Submission Local Plan
Core Strategy

Sustainability Appraisal

June 2012

RICHMONDSHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL
working for a better future

Contents

Contact Details

To comment on this document please contact us in one of the following ways:

Telephone: Planning Policy & Conservation Team: 01748 828760

Email: planning.policy@richmondshire.gov.uk

Website: www.richmondshire.gov.uk

Write to: Planning Policy & Conservation
Richmondshire District Council
Civic Centre
Stone Cross
Northallerton
DL6 2UU

1.0 Introduction

1.1 A Sustainability Appraisal (SA) was originally prepared in July 2010 to accompany publication of the Richmondshire Preferred Core Strategy. The SA summarised the appraisal work undertaken during preparation of the Core Strategy, and considered the likely significant social, environmental and economic effects of implementing the proposed Spatial and Core Policies.

1.2 The Submission Core Strategy has been subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA), under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004). The SA conducted must also meet the requirements for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in accordance with European Directive 2001/42/EC (also known as the SEA Directive).

1.3 This report constitutes the SA Report for the Richmondshire District Council Local Plan Core Strategy. It has been produced alongside the emerging Core Strategy, and is being published for consultation at the same time to provide the public and statutory bodies with an opportunity to express their opinions on the SA Report and to use it as a reference point in commenting on the Core Strategy DPD.

1.4 The Core Strategy sets out the overall strategy for the Richmondshire Local Plan and key policies against which development proposals will be assessed. The Core Strategy will be supported by a Delivering Development Plan, which will include both policies to provide further detail and help implement the Core Strategy with site specific proposals for new development and area based designations, also designed to deliver the intentions of the Core Strategy. A Proposals Map is also to be produced, which will geographically express the land use policies and proposals in the other Plan. All new Local Plan documents will be subject to Sustainability Appraisal.

1.5 It is also intended that several Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) will be produced where required to provide additional information and guidance on matters such as affordable housing and design.

1.6 This SA, incorporating SEA, was undertaken in line with ODPM Guidance. The objective of the SEA Directive is *'to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans….with a view to promoting sustainable development'.* According to the Government's guidance, SA includes a wider range of considerations, extending to social and economic impacts of plans, whereas SEA is more focussed on environmental impacts. A key output of the SA process is this SA Report which describes the plan being appraised, how the appraisal has been conducted, and the likely significant sustainability effects of implementing the plan.

1.7 Throughout this report the term 'SA' refers to Sustainability Appraisal incorporating the requirements of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). This SA should be read alongside the Scoping Report (2008), which sets out the relationship of this document to other relevant plans and programmes and provides information on the current state of the environment in Richmondshire.

1.8 Representations were invited on the Preferred Core Strategy for a six week period from 14th June to 31st July, 2010. A total of 48 responses were received. The responses have been reviewed and commentary can be found within the Consultation Statement (Plan Our Future 3). As a result of the responses received and changes in national and regional planning policy, some minor changes have been made and incorporated into the Preferred Core Strategy.

1.9 There were three responses to consultation on the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment. Comments included addressing the location of major development proposals in relation to the source of materials and potential to utilise minerals supply; an

outline of the relationship of the Core Strategy to other relevant plans and programmes; information on the current state of the environment in Richmondshire; details of monitoring and indicators to measure progress and to include a Health Impact Assessment. Further details of the Council's response can be found within the Preferred Strategy Consultation Statement.

1.10 This SA takes on board the comments made during consultation on the Preferred Strategy and Sustainability Assessment and reassesses the revised Spatial Principles and Core Policies against the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives set out within the Sustainability Appraisal of the Richmondshire Local Development Framework Scoping Report (January 2008). The Sustainability Appraisal Objectives to help test the Core Strategy can be found within Table 7.1, page 23 of the Scoping Report.

1.11 In addition, as part of the Preferred Core Strategy preparation a new Policy (CP14) on the Control and Release of Sites for Development and revised Sub Area Strategies for Central Richmondshire and Lower Wensleydale were subject to consultation in September to October 2011. The responses received to both these consultations have been taken into consideration in revising the Submission Core Strategy and this Sustainability Appraisal.

1.12 Changes to policies at national level, through the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) have influenced changes to the core policies. Further local studies and research have also informed changes to certain policies such as that for affordable housing (CP6), following the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and Economic Viability Assessment (EVA) work in 2011.

1.13 The listing of the Core Policies has also been reviewed to provide a more logical ordering of policies and some previous policies have been split or merged in parts. Table 1 shows the new policy numbering alongside that of the Preferred Core Strategy.

Table 1: New Core Policy numbers alongside previous Core Policy numbers and titles of policies.

New Core Policy Number – Submission Core Strategy	Previous Core Policy Number – Preferred Core Strategy	Core Policy Title
CP0	New	Planning Positively
CP1	CP7	Responding to Climate Change
CP2	CP6	Achieving Sustainable Development
CP3	CP1	Supporting the Settlement Hierarchy
CP4	CP14	Supporting Sites for Development
CP5	CP4	Providing a Housing Mix
CP6	CP5A & 5B	Providing Affordable Housing
CP7	CP9	Promoting a Sustainable Economy
CP8	CP3	Achieving Rural Sustainability
CP9	CP10	Supporting Town and Local Centres
CP10	CP11	Developing Tourism
CP11	CP2 & 12	Supporting Community and Recreation Assets
CP12	CP8	Conserving and Enhancing Environmental and Historic Assets
CP13	CP6 & CP13	Promoting High Quality Design
CP14	New	Providing and Delivering Infrastructure
Previous CP references relate to Preferred Core Strategy, June 2010 and consultation on CP14 in September 2011.		

