wider impact of the inclusion of the two sites is not considered significant.

4. Conclusions

- 4.1 Generally speaking, the majority of the Proposed Modifications are minor amendments rather than radical modifications. Refinements to the sustainability criteria, relevant to the policies and proposals and to the Plan's overall context of sustainable development have been assessed and remain largely unchanged. Where a change has occurred it has been minor, for example from > to >> (marginally moving towards sustainability to moving significantly towards sustainability) or vice versa, from the previous stage. The Proposed Modifications have continued to incorporate recent government guidance, in the new generation of Planning Policy Statements and elsewhere, towards more sustainable approaches to some types of development.

APPENDIX 1 - Sustainability criteria for Proposed Modifications stage of UDP

[Note: This is unchanged from the version used in the Deposit Draft UDP and Revised Deposit Draft but is included for reference.]

STRATEGIC CRITERIA	CRITERIA USED IN APPRAISAL AT DEPOSIT DRAFT STAGE	DEFINITIONS AND EXPLANATORY NOTES ON POTENTIAL IMPACTS	CONDITIONS, QUALIFICATIONS
Travel, trips and modes	<p>Travel demand and distance</p> <p>Modal shift from cars</p>	<p>Assessing the degree to which new travel demand is generated or existing travel reduced, and the extent to which travel distances are increased or reduced.</p> <p>Assessing the degree to which travellers are encouraged to switch from car to bus, rail, walking or cycling.</p>	<p>Policies generally support reduction in travel need/demand and distance, but individual proposals may inevitably increase trip generation and distance, even with adequate provision for use of the more sustainable modes of transport.</p>
Resource efficiency and use (including energy).	<p>Energy or resource efficiency</p>	<p>Assessing the potential for reduced consumption or increased conservation of energy sources, or the potential for more efficient or less wasteful use of all kinds of resource assets (land, water, buildings, etc.).</p>	<p>In many cases of development, energy efficiency will refer mainly to increases/decreases in fossil fuel consumption for transport purposes.</p>
Land-based environmental assets	<p>Landscape character</p> <p>Landscape quality</p> <p>Design</p> <p>Wildlife & biodiversity</p> <p>Cultural heritage</p> <p>Open space and amenity</p>	<p>Assessing the potential for beneficial/adverse change to the character types, features, resilience, etc., as identified in the Herefordshire landscape character assessment.</p> <p>Assessing the potential for beneficial/adverse change to the recognised quality of particular landscape zones, e.g. AONBs, National Park, Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Assessing the likely contribution of design improvements to a development proposal.</p> <p>Assessing the potential impact on habitats (especially important designated ones) and on individual species (especially protected ones).</p> <p>Assessing the potential impacts on built heritage and archaeological remains, as well as history and culture in its more abstract sense.</p> <p>Assessing the quantitative levels of new open space (or the loss of existing open space), but also the more qualitative gain/loss of general amenity for neighbours.</p>	<p>The assessment seeks to be as objective as possible, i.e. without reference to the more subjective quality judgements about landscape value.</p> <p>Full impacts are unlikely to be gauged until detailed design proposals are prepared, but a policy may increase the likelihood of good design, for instance by requiring the submission of design statements.</p> <p>Impacts will tend to be site-specific, possibly affecting surrounding areas.</p>
Resource impacts	<p>Brownfield/ greenfield land.</p>	<p>Assessing the proportions of brownfield or greenfield land consumed by development proposals.</p>	<p>More pertinent to specific site proposals, where the extent of each can be measured.</p>

Resource impacts	Land and soil quality	Assessing impacts on land according to agricultural land classification, contamination, dereliction, etc.	More pertinent to specific site proposals, where the impact can be directly assessed.
	Water quality	Assessing impacts on water resources, including aquifers, watercourses, drinking water supplies, etc.	
	Air quality	Assessing impacts on air purity or impurity, largely through chemical/biological changes.	Likely impacts are better known where regular air quality monitoring occurs.
	Noise/intrusion	Assessing potential increases/decreases in noise levels, tranquillity, disturbance from human activity.	Relative to previous human activity on site. Generally assumed that new development will introduce new noise/intrusion, unless the previous activity was of a similar kind and intensity. Some developments may enable reduced noise elsewhere.
	Mineral reserves	Assessing impacts on known deposits of usable and workable minerals, whether or not preferred sites for extraction in current Minerals Plan.	
	Waste management	Assessing impacts on generation, disposal, recycling and other means of waste management, including waste water and sewage.	Presence or absence of mains sewerage, and its capacity to cater for new development, is a key factor.
Economic welfare and community regeneration	Regeneration	Assessing the contribution to regeneration of the economic, social and physical fabric of the community.	
	Employment opportunities	Assessing the potential gain/loss in jobs across all economic sectors.	
Community needs	Housing need	Assessing the contribution to provision of housing to meet identified need.	
	Social inclusion	Assessing the contribution to the provision of access for <u>all</u> social groups to new facilities and services.	Individual policies may apply to particular groups or all groups.
	Health	Assessing the contribution to better health, including through new health services and facilities.	
Settlements	Infrastructure capacity	Assessing impacts on provision of utility services, including the capability of utility providers to meet identified need.	Water supply and sewerage capacity likely to be key factors in development policies.