2.0 Characterisation of Richmondshire and Key Sustainability Issues

2.1 Richmondshire is essentially rural in character and includes part of the Yorkshire Dales National Park. Richmond and Leyburn are the main towns in the District. However, Catterick Garrison is the largest urban area and is centrally located within the District and it is a complex area that has evolved through the growth of military and non-military settlements. The population of the plan area is estimated to be 43,310 (mid 2011 revised), which is 86% of the District total. Two thirds of this population live in the seven largest settlements, with estimated populations of Catterick Garrison (Colburn, Scotton and Hipswell) 14,600, Richmond 8,140, Catterick Village (including Marne Barracks) 2,785, Leyburn 2,110 and Brompton on Swale 1,800.

2.2 There are over 70 villages in the District, which vary in size considerably and are distributed across this large plan area. Outside the settlements land use is almost wholly agricultural, and this is a dominating influence on the landscape. The plan area lies to the east of the Yorkshire Dales National Park, and the lower stretches of the Swale and Ure valleys form natural extensions of this nationally designated landscape area. The Nidderdale and North Pennines Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) extend from the south and north-west into small parts of the plan area. Within the remainder of the area there are many other identifiable landscapes with their own distinctive qualities and character. Many areas have a local landscape importance, particularly around the historic settlements. The Ministry of Defence (MoD) is the largest single landowner and operates training estates over very substantial areas of moorland.

2.3 The District is relatively prosperous, with a working age population of about 30,600 of which an estimated 24,500 are economically active. The MoD employs about 9,400 people in the plan area, including military personnel.

2.4 Key sustainability issues for the Richmondshire area include:

- supporting sustainable communities;
- reducing the need for people to travel;
- supporting and sustaining the character of rural communities;
- supporting and sustaining the social and economic fabric of rural communities;
- encouraging local and military authorities to work together;
- accommodating future population and employment growth;
- the provision of a mix of good quality housing types, sizes and tenures to meet local housing needs;
- responding to the issues of climate change;
- conserving and enhance the historic character and identity of local towns and villages;
- protecting and improving the countryside, wildlife diversity and habitats;
- supporting local economic growth;
- supporting vibrant and prosperous towns to function as service centres with a range of good quality jobs, businesses, shops and services;
- encouraging high quality design in new development;
- establishing effective partnerships between public and private organisations and local communities to deliver the vision of the plan area.

3.0 Monitoring

3.1 The SEA Directive requires monitoring of the significant environmental effects of implementing the plan. SA monitoring will cover the significant sustainability effects as well as the environmental effects.

3.2 The key effects to be monitored are the impact of development on landscape and townscape quality; protection of environmental assets such as biodiversity, heritage, and natural resources; the sustainability of development locations, contributions to climate change; and effects on the economy, deprived areas, housing needs, and the accessibility of services. A range of indicators and sources of information are identified within the Core Strategy.

3.3 An on-going dialogue with the statutory environmental consultees and other stakeholders should take place as necessary to agree the significant effects to be monitored and the information to be collected, including who will collect the information and when.

4.0 Submission Core Strategy Appraisal

4.1 The Submission Core Strategy sets out a framework to secure sustainable development based on five Spatial Principles, three Sub Area strategies and 14 Core Policies. For each of these, a preferred approach has been selected from a range of alternative approaches, which have been discounted. The reasons for choices made and elimination are given in the summary boxes at the end of each assessment.

4.2 It is necessary to show that the Submission Core Strategy remains the most likely strategy to deliver sustainable development. This is done by comparing the range of options with the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives. The assessment compares the range of options using the following symbols for scoring.

Table 2: Symbols for scoring against Sustainability Appraisal Objectives

Strongly supportive of Sustainability Appraisal Objective	↑↑
Supportive of Sustainability Appraisal Objective	↑
No relationship with Sustainability Appraisal Objective	~
Unsupportive of Sustainability Appraisal Objective	↓
Strongly unsupportive of Sustainability Appraisal Objective	↓↓

4.3 The options appraisal shows that overall the selected approach delivers the best sustainability outcomes. The results also show similar tensions between development and protection of the environment and also between support for the rural areas and prioritisation of development. The commentary on the specific options that follows shows how this balance is achieved and where other elements of the Submission Core Strategy mitigate undesirable impacts of chosen options.

5.0 Changes to Spatial Principles, Sub Area Strategies and Core Policies

Spatial Principles

5.1 Spatial Principle SP4 has been amended in light of revised housing and employment requirements. This has seen the housing requirement reduced from 2,250 to 1440. This results in a requirement of 180 dwellings per annum as opposed to 200 per annum in the Preferred Strategy. In addition two Spatial Principles have been renumbered; SP1 Sub Areas (was SP2) and SP2 Settlement Hierarchy (was SP1).