APPENDIX 2 – IMPACT MATRICES FOR UDP POLICIES AND PROPOSALS

The following matrices contain the revised sustainability appraisals for each individual policy (i.e. each row) in the Revised Deposit UDP. Those matrix cells containing policies, sustainability ratings and explanatory notes that have been modified in the Revised Deposit UDP are highlighted with grey tone. The notes column indicates the principal modifications to the policy and, where relevant, any resultant changes to the sustainability ratings. Modifications to policies will not necessarily lead to changes in sustainability ratings. Note also that some policy numbers and titles have changed from those in the Deposit Draft UDP.

HEREFORDSHIRE UDP – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

POLICY IMPACT MATRIX – DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA.> [receptors]	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity	EXPLANATORY NOTES
S2. Development requirements.	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	-	>>	>>	>>	
DR1. Design.	-	-	>>	-	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	-	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	-	-	-	-	>>	>>	
DR2. Land use and activity.	>>	>>	>>	-	-	-	>>	-	-	>>	>	-	-	-	-	>	>>	-	-	>	-	>	>>	-	
DR3. Movement.	>>	>>	>>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>	-	-	-	-	>>	>	-	-	>	-	>>	>>	-	
DR4. Environment.	>	>	>>	>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	-	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	-	-	-	-	>>	>>	
DR5. Planning Obligations.	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	
DR6. Water Resources.	-	-	>>	-	-	-	-	>>	-	-	-	-	-	>>	>	-	-	>>	-	-	-	-	>>	>	
DR7. Flood risk.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>	>	>>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>	>	Strengthening of preliminary text and policy clarification. Impact unchanged.
DR8. Culverting.	-	-	-	-	>	>	-	>	-	>	-	-	-	>>	>>	-	-	>	-	-	-	-	-	>	
DR9. Air quality.	>	>	>>	-	-	-	-	>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>>	-	>	-	-	-	-	>>	-	
DR10. Contaminated land.	-	-	>	>>	-	-	-	>	-	-	>	-	>>	>>	-	-	-	>>	-	-	-	-	>>	>	
DR11. Soil quality.	-	-	>	>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>>	>	>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>	-	
DR12. Hazardous substances.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>>	>>	-	>>	-	>	-	-	-	-	>>	-	

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA.> [receptors]	POLICY OR PROPOSAL																					EXPLANATORY NOTES			
	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift t from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need		Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity
DR13. Noise.	i	i	i	i	i	v	v	v	v	v	i	i	i	i	i	v	v	i	i	i	i	i	v	i	
DR14. Lighting.	i	i	v	i	v	v	v	v	i	v	i	i	i	i	v	i	i	i	i	i	v	v	v	i	

SUSTAINABILITY RATINGS:			
<<	Moving significantly away from sustainability.	<	Moving marginally away from sustainability.
>>	Moving significantly towards sustainability.	v	Moving marginally towards sustainability.
0	No effect or neutral net effect.	i	Criterion not applicable.
?	Impact unknown (or data not available).		

HEREFORDSHIRE UDP – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

POLICY IMPACT MATRIX – HOUSING

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA...> [receptors]	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity	EXPLANATORY NOTES
S3. Housing.	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	vv	vv	vv	v	v	v	^	^	v	-	vv	vv	vv	v	v	Updated housing targets, increased provisions and rejection on Inspector's recommendation regarding Bullinghope. Matrix for Strategy policy remains unchanged, however policy H2 ratings have been affected.
H1. Hereford City and the market towns: settlement boundaries and established residential areas.	vv	vv	vv	v	v	vv	v	v	v	v	vv	vv	vv	v	v	^	^	v	-	vv	vv	vv	v	v	Settlement boundary updates, ratings unchanged.
H2. Hereford City and the market towns: housing land allocation.	v	v	vv	v	^	vv	v	v	v	vv	vv	vv	vv	v	v	^	^	v	-	vv	vv	vv	v	v	Various changes, most significant being the release of additional Greenfield land (Bullinghope and Holmer). Ratings for travel demand & distance, modal shift from cars, brownfield/Greenfield land and landscape character have changed.
H3. Managing the release of housing land.																									This policy has been deleted as phasing is not necessary.
H4. Main villages: settlement boundaries.	v	v	v	vv	v	v	v	v	v	vv	v	v	v	v	v	^	^	v	-	vv	vv	vv	v	v	Reconfiguration of data and deletion of some policy wording – ratings unchanged
H5. Main villages: housing land allocations.	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	vv	v	v	v	v	v	^	^	v	-	vv	vv	vv	v	v	Strengthening of policy wording regarding recreational facilities, ratings unchanged