Sub Area Strategies

5.2 As explained in Paragraph 5.1 above, the main change relating to the Sub Area Strategies is the reduction of the overall housing and employment requirements (through Spatial Principles SP4 and SP5) and the slight redistribution of this development across the plan

area. The proportions of the redistribution within each Sub Area remain relative the same as that set out in the Preferred Core Strategy.

Core Policies

Policy CP0 (New) – Planning Positively

5.3 Please refer to assessment under CP2 as CP0 is an extract from CP2.

Policy CP1 (was CP7) - Responding to Climate Change

5.4 Core Policy CP1 supports renewable and low carbon energy generation; seeks to minimise energy demand and carbon use; improve energy efficiency; maximise use of renewables, sets sustainable building standards; promotes mitigation/compensatory measures; and ensures adaptation of the built environment through layout, design, green infrastructure, minimising flood risk and use of sustainable urban drainage.

5.5 This policy has been developed and improved to clarify the Local Plan's commitment to maximising renewable energy resources in accordance with the findings of the Richmondshire Local Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Capacity Study 2012 and the Spatial Principles.

5.6 Applications for development within the Garrison Area and Leyburn will be required through CP1 to investigate opportunities for District Heating solutions. Renewable and low carbon energy proposals that accord with the Energy Opportunities Map in the Richmondshire Local Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Capacity Study 2012 are supported.

5.7 The policy applies specific requirements for new development in relation to the Code for Sustainable Homes, and Building Research Establishment, Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) standards for non residential development, in line with current advice.

5.8 Finally, the policy sets out the Local Plan's legal duty to respond to climate change in the explanatory text and sets local targets in line with advice in the NPPF. It sets out more recent evidence in the 2011 Regional Low Carbon and Renewable Energy Study, 2011 (AECOM) and a 2011 Vantage Point carbon modelling assessment for Richmondshire. These revealed that the Council is unlikely to meet the national Climate Change interim target of 34% carbon reduction by 2020 (and 80% cut by 2050) simply through the Government's Low Carbon Transition Plan actions alone. The text also refers to a Local Low Carbon and Renewable Energy Study for Richmondshire which will be produced in 2012 providing more local evidence which will be considered when assessing proposals and to the 2011 "Managing Landscape Change: Renewable & Low Carbon Energy Developments – A Sensitivity Framework for North Yorkshire and York" (AECOM) which provides a methodology for assessing applications.

5.9 The selected strategy for CP1 has raised the standards from that assessed within the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment. The Richmondshire Local Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Capacity Study 2012 demonstrates that the proposals are achievable and that the standards do not significantly raise build costs. However, insisting on even higher standards, for example insisting on zero carbon developments, would significantly increase build costs.

Policy CP2 (was CP6) - Achieving Sustainable Development & Policy CP0 (New) – Planning Positively

5.10 Core Policy CP2 promotes a list of sustainability considerations; prioritises brownfield sites; minimises the need to travel and promotes sustainable transport modes and materials.

5.11 This policy has been amended to include reference to support for the reuse of sustainable resources. There is now also a reference to support for the use of locally reclaimed sustainable building materials where appropriate which do not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of historic and environmental assets, as dealt with in Policy CP12. A further reference has also been included on support for the inclusion of mitigation measures to address the effects of flash flooding of rivers and drains and drought. The final paragraph of the former policy (CP6) on high quality design aspects has been removed and incorporated into the new Policy CP13 - Promoting High Quality Design.

5.12 The selected strategy for CP2 seeks to maintain a sustainable balance for local communities in a high quality environment. The alternatives considered here, to be more or less restrictive and prescriptive tip this balance, either to promote greater conservation at the cost of adaptation to future social and economic change, or in favour of development at the cost of the environmental quality.

Policy CP3 (was CP1) - Supporting the Settlement Hierarchy

5.13 Core Policy CP3 prioritises development in the settlement hierarchy (SP2); prioritises development on brownfield sites and within settlements; and allows for development adjacent to settlements pending the review of Development Limits.

5.14 CP3 has been amended to allow for development adjacent to the Development Limits of the 22 settlements in the hierarchy as they currently do not provide sufficient scope for development within and it will be some time before they are reviewed in a further Local Plan document. The considerations applying to the scope for development adjacent to the settlements in the hierarchy are identified in the supporting text. Priority is also given to sites within the settlements and brownfield sites.

5.15 The selected strategy seeks to support the roles of settlements in the SP2 settlement hierarchy by enabling an appropriate scale of development in each settlement through interim development and the review of Development Limits. The absence of these would lead to a loss of focus in the overall strategy and limit its capacity to deliver necessary infrastructure improvements. It would also risk unplanned impacts on smaller villages and the surrounding countryside.

Policy CP4 (was CP14) – Supporting Sites for Development

5.16 Core Policy CP4 guides the allocation of sites in future plans and allows for development in accordance with other Core Policies and of a scale and distribution identified in SP4 (Housing) and SP5 (Employment) and in accordance with the Sub Area Strategies (and locational advice for new development) and community preferences, Neighbourhood Planning and masterplanning / Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs).

5.17 This policy was introduced as an additional policy to allow for sites to be approved for development and to guide the making of new allocations in the following Local Plan document. It was subject to separate consultation during September and October 2011.