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA..> [receptors]	POLICY OR PROPOSAL																				EXPLANATORY NOTES				
	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift t from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services		Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity
H6. Housing in smaller settlements.	0	<	<	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	<	>	>	>	0	0	>	-	<	>	>	>	0	Reconfiguration of data, ratings unchanged.
H7. Housing in the countryside outside settlements.	<	<	<	>	>	>	>	>	>	0	>	>	>	>	>	0	0	>	-	<	>	>	>	0	Alteration of policy wording for greater clarity, ratings unchanged.
H8. Agricultural and forestry dwellings associated with rural businesses.	>	<	0	>	>	>	>	>	>	0	>	>>	>	>	>	0	0	>	-	<	>>	>	>	?	
H9. Affordable housing.	>	>	>	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	>	>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>>	>>	>	?	
H10. Rural exception housing.	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	?	?	0	>	>	?	?	>	0	0	-	-	-	>>	>>	>	?	
H11. Residential caravans.	>	>	>	?	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	<	<	>	-	>	>>	>>	>	0	
H12. Gypsies and other travellers.	>	>	>	?	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	<	<	>	-	>	>>	>>	>	0	
H13. Sustainable residential design.	>	>>	>>	-	>	>	>>	>	>	>>	>	-	>	>>	>	>	>	>	-	-	-	-	>	>	
H14. Re-using previously developed land and buildings.	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	?	>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	-	-	>	?	
H15. Density.	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	?	?	?	>	-	-	-	-	<	<	>	-	-	>>	>>	<	?	Alteration of wording with regards to housing density in town centres, ratings unchanged.
H16. Car parking.	>	>	>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>	>	-	-	-	-	-	>	>	-	
H17. Sub-division of existing housing.	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	-	?	>	>>	-	-	-	<	<	-	-	-	>>	>>	0	?		

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA..> [receptors]	POLICY OR PROPOSAL																					EXPLANATORY NOTES			
	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need		Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity
H18. Alterations and extensions.	>	0	>	>	>	-	>>	-	>	>	>	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	>	>	>	0	
H19. Open space requirements.	>	>	>	-	>	-	>>	>	>	>>	>	-	-	-	-	>	>	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	-	Additional wording to strengthen open space requirements, ratings unchanged.

SUSTAINABILITY RATINGS:

<<	Moving significantly away from sustainability.	<	Moving marginally away from sustainability.	0	No effect or neutral net effect.
>>	Moving significantly towards sustainability.	>	Moving marginally towards sustainability.	-	Criterion not applicable.
				?	Impact unknown (or data not available).

HEREFORDSHIRE UDP – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

POLICY IMPACT MATRIX – EMPLOYMENT

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA...> [receptors]	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity	EXPLANATORY NOTES
S4. Employment.	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	=	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	=	>	=	=	>>	=	>	Amendment to employment land requirement, ratings unchanged
E1. Rotherwas Industrial Estate.	>	>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	=	>	=	=	>>	=	>	Deletion of Chapel Road, Rotherwas, ratings unchanged
E2. Moreton-on-Lugg Depot	>	>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>>	>	>	=	>	=	=	>>	=	>	
E3. Other employment land allocations.	>	>	0	>	>	>	>	>	>	0	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	=	=	=	=	>>	=	>	Various minor wording alterations to land allocated for employment, ratings unchanged.
E4. New employment land allocations.																									Deleted in Revised Deposit
E5. Safeguarding employment land and buildings.	>	>	>	>>	>	>	0	>	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	0	0	=	=	=	=	>>	=	>	Land off Yazor Road, north of Whitecross School and land at Whitecross Road deleted, ratings unchanged.
E6. Expansion of existing businesses.	>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	0	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	=	=	=	=	>>	=	>	
E7. Other employment proposals in Hereford and the market towns.	>	>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	=	=	=	=	>>	=	>	
E8. Design standards for employment sites.	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>>	>	>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	=	=	=	>	>>	>>	
E9. Home based businesses.	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	=	=	=	>	>	=	>	

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA..> [receptors]																					EXPLANATORY NOTES				
	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services		Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity
E10. Employment proposals within or adjacent to main villages.	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	-	-	>>	-	>	
E11. Employment in the smaller settlements and open countryside.	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	-	-	>>	-	>	
E12. Farm diversification.	>	>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	-	-	>>	-	>	
E13. Agricultural and forestry employment.	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	-	-	>>	-	>	
E14. Conversion of country houses to offices.	<	>	<	>	>	>	>>	>	>>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	<	-	-	-	-	>>	-	>	
E15. Protection of greenfield land.	-	-	>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	-	-	-	-	>	-	-	
E16. Intensive livestock units.	<	0	<	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	-	-	-	>	-	>	
E17. Military developments	?	?	?	>	>	-	0	0	?	?	>	-	-	-	-	-	<	?	-	-	-	-	-	?	New policy

SUSTAINABILITY RATINGS:

<<	Moving significantly away from sustainability.	<	Moving marginally away from sustainability.	0	No effect or neutral net effect.
>>	Moving significantly towards sustainability.	>	Moving marginally towards sustainability.	-	Criterion not applicable.
				?	Impact unknown (or data not available).

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA...> [receptors]	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity	EXPLANATORY NOTES
S5. Town centres and retail.	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	>	-	>	-	>	Addition of Barons Cross as a listed local shopping centre and Belmont as a neighbourhood shopping centre, ratings unchanged
TCR1. Central shopping and commercial areas.	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	>	-	>	-	>	
TCR2. Vitality and viability.	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	>>	-	>>	>	>	
TCR3. Primary shopping frontages.	-	-	>	>	>	>	>>	-	>>	-	>>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TCR4. Secondary shopping frontages.	-	-	>	>	>	>	>>	-	>>	-	>>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TCR5. Use outside Class A of the Use Classes Order.	-	-	-	-	-	>	>	-	>>	-	>>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TCR6. Non-retail uses (Classes A2 and A3).	-	-	-	-	-	>	>	-	>>	-	>>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TCR7. Amusement centres.	-	-	-	-	-	>	>	-	>>	-	>>	-	-	-	-	-	>>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TCR8. Small-scale retail development.	-	-	>	>	>	>	>>	-	>>	-	>>	>	-	-	-	0	0	-	-	>	-	>	-	-	
TCR9. Large-scale retail development outside central shopping areas.	<	<	<	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	<	>>	>	>	>	<	<	>	-	>	-	>>	-	>	Minor word alterations, ratings unchanged

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA..> [receptors]	POLICY OR PROPOSAL																					EXPLANATORY NOTES			
	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift t from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need		Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity
TCR10. Office development.	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	-	v	vv	v	v	v	^	^	v	-	-	-	v	-	v	
TCR11. Loss of existing offices.	-	-	v	v	v	-	-	-	v	-	vv	vv	-	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	-	v	-	-	
TCR12. Commercial leisure.																									
TCR13. Local and neighbourhood shopping centres.	v	v	v	vv	v	v	v	v	v	-	vv	vv	v	v	v	v	v	-	-	vv	-	v	-	v	
TCR14. Village commercial facilities.	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	-	vv	v	v	v	v	v	v	-	-	v	-	v	-	v	
TCR15. Hot food take-away outlets.	-	<	<	?	v	v	v	v	v	-	v	v	v	v	v	<	<	-	-	-	-	v	-	v	
TCR16. Garden centres.	v	v	v	?	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	vv	v	v	v	<	<	-	-	-	-	v	-	v	
TCR17. Farm shops.	<	<	<	?	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	<	0	-	-	-	-	v	-	v	
TCR18. Petrol filling stations.	<	<	<	?	v	v	v	v	v	-	v	v	v	v	v	<	<	-	-	-	-	v	-	v	
TCR19R. Hereford Livestock Market – relocation.	<	<	<	?	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	vv	v	v	v	<	<	v	-	-	-	v	-	v	TCR19 was deleted and replaced with TCR19R (At Revised Deposit Stage). Minor word amendments, including reference to flood risk assessment, ratings unchanged.
TCR20R Eign Gate regeneration area.	vv	vv	vv	vv	v	v	v	v	<	v	vv	vv	v	v	v	v	<	v	-	v	v	v	-	v	TCR20 was deleted and replaced with TCR20R (At Revised Deposit Stage). Additional wording regarding flood risk assessment, ratings unchanged

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA.> [receptors]	POLICY OR PROPOSAL																				EXPLANATORY NOTES				
	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift t from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services		Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity
TCR21R. Canal basin and historic core.	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	0	0	-	-	>	-	>>	-	>	TCR21 was deleted and replaced with TCR21R (At Revised Deposit Stage).
TCR22R. Hereford United Football Club/Merton Meadow	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	0	0	-	-	>	>	>>	-	>	TCR22 was deleted and replaced with TCR22R (At Revised Deposit Stage). Additional supporting text wording and minor amendments to policy, ratings unchanged.
TCR23R. Civic quarter.	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	<	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	0	0	-	-	>	-	>>	-	>	TCR23 was deleted and replaced with TCR23R (At Revised Deposit Stage). This relates to Land at Commercial Road, TCR26R
TCR24R. Causeway Farm																									TCR24 was deleted and replaced with TCR24R (At Revised Deposit Stage). Policy deleted with supporting text, policy has been overtaken by events, ratings unchanged.
TCR25R. Land for retail warehousing	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>	0	0	-	-	-	>	>>	-	>	TCR25 was deleted and replaced with TCR25R (At Revised Deposit Stage).
TCR26R. Land at Commercial Road	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	<	>	>>	>>	>	>	>	0	0	-	-	>	-	>>	-	>	TCR26 was deleted and replaced with TCR26R (At Revised Deposit Stage).

SUSTAINABILITY RATINGS:			
<<	Moving significantly away from sustainability.	<	Moving marginally away from sustainability.
>>	Moving significantly towards sustainability.	>	Moving marginally towards sustainability.
0	No effect or neutral net effect.	-	Criterion not applicable.
?	Impact unknown (or data not available).		