Policy CP5 (was CP4) - Providing a Housing Mix

5.18 Core Policy CP5 promotes a housing mix to meet local needs, including accessible and adaptable homes.

5.19 The policy wording is little changed from the Preferred Strategy. However, the explanatory text and justification has been greatly extended to provide further guidance on the required type, tenure and size of future housing. This is based on the findings of the 2011 Strategic

Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for Richmondshire, including specific advice on the affordable housing mix and the increasingly important needs of the elderly.

5.20 Failure to include a policy to address housing mix would lose the opportunity to address current and future mismatches in the range of housing types available in the plan area.

Policy CP6 (was CP5A & CP5B) - Providing Affordable Housing

5.21 Core Policy CP6 sets a site size threshold and sub area targets for the negotiation of affordable housing, subject to economic viability.

5.22 In view of the findings of both the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and Economic Viability Assessment (EVA) carried out in 2011, the proposed threshold has been reduced from 4 dwellings / 0.15 hectares to single unit developments and the targets have been reduced in Lower Wensleydale from 50% to 40% and in North Richmondshire from 50% to 30% and remained at 40% in Central Richmondshire. The justification has been amended to provide more up-to-date background on affordable housing needs and it provides reasoning for the policy requirements based on the study findings.

5.23 The policy of rural exception developments is retained to help meet identified small scale local needs in villages.

5.24 The selected strategy recognises that an affordable housing need arises across the whole plan area but varies across the three sub areas (based on the SHMA findings). The Sub Area targets reflect the findings of the EVA work and are a more up-to-date and reliable basis for negotiation based on viability of development. It also recognises that lower site size thresholds, down to a single dwelling should not be unviable or hold sites back (based on the EVA findings). This will also maximise opportunities for affordable housing provision in all areas and be particularly helpful in the rural areas with typical small site developments where a higher threshold would limit opportunities.

5.25 Overall the policy seeks to maximise affordable housing opportunities to help meet local needs wherever it is viable. The rural exception site policy allows for provision to address specific and localised need in smaller settlements.

Policy CP7 (was CP9) - Promoting a Sustainable Economy

5.26 Core Policy CP7 provides a list of appropriate new development types and priority actions, including providing high quality sites for B1 uses in the towns and improving infrastructure and accessibility of jobs

5.27 The main changes to this policy have been to remove the list of infrastructure projects. These projects are now within the explanatory text and further information will be contained within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There have been minor changes to the structure and further support has been given through CP7(i) for small scale rural development in line with CP8 Achieving Rural Sustainability. The justification text has been developed further.

5.28 The selected strategy for CP7 seeks to balance the need for continuing economic activity to help sustain local communities with that to maintain the high quality environment locally. The alternative approaches, to be less directive or more prescriptive tip this balance in favour of either economic pressures or environmental protection, both of which would impact on the overall sustainability of local communities.

Policy CP8 (was CP3) – Achieving Rural Sustainability

5.29 Core Policy CP8 takes forward SP3 in more detail. It encourages small scale housing developments in or adjacent to smaller settlements. It encourages new and expanded

rural businesses and encourages the reuse of rural buildings. It sets out further rural developments to be encouraged; and identifies the circumstances where development is acceptable.

5.30 The start of this policy no longer refers to rural areas outside Development Limits, but rural areas lying beyond the SP2 settlements in the hierarchy. CP1 now covers development outside Development Limits. Policy CP8 now relates to smaller settlements and the open countryside. 'Small scale housing developments in or adjacent to smaller villages' has been added to the list of developments to be encouraged (1a). References to 'within Development Limits' and 'appropriate' (re businesses and tourism) have been removed. 'National defence training' has been added to the list at 2a of developments to be supported in the rural areas. (Reference to defence/military training areas has been removed from Policy CP12 – formerly in CP8f). The requirement for housing to be only exceptional to help meet a local housing need has been made more permissive to allow for housing which would meet a local housing need, which is not confined to affordable housing. Other policy wording has been amended to read more clearly.

5.31 This assessment reflects the tensions between supporting rural communities while at the same time preventing stagnation through choking off the capacity for change. The laissez-faire option considered in CP8 Option 2 of allowing market forces to prevail would risk damaging the rural fabric of the area. CP8 Option 1 would conserve the high quality environment but at the cost of restricting the local rural economy and the social wellbeing of communities which sustain it. The selected option strikes a balance between these two options and is supported by the rest of the Submission Core Strategy in a way that seeks to retain sustainable rural communities. Core Policy CP12 mitigates the impact on Sustainability Objective 13.

Policy CP9 (was CP10) - Supporting Town and Local Centres

5.32 Core Policy CP9 sets out the retail hierarchy and roles of the 3 main centres, including the types of development to be supported in each. It supports town centres and allows new uses of appropriate scale and with no adverse impact and controls new developments outside centres above and below a size threshold.

5.33 There have been some more significant changes to the policy for supporting town and local centres. This has been in response to consultation which sought further clarification of the roles of the Principal Towns of Richmond and the Garrison. This has included, in particular, the complementary nature of the towns, and the need to protect and enhance the role of Richmond and not to sideline it to a development of niche retail.