HEREFORDSHIRE UDP – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

POLICY IMPACT MATRIX – TRANSPORT

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA...> [receptors]	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity	EXPLANATORY NOTES
T1 Public transport facilities	0	>>	>>	0	?	?	>	?	?	?	>	>	?	?	-	>	0	-	-	>	-	>	0	-	
T2 Park and ride	0	>	>	?	?	?	>	?	?	?	>	0	?	?	-	0	<	-	-	0	-	0	0	-	
T3 Protection & development of the rail network	0	>>	>>	>>	>	?	0	?	0	-	>	>	>	?	-	>	<	-	-	0	-	>	0	-	
T4 Rail freight	0	>>	>>	>>	>	?	0	?	0	-	>	>	>	?	-	>	<	-	-	0	-	0	0	-	Deletion of Withington, ratings unchanged.
T5 Safeguarding former railway land	0	>>	>>	>>	0	0	0	>	>	-	>	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	
T6 Walking	0	>>	>>	>>	0	0	>	0	>	>	>	0	0	0	0	>>	0	-	-	-	-	>>	>>	-	
T7 Cycling	0	>>	>>	>>	0	0	>	>	>	>	>	0	0	0	0	>>	0	-	-	-	-	>>	>>	-	Minor word amendments for clarity, ratings unchanged
T8 Road hierarchy	0	0	0	0	0	0	>	0	0	>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	
T9 Road freight	0	<	<	-	0	>	>	0	0	>	0	0	0	0	0	>	>	-	-	-	-	-	>>	-	
T10 Safeguarding of road schemes	0	<	<	<	<	<	0	<	<	<	>	>	?	0	?	<	<	-	-	-	-	0	>	-	Deletion of A49 to A465, deletion of and amendment regarding A4103 Roman Road, Stretton Sugwas and general amendments to wording, ratings unchanged.
T11 Parking provision	0	<	<	0	0	0	>	0	?	>	<	0	0	0	0	<	<	-	-	-	-	0	0	-	

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA..> [receptors]	POLICY OR PROPOSAL																					EXPLANATORY NOTES			
	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift t from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need		Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity
T12 Existing parking areas	0	>	>	>>	0	0	>>	0	>	>	>	>	0	0	0	>	>	-	-	-	>	0	>	-	
T13 Traffic management schemes	0	>	>	0	0	0	>>	0	0	>	>	0	0	0	0	>	>	-	-	-	-	>	>	-	
T14 School travel	>	>>	>>	0	0	0	>	0	0	>	0	0	0	0	0	>	>	-	-	-	-	>	>>	-	
T15 Air transport facilities	<	<	<	0	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	0	0	0	>	>	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	
T16 Access for all	0	>	>	0	0	0	>>	0	0	>	>	>	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	>>	>	-	

SUSTAINABILITY RATINGS:

<<	Moving significantly away from sustainability.	<	Moving marginally away from sustainability.	0	No effect or neutral net effect.
>>	Moving significantly towards sustainability.	>	Moving marginally towards sustainability.	-	Criterion not applicable.
				?	Impact unknown (or data not available).

HEREFORDSHIRE UDP – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

POLICY IMPACT MATRIX – NATURAL & HISTORIC HERITAGE

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA...> [receptors]	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity	EXPLANATORY NOTES
S7. Natural and historic heritage.	-	-	v	v	vv	vv	vv	vv	vv	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	-	v	-	-	v	v	-	
LA1. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	-	-	v	v	vv	vv	vv	vv	vv	v	vv	vv	v	v	v	v	v	-	v	-	-	v	v	-	
LA2. Landscape character.	-	-	v	v	vv	vv	vv	v	vv	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	-	v	-	-	v	v	-	Removal of reference to areas or landscapes least resilient to change, ratings unchanged.
LA3. Setting of settlements.	-	-	v	v	vv	vv	vv	v	vv	vv	v	v	v	v	v	v	v	-	v	-	-	v	v	-	
LA4. Protection of historic parks and gardens.	-	-	v	v	vv	vv	vv	vv	vv	vv	-	v	v	v	v	vv	v	v	-	-	-	vv	vv	-	
LA5. Protection of trees, woodlands and hedgerows.	-	-	v	v	vv	vv	vv	vv	vv	vv	-	v	v	v	v	vv	v	v	-	-	-	vv	vv	-	
LA6. Landscaping schemes.	-	-	v	v	vv	vv	vv	vv	vv	vv	v	-	v	v	v	v	v	-	-	-	-	v	v	-	
NC1. Nature conservation and development.	-	-	v	v	v	v	v	vv	v	v	-	-	vv	vv	v	vv	v	-	-	-	-	v	vv	-	
NC2. Sites of international importance.	-	-	v	v	v	v	v	vv	v	v	-	-	vv	vv	v	vv	v	-	-	-	-	v	vv	-	
NC3. Sites of national importance.	-	-	v	v	v	v	v	vv	v	v	-	-	vv	vv	v	vv	v	-	-	-	-	v	vv	-	
NC4. Sites of local importance.	-	-	v	v	v	v	v	vv	v	v	-	-	vv	vv	v	vv	v	-	-	-	-	v	vv	-	Policy clarification and amendment in relation to mitigation and compensation, ratings unchanged.