5.34 The policy has been separated into four parts. The first part establishes the retail hierarchy in line with the Spatial Principles and establishes the role of each centre and the opportunities for future development. Part 2 deals with development within the town centre, or primary retail area for retail developments, and establishes a lower threshold than the previous policy (now 500 sq m, previously 1,500 sq m). Part 3 sets the approach for considering development over 500 sq m (previously 1,500 sq m) outside of the town centre boundary. Finally, Part 4 deals with development outside of the retail hierarchy. Previously, the role of the centres of Richmond, Catterick Garrison and Leyburn and their position in the retail hierarchy was not established, and retail developments of over 1,500 sq m regardless of location were required to assess the impact on viability and vitality of the centres. The justifying text for this policy has been further developed.

5.35 The selected strategy for CP9 seeks to balance the need for continuing economic activity to help sustain local town centres with that to maintain the high quality environment locally. The alternative approaches tip this balance in favour of either economic pressures or environmental protection, both of which would impact on the overall sustainability of local communities.

Policy CP10 (was CP11) - Developing Tourism

5.36 Core Policy CP10 promotes and identifies priorities for tourism development. There have been minor wording changes to the policy and its justification to provide greater clarity and the promotion of medium to large scale hotel accommodation in larger settlements.

5.37 The selected strategy for CP10 seeks to balance the need for continuing economic activity through support for the locally important tourism sector with that to maintain the high quality environment locally. The alternative approaches tip this balance in favour of either economic pressures or environmental protection or discount concern for the impact of tourism development. These alternatives increase the potential for negative impacts on the sustainability of local communities. Any undesirable impacts of the Submission Strategy would be mitigated under Core Policy CP12 (Conserving and Enhancing Environmental and Historic Assets).

Policy CP11 (was CP2 & CP12) - Supporting Community and Recreation Assets

5.38 Core Policy CP11 supports new community and recreation facilities, requires new provision or contributions in conjunction with new development and protects future losses of assets.

5.39 CP11 was previously two policies: the former Core Policy CP2 for the provision of community facilities and Core Policy CP12 for the provision of recreational facilities. In line with the NPPF it is appropriate to merge these two policies into one. The policy has also been clarified and restructured so as to make clear that it relates to provision, enhancement and prevention of loss of assets or facilities. The wording has been improved to make clear that community uses/assets include a broad range of facilities. The explanatory text has been amended and further developed to include reference to the NPPF and the 2011 Settlement Facilities Study. It also explains the information required for the assessment of any application involving the loss of a facility or asset.

5.40 The selected strategy for CP11 seeks to maximise the amount of leisure and cultural provision without impairing the capacity of overall development or promoting the loss of facilities through lack of standards required to support local needs for this provision.

Policy CP12 (was CP8) – Conserving and Enhancing Environmental and Historic Assets

5.41 Core Policy CP12 protects the natural environment and heritage, identifying a broad range of assets, including landscape beauty, landscape character, biodiversity and geo-diversity, green infrastructure network and historic assets. The policy seeks improvements; requires mitigation and compensatory measures; and covers enabling development for heritage assets.

5.42 The specific list of heritage assets has been moved to the explanatory text as the term ‘designated and undesignated heritage assets’ covers all these items.

5.43 Reference to military training areas (previously at f) has been deleted as it did not fit well in this policy and is now covered under Policy CP8 Achieving Rural Sustainability.

5.44 CP12 Option 1 clearly increases the potential to protect the plan area’s high quality environment, but this limits scope for improving the overall sustainability of settlements. Overall sustainability is achieved by encouraging necessary change and development to secure social and economic sustainability, as well as protecting their environment. Option 2 is less prescriptive and leaves the environment and heritage assets vulnerable to market forces.

Policy CP13 (was CP6 & CP13) – Promoting High Quality Design

5.45 Core Policy CP13 sets out building and landscaping design requirements, including sustainable building and the promotion of safe living/crime reduction.

5.46 This is a new policy which incorporates the design elements of the former CP6 (Sustainable Development) and CP13 (Crime and Road Safety) policies.

5.47 CP13 seeks to deliver high quality design in development proposals, open spaces and landscaping through the principles set out in the policy. The principles and requirements set out in the policy take into account the need for sustainability in terms of materials, construction techniques and, where possible, locally sourced resources. High quality design also needs to consider the promotion of safe living environments, the impact of crime and the fear of crime. The alternative options offer the two extremes in terms of a *'laissez-faire'* approach to high quality design, which is likely to achieve minimal delivery of high quality design and sustainability, and a prescriptive and strict policy, likely to stifle such development in terms of viability.

5.48 The selected policy approach attempts to strike a balance between these two extremes of viability and design quality and sustainability.

5.49 Option 1 provides a strict, uncompromising policy which may stifle development proposals in terms of viability. Option 2 provides a much more relaxed approach which potentially jeopardises any level of design quality and sustainability in proposals.

Policy CP14 (new) - Providing and Delivering Infrastructure

5.50 This new policy promotes the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and requires necessary infrastructure provision, including developer contributions.

5.51 This is a new policy specifically related to the provision and delivery of key infrastructure and should be considered alongside the IDP.

5.52 The selected policy approach to CP14 provides a basis for introducing the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), a key element in the provision of required infrastructure schemes. It also presents a requirement on developers or infrastructure providers to deliver the necessary schemes in a timely manner, which will complement development growth, not hinder it.

5.53 Option 1 suggests presenting a list of specific infrastructure schemes to be delivered through the Plan. This is very inflexible and prescriptive and leaves little room for any potential amendments throughout the plan period. Also, the IDP is where such a list should be presented where flexibility is built in. Option 2, the 'do nothing' option, leaves little scope to require and / or implement such infrastructure requirements in a policy context. It also diminishes the weight the Council may have (e.g. through CIL) to place obligations on developers to make contributions.

Table 3: Comparison of Submission Core Strategy with Alternatives

Spatial Principles

SP1: Sub Areas				
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Smaller Areas** Further subdivision would create areas with smaller populations but with little to distinguish them. We have addressed the relationships between groups of smaller settlements in the clusters proposed in Spatial Principle SP1.	**Option 2: Fewer Areas** It could be argued that North Richmondshire is simply the extensive rural hinterland of the Central Area. This risks blurring the main policy approach to strengthen the District's main centres and effectively dilutes our ability to constrain development in the north of the District, where there is limited scope in the small settlements. It would also fail to recognise the relationships of the northern part of the District with Darlington and Barnard Castle.	**Option 3: Different Areas** The areas identified are rooted in local geography and community patterns. The A1 corridor, from Catterick Village to Barton, could be described because of the strong transport links it provides. The A1 effectively bypasses the district's main centres at Richmond, the Garrison area and Leyburn and a single policy approach to this corridor would risk encouraging development away from the existing centres.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑↑	↑↑	↓	↓
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑↑	↑↑	↑	↑
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	↑↑	↑↑	↓	↓
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑↑	↑↑	↓	↓
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	↑↑	↑↑	↓	↓
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	↑↑	↑↑	↓	↓
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources & minimal production of waste	~	~	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑↑	↑↑	↓	↓
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~	~

SP1: Sub Areas				
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Smaller Areas** Further subdivision would create areas with smaller populations but with little to distinguish them. We have addressed the relationships between groups of smaller settlements in the clusters proposed in Spatial Principle SP1.	**Option 2: Fewer Areas** It could be argued that North Richmondshire is simply the extensive rural hinterland of the Central Area. This risks blurring the main policy approach to strengthen the District's main centres and effectively dilutes our ability to constrain development in the north of the District, where there is limited scope in the small settlements. It would also fail to recognise the relationships of the northern part of the District with Darlington and Barnard Castle.	**Option 3: Different Areas** The areas identified are rooted in local geography and community patterns. The A1 corridor, from Catterick Village to Barton, could be described because of the strong transport links it provides. The A1 effectively bypasses the district's main centres at Richmond, the Garrison area and Leyburn and a single policy approach to this corridor would risk encouraging development away from the existing centres.
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↓	↓	↓↓	↓↓
12. Minimal pollution levels	↑↑	↑↑	↓	↓
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	↑↑	↑↑	↓	↓
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that makes good use of derelict sites, minimises travel & promotes balanced development	↑↑	↑↑	↓	↓
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	↑↑	↑	↑↑	↑↑
16. Local needs met locally	~	~	~	~
Commentary	The smaller areas considered in Option 1 do not restrict our ability to deliver the overall Spatial Strategy, but they would make it harder to engender debate through the multiple areas. Both Option 2 and Option 3 are similar in that they lower our ability to deliver the Core Strategy. They each have weaknesses either through a lack of resolution (Option 2) or creating a distorting effect (Option 3) from the aim to create a strong focus on existing service centres in Richmond, the Garrison Area and Leyburn as proposed in Spatial Principle SP2. **Impact on Sustainability Appraisal** This assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy assessment but for the addition of 2 symbols to assess Options 1 & 2 against criteria 12, which were omitted from the Preferred Core Strategy in error.			

SP2: Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy				
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Changing the roles in the hierarchy** The main roles of Richmond, the Garrison Area and Leyburn were defined in the RSS and these reflect the wider range of services they offer. The remainder of settlements have a much more limited range of services making it difficult to separate them. One possibility is on the basis of economic characteristics. However only two settlements have distinct economic characteristics, which are dealt with under Spatial Principle SP5.	**Option 2: Changing the levels in the hierarchy** The main levels of the hierarchy are defined in the RSS. We have some choice in varying the lower levels to emphasise particular features of the Plan Area. After Richmond, the Garrison area and Leyburn, the size and availability of services in these settlements is limited and offers little scope for constructing further levels.	**Option 3: Changing the settlements in each of the levels or roles** The status of Richmond, the Garrison Area and Leyburn is well established. Spreading the hierarchy too thin by increasing the number of lower order settlements in order to constrain development leaves the Plan Area with an indistinct strategy for the villages. It would encourage small amounts of development over a much wider area making it difficult to focus the use of limited resources designed to improve sustainability over the Plan Area.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑↑	↓	↓	↓
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑↑	↑	↑	↑
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	↑↑	↓	↓	↓
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑↑	↓	↓	↓
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	↑↑	↓	↓	↓
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	↑↑	↓	↓	↓
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑↑	↑	↑	↑
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↓	↓	↓
12. Minimal pollution levels	↓	↓↓	↓↓	↓↓