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA.> [receptors]	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift t from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity	EXPLANATORY NOTES
NC5. European and nationally important species.	-	-	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>	>	-	-	>>	>>	>	>>	>	-	-	-	-	>	>>	-	
NC6. Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats and species.	-	-	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>	>	-	-	>>	>>	>	>>	>	-	-	-	-	>	>>	-	
NC7. Compensation for loss of biodiversity.	-	-	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>	>	-	-	>>	>>	>	>>	>	-	-	-	-	>	>>	-	
NC8. Habitat creation, restoration and enhancement.	-	-	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>	>	-	-	>>	>>	>	>>	>	-	-	-	-	>	>>	-	
NC9. Management of landscape features	-	-	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>	>	-	-	>>	>>	>	>>	>	-	-	-	-	>	>>	-	
HBA1. Alterations and extensions to listed buildings.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	>	>>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>	>	-	-	
HBA2. Demolition of listed buildings.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	>	>>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>	>	-	-	
HBA3. Change of use of listed buildings.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	>	>>	?	-	-	-	?	?	-	-	?	?	>	-	?	
HBA4. Setting of listed buildings.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	>	>>	-	>	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
HBA5. Designation of conservation areas.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>>	>	>>	>>	>>	?	>	?	-	0	?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
HBA6. New development within conservation areas.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>>	>	>>	>>	>>	?	>	?	-	?	?	-	-	-	>	>	-	?	
HBA7. Demolition of unlisted buildings within conservation areas.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	>	>>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
HBA8. Locally important buildings.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	>	>>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA..> [receptors]	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift t from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity	EXPLANATORY NOTES
HBA9. Protection of open areas and green spaces.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>>	>	>>	>>	>	-	>>	>	>	>	>	-	-	>	-	>	>>	-	Removal of Suckley lane, Pembridge and land between St, Katherines and Huntingdon, Cradley and the addition of Brookside, Cradley to policy, ratings unchanged.
HBA10. Shopfronts.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	>	>>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
HBA11. Advertising.	-	-	-	-	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	>	>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
HBA12. Re-use of traditional rural buildings.	>	>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	>	>>	>	-	-	-	?	?	-	-	?	?	>	-	?	
HBA13. Re-use of traditional rural buildings for residential purposes.	>	>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	>	>>	?	-	-	-	?	?	-	-	-	>>	>	-	?	
ARCH1. Archaeological assessments and field evaluations.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	>	>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
ARCH2. Foundation design and mitigation for urban sites.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	-	>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
ARCH3. Scheduled Ancient Monuments.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>>	>	>	-	>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>	-	-	
ARCH4. Other Sites of National and Regional Importance.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>>	>	>	-	>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>	-	-	
ARCH5. Sites of Regional and Local Importance.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	>>	>	>	-	>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>	-	-	
ARCH6. Recording of archaeological remains.	-	-	-	-	>>	>>	>	-	>>	>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA..> [receptors]	POLICY OR PROPOSAL																					EXPLANATORY NOTES			
	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need		Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity
ARCH7. Hereford AAI.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	>	>>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>	-	-	
ARCH8. Enhancement and improved access to archaeological sites.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	>>	-	>>	>	>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>	-	-	

SUSTAINABILITY RATINGS:			
<<	Moving significantly away from sustainability.	<	Moving marginally away from sustainability.
>>	Moving significantly towards sustainability.	>	Moving marginally towards sustainability.
0	No effect or neutral net effect.	-	Criterion not applicable.
?	Impact unknown (or data not available).		

HEREFORDSHIRE UDP – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

POLICY IMPACT MATRIX – RECREATION, SPORT & TOURISM

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA...> [receptors]	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity	EXPLANATORY NOTES
S8. Recreation, sport and tourism.	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>>	>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	-	
RST1. Criteria for recreation, sport and tourism development.	>>	>>	>	>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	-	
RST2. Recreation, sport and tourism development within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	>>	>>	>	>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	-	
RST3. Standards for outdoor playing and public open space.	-	-	>	>	-	-	-	-	-	>>	>	-	-	-	-	-	>	-	-	>>	>	>>	>>	-	
RST4. Safeguarding existing open space.	>	-	>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	-	-	-	-	>	>	>	-	-	>>	-	>>	>>	-	
RST5. New open space in/adjacent to settlements.	>>	>>	>	>	>	>	>>	>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	>>	>	>>	>>	-	
RST6. Countryside access.	>	>	>	0	>	>	>>	>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	-	>>	>>	-	
RST7. Promoted recreational routes.	>	>	>	0	>	>	>	>>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	>	-	>>	>>	-	
RST8. Waterway corridors and open water areas.	>	>	>	0	>	>	>	>>	>	>>	>>	>	0	>>	>	>	>	-	>	>	-	>>	>>	-	
RST9. Herefordshire & Gloucestershire Canal.	0	>	>	>	>>	>>	>>	>	>>	>>	>>	>	>	>>	>>	>	>	-	-	>	-	>>	>>	>	
RST10. Major sports facilities.	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	>>	-	>	>>	-	

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA..> [receptors]	POLICY OR PROPOSAL																				EXPLANATORY NOTES				
	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift t from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services		Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity
RST11. Golf courses.	<	<	<	<	<	>	>>	>	?	>>	>	>	>	>	>	<	<	-	-	>	-	0	>>	-	
RST12. Visitor accommodation.	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	-	>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	0	0	-	-	-	>	-	-	-	
RST13. Rural and farm tourism development.	<	<	<	>	>	>	>>	-	>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	<	0	-	-	-	>	-	-	-	Deletion of criterion 3 regarding agricultural activities, ratings unchanged.
RST14. Static caravans, chalets, camping and touring caravan sites.	<	<	<	<	>	>	>>	?	?	>	>>	>	>	>	>>	<	<	-	-	-	>	>	>	?	Addition of criterion regarding flood risk. Criterion has changed from > to >> because of strengthening of policy wording.