SP2: Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy				
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Changing the roles in the hierarchy** The main roles of Richmond, the Garrison Area and Leyburn were defined in the RSS and these reflect the wider range of services they offer. The remainder of settlements have a much more limited range of services making it difficult to separate them. One possibility is on the basis of economic characteristics. However only two settlements have distinct economic characteristics, which are dealt with under Spatial Principle SP5.	**Option 2: Changing the levels in the hierarchy** The main levels of the hierarchy are defined in the RSS. We have some choice in varying the lower levels to emphasise particular features of the Plan Area. After Richmond, the Garrison area and Leyburn, the size and availability of services in these settlements is limited and offers little scope for constructing further levels.	**Option 3: Changing the settlements in each of the levels or roles** The status of Richmond, the Garrison Area and Leyburn is well established. Spreading the hierarchy too thin by increasing the number of lower order settlements in order to constrain development leaves the Plan Area with an indistinct strategy for the villages. It would encourage small amounts of development over a much wider area making it difficult to focus the use of limited resources designed to improve sustainability over the Plan Area.
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	~	~	~	~
14. A quality built environment that protects and enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promote balanced development	↑↑	↓	↓	↓
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	↑↑	↓	↓	↓
16. Local needs met locally	↑↑	↓	↓	↓
Commentary	The selected option increases the accessibility of housing, employment, leisure and health opportunities by strengthening these facilities in population centres. The alternatives each reduce general accessibility by spreading these opportunities over a wider area and diluting their potential benefits to the wider population. Reduced accessibility lowers the number of people available to readily access facilities, which in turn detracts from their viability. The exceptions to this affect specific elements of the community. For example the business community (SA Objective 2) can exploit a range of locations outside of the SP2 Settlement Hierarchy. Also, some alternatives may deliver benefit against the SA objectives but are less efficient at this than the selected option, for example minimisation of carbon pollution (SA Objective 9). **Impact on Sustainability Appraisal** This assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment.			

SP3: Achieving Rural Sustainability			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: A more restrictive approach** A more restrictive approach would seek to preserve the appearance of the Plan area. This could limit opportunities for the re-use of buildings and access to new employment and other service opportunities. This approach would risk creating stagnation in many smaller settlements and limit their role to a mainly residential one.	**Option 2: A less restrictive approach: exclude the specific principle** A less restrictive approach might not require inclusion of this strategic principle at all. It could rely on the other policies of the Plan or on the operation of market forces to deliver rural sustainability. Making this principle explicit, and following its direction through the rest of the Plan, assists the ability to distinguish between rural and urban activities and resists the erosion of the fabric of our rural landscape and settlements.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑↑	↑	↓
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑	↓	↑↑
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	↑↑	↑	↓
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑↑	↑	↓
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	↑↑	↑	↓
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	↑↑	↑	↓
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑	↑↑	↓
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↑	↓
12. Minimal pollution levels	↓	↓↓	↓↓
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	↑	↑↑	↓

SP3: Achieving Rural Sustainability			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: A more restrictive approach** A more restrictive approach would seek to preserve the appearance of the Plan area. This could limit opportunities for the re-use of buildings and access to new employment and other service opportunities. This approach would risk creating stagnation in many smaller settlements and limit their role to a mainly residential one.	**Option 2: A less restrictive approach: exclude the specific principle** A less restrictive approach might not require inclusion of this strategic principle at all. It could rely on the other policies of the Plan or on the operation of market forces to deliver rural sustainability. Making this principle explicit, and following its direction through the rest of the Plan, assists the ability to distinguish between rural and urban activities and resists the erosion of the fabric of our rural landscape and settlements.
14. A quality built environment that protects and enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promote balanced development	↑↑	↑	↓
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	↑↑	↓	↓
16. Local needs met locally	~	~	~
Commentary	This assessment reflects the tensions between supporting rural communities while at the same time preventing stagnation through choking off the capacity for change. The '*laissez-faire*' option considered in Option 2 of allowing market forces to prevail would risk damaging the rural fabric of the area. Option 1 would conserve the high quality environment but at the cost of restricting the local rural economy and the social wellbeing of communities which sustain it. The selected option strikes a balance between these two options and is supported by the rest of the Submission Core Strategy to strike this balance in a way that seeks to retain sustainable rural communities. **Impact on Sustainability Appraisal** This assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment.		

SP4: Housing - Distribution			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Centralised distribution.** A more centralised distribution than that proposed in SP4 would mean that development would be even more concentrated in the Garrison Area, Leyburn and Richmond. This would have two effects – less change in the surrounding villages, and increased pressure on infrastructure in the towns. It could also lead to further pressure to extend Richmond – for example eastwards beyond Scott's Dyke.	**Option 2: Diffuse distribution.** Development would follow the market and put pressure to release more land in the villages. This would limit the opportunity for creating a more cohesive settlement in the Garrison Area. It would also dilute opportunities to sustain services across the whole plan area, by on the one hand, reducing the potential to support continued and enhanced provision from the main centres – and on the other, the resulting limited development in smaller settlements, because of its scale, would be unlikely to result in more viable services in those settlements.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	~	~	~
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	~	~	~
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	~	~	~
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑↑	↑	↑
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	~	~	~
7.Culture, heritage, leisure & recreation activities to all	~	~	~
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy & natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑↑	↑	↓
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↓	↓
12. Minimal pollution levels	↓	↓	↓↓
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	~	~	~