SUSTAINABILITY RATINGS:

<<	Moving significantly away from sustainability.	<	Moving marginally away from sustainability.	0	No effect or neutral net effect.
>>	Moving significantly towards sustainability.	>	Moving marginally towards sustainability.	-	Criterion not applicable.
				?	Impact unknown (or data not available).

HEREFORDSHIRE UDP – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

POLICY IMPACT MATRIX – MINERALS

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA...> [receptors]	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity	EXPLANATORY NOTES	
S9. Minerals	<	>	>>	<	>	>	>>	>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	>	-	>	>	-		
M1. Preferred areas for aggregate extraction.																										
M2. Borrow pits	<	<	>	<	>	>	>	>	>	0	0	0	>	>	>	>	>	>	<	0	-	0	0	-		
M3. Criteria for new aggregate mineral workings.	>	>	>	>	>>	>>	>	>>	>>	>>	-	-	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	>>	0	-	>	>	-	Amendment to order of constraints, ratings unchanged.	
M4. Non-aggregate building stone and small-scale clay production.	0	0	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	-	-	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	-	-	-	-	-		
M5. Safeguarding mineral reserves.	-	-	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	-	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	-	-	-	-	-		
M6. Secondary aggregates and recycling.	>	-	>>	>	>	>	>	0	0	-	-	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	-	-	-	>	-		
M7. Reclamation of mineral workings.	-	-	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	>>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	>	-	>	>	-		
M8. Malvern Hills.	-	-	>	>	>>	>>	-	>	>	>	-	-	>	>	>	>	>	>	>>	-	-	-	>	-		
M9. Minerals exploration.	-	-	>	<	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	>	>	>	>	>	-	>>	-	-	-	>	-		
M10. Oil and gas exploration and development.	-	-	>	<	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	>	>	>	>	>	-	>>	-	-	-	>	-		
SUSTAINABILITY RATINGS:																										
<<	Moving significantly away fro sustainability.										<	Moving marginally away from sustainability.										0	No effect or neutral net effect.			
>>	Moving significantly towards sustainability.										>	Moving marginally towards sustainability.										-	Criterion not applicable.			
																						?	Impact unknown (or data not available).			

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA..> [receptors]	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/Intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity	EXPLANATORY NOTES
S10. Waste	>	>	>>	?	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	-	-	-	-	>>	>	
W1. New waste management facilities.	>>	>>	>>	?	>>	>>	>	>>	>>	>	-	-	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	-	-	-	-	>>	>	Amendment to order of constraints, ratings unchanged.
W2. Landfill or land-raising.	-	-	>	?	>	>	>	>	>	>	-	-	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>>	-	-	-	-	>>	>	
W3. Waste transportation and handling.	>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	>>	>	>>	-	-	-	-	>>	-	
W4. Temporary permissions.	-	-	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	?	-	-	?	?	?	?	?	>>	-	-	-	-	?	-	
W5. Waste management licensing.	-	-	-	-	>	>	>	?	?	>	-	-	>>	>	-	>	>>	>>	-	-	-	-	>	-	
W6. Development in the vicinity of waste management facilities.	-	-	-	-	>	>	>	-	-	>	-	-	>	>	-	>>	>	>>	-	-	-	-	>>	-	
W7. Landfill gas utilisation.	-	-	>>	>>	>	>	>	0	0	-	-	-	>	>	-	>>	>	>>	-	-	-	-	>>	-	
W8. Waste disposal for land improvement.	-	-	-	0	>	>	>	>	0	>	-	-	>	>	>	-	-	>	-	-	-	-	-	-	
W9. Reclamation, after-care and after-use.	-	-	>	>>	>>	>>	>>	>	-	>	-	-	>>	>>	-	>>	>>	>>	-	-	-	-	>>	-	
W10. Time limits for secondary activities.	-	-	-	-	-	>	>	-	-	-	-	-	>	>	-	>	>>	>>	-	-	-	-	>	-	

SUSTAINABILITY RATINGS:			
<<	Moving significantly away from sustainability.	<	Moving marginally away from sustainability.
>>	Moving significantly towards sustainability.	>	Moving marginally towards sustainability.
0	No effect or neutral net effect.	-	Criterion not applicable.
?	Impact unknown (or data not available).		

HEREFORDSHIRE UDP – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

POLICY IMPACT MATRIX – COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES

SUSTAINABILITY CRITERIA...> [receptors]	Travel demand & distance	Modal shift from cars	Energy/resource efficiency	Brownfield/greenfield land	Landscape character	Landscape quality	Design	Wildlife & biodiversity	Cultural heritage	Open space/ amenity	Regeneration	Employment opportunities	Land/soil quality	Water quality	Flood risk	Air quality	Noise/intrusion	Waste management	Mineral reserves	Community services	Housing need	Social inclusion	Health	Infrastructure capacity	EXPLANATORY NOTES
CF1. Utility services and infrastructure	-	-	>	?	?	?	>	?	?	?	-	-	?	>>	>	0	?	>	-	>>	-	-	>	>>	
CF2. Foul drainage	-	-	>	?	?	?	>	?	?	-	-	-	>	>>	>	0	0	>	-	>>	-	-	>	>>	Additional text regarding sustainable foul drainage systems, ratings unchanged
CF3. Telecommunications	-	-	0	<	>	>	<	>	>	>	0	0	-	-	-	?	<	-	-	>	-	-	?	-	
CF4. Renewable energy	-	-	>>	<	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	?	0	?	>>	<	-	-	>	-	-	-	-	
CF5. New community facilities	>	>	>	?	?	?	>	?	?	?	>	>	?	?	?	?	?	-	-	>>	-	>>	>>	?	
CF6. Retention of existing facilities	>	>	>	>	>	>	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	>	-	>	>	0	
CF7. Residential nursing and care homes	>	>	>	?	?	?	>	?	?	>	0	>	?	?	?	?	<	-	-	>>	>>	>>	>>	?	
CF8. School proposals	0	0	0	<<	<	<	>	0	0	>	0	-				0	<	-	-	>>	-	>	-		
CF9. Community facilities at Bradbury Estate, Hereford	>	>	>	>>	0	0	>	0	0	>	>	>	0	0	-	0	0	-	-	>>	>>	>>	0	0	

SUSTAINABILITY RATINGS:			
<<	Moving significantly away from sustainability.	<	Moving marginally away from sustainability.
>>	Moving significantly towards sustainability.	>	Moving marginally towards sustainability.
0	No effect or neutral net effect.	-	Criterion not applicable.
?	Impact unknown (or data not available).		

References

- A Better Quality of Life: A Strategy for Sustainable Development for the UK – CM 4345. DETR, May 1999.
- Monitoring Progress: Indicators for the Strategy for Sustainable Development for the UK. DETR, May 1999.
- Opportunities for Change: Consultation Paper on a Revised UK Strategy for Sustainable Development. DETR, 1998.
- Environmental Appraisal of Development Plans: A Good Practice Guide. DoE, 1993.
- Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan: Sustainability Appraisal of the Development Options. Herefordshire Council. 1999.
- Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan:
(1) Deposit Draft Written Statement. Herefordshire Council, September 2002;
(2) Revised Deposit Draft. Herefordshire Council, May 2004.
- Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan: Deposit Draft Sustainability Appraisal. Herefordshire Council, September 2002.
- Quality of Life Counts: Indicators for a Strategy for Sustainable Development for the UK – a Baseline Assessment. Government Statistical Service, DETR, 1999.
- Local Quality of Life Counts in a Nutshell: A Handbook for a Menu of Local Indicators of Sustainable Development. DETR, 2000.
- Quality of Life Capital. Countryside Agency and others, 2001.
- Planning for Sustainable Development: Towards Better Practice. DETR, October 1998.
- Sustainable Settlements: A Guide for Planners, Designers and Developers. University of the West of England/Local Agenda 21 UK/Local Government Management Board.
- Defining Rural Sustainability: 15 Criteria for Sustainable Developments in the Countryside, together with 3 Model Policies for Local Plans. The Land Is Ours, May 1999.
- Worcestershire County Structure Plan 1996-2011 – Adopted Plan June 2001. Chapter 13 Sustainability Appraisal. Worcestershire County Council, 2001.
- Sustainability Appraisal for Regional Planning Guidance for the West Midlands. Report to Regional Planning Officers Group, 11th June 1999.
- The State of Herefordshire Report: Monitoring Report 2002/03. The Herefordshire Partnership. 2003.
- Sustainable Communities – Delivering through Planning. ODPM, February 2003.
- Sustainable Communities – Building for the Future. ODPM, February 2003.
- Consultation Paper on Planning Policy Statement 1: Creating Sustainable Communities. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, February 2004.
- Directive 2001/42/ec of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27th June 2001 on the Assessment of the Effects of Certain Plans and Programmes on the Environment. European Parliament & Council of the European Union, 2001.
- Draft Guidance on the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive. ODPM/Levett-Therivel Sustainability Consultants, October 2002.
- The Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive: Guidance for Planning Authorities. ODPM, October 2003.
- Developing Guidance for DfT on the SEA Directive – Consultation Core Draft. Department for Transport, February 2004.
- The Draft Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 – A Consultation Document. ODPM, February 2004.
- Good Practice Guide on Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Planning Guidance. DETR, 2000.
- Herefordshire Unitary Development Plan Inspector's Report, March 2006.