SP4: Housing - Distribution			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Centralised distribution.** A more centralised distribution than that proposed in SP4 would mean that development would be even more concentrated in the Garrison Area, Leyburn and Richmond. This would have two effects – less change in the surrounding villages, and increased pressure on infrastructure in the towns. It could also lead to further pressure to extend Richmond – for example eastwards beyond Scott's Dyke.	**Option 2: Diffuse distribution.** Development would follow the market and put pressure to release more land in the villages. This would limit the opportunity for creating a more cohesive settlement in the Garrison Area. It would also dilute opportunities to sustain services across the whole plan area, by on the one hand, reducing the potential to support continued and enhanced provision from the main centres – and on the other, the resulting limited development in smaller settlements, because of its scale, would be unlikely to result in more viable services in those settlements.
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanced development	↑↑	↑	↓
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	↑↑	↓	↓
16. Local needs met locally	↑↑	↑	↑
Commentary	Option 3 may offer the prospect of more housing to better fulfil Sustainability Objective 4, but this is at the cost of the SP2 Settlement Hierarchy principle and potentially weaken service provision and the capacity of communities to engage in local issues because resources would be spread more thinly. Similarly a more centralised distribution of housing would tend to exclude more rural communities. **Impact on Sustainability Assessment** This assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment.		

SP4: Housing – Military Housing Distribution			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy on Military Housing Distribution**	**Option 1: Wider distribution of military housing across the Plan Area** Distribute these houses in the same proportion as the SP2 settlement hierarchy. Distribution across the SP2 hierarchy would see 30% or 675 being added to the targets for Leyburn and other smaller settlements. This would increase traffic into the Garrison from across the whole area. It would also place further pressures on the limited services elsewhere.	**Option 2: Wider distribution of military housing across the Plan Area and outside** Further distribution outside of the Plan Area is harder to quantify. Although it would have the benefit of reducing development pressure on settlements in the plan area, it too would increase commuting into the Garrison.
1. Good quality Employment opportunities available to all	~	~	~
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	~	~	~
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	~	~	~
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑↑	↑	↓
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	~	~	~
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	~	~	~
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy & natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑↑	↑	↓
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↑	↓
12. Minimal pollution levels	↓	↓↓	↓↓
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	~	~	~
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and	~	~	~

promotes balanced development			
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	↑↑	↑	↓
16. Local needs met locally	↑↑	↑	↑
Commentary	The selected option concentrates the military workforce around its workplace. This brings benefits in terms of retaining economic benefit, encouraging a scale of development which could deliver substantial decentralised energy solutions and reduce transport. When combined with open market development, this creates an opportunity for a more diverse community that is well serviced. The alternatives dilute these benefits and encourage greater travelling. Traffic would increase if larger proportions of military housing needs were met outside of the area (Option 2) while at the same time reducing the potential of the area to support solutions to this problem. **Impact on Sustainability Appraisal** This assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment.		

SP4: Housing - Scale			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy - Scale**	**Option 1: Make less provision for housing.** A lower target would reduce the impact of new development on the local area. However, it would also reduce the opportunities to increase the supply of affordable housing in the district to meet local needs.	**Option 2: Make more provision for housing** A higher housing target might be considered because of national population projections. This could well require extensions beyond the historical boundaries of Richmond and other traditional settlements.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	~	~	~
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	~	~	~
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	~	~	~
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑	↓	↑↑
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	~	~	~
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	~	~	~
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑↑	↑	↑
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↑	↓
12. Minimal pollution levels	↓	↓	↓↓
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	~	~	~
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanced development	↑↑	↑	↓

SP4: Housing - Scale			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy - Scale**	**Option 1: Make less provision for housing.** A lower target would reduce the impact of new development on the local area. However, it would also reduce the opportunities to increase the supply of affordable housing in the district to meet local needs.	**Option 2: Make more provision for housing** A higher housing target might be considered because of national population projections. This could well require extensions beyond the historical boundaries of Richmond and other traditional settlements.
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	↑↑	↓	↓
16. Local needs met locally	↑↑	↑	↓
Commentary	The selected scale of housing development seeks to guide the overall amount of development in the Plan Area. This reflects the difficult balance that is a feature of this Core Strategy. A larger scale of growth would seem to offer greater chances to address affordability issues. This would be at a greater environmental cost and the erosion of local distinctiveness. A greater housing supply would also help sustain the scale of in migration from across the country into this area. A reduced scale of development also presents problems. It would be less likely to address local affordability issues and would also limit the support for sustaining existing or new services potentially leading to stagnation in some parts of the area. **Impact on Sustainability Appraisal** Although the scale of housing has been reduced slightly, this assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment.		

SP5: Employment Land - Scale			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy - Scale**	**Option 1: Allocate less land** Whilst there is no certainty about employment projections and resultant estimates of need for land, allocating a smaller quantity may well not provide a sufficient range and choice to sustain the local economy during the plan period.	**Option 2: Allocate more land** Given the uncertainties, yet further provision risks diluting the strategic focus on the settlement hierarchy and the key locations, and would be likely to conflict increasingly with environmental objectives.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑	↓	↓
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑	↓	↑↑
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	↑	↓	↓
4. Quality housing available to everyone	~	~	~
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	~	~	~
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	~	~	~
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	~	~	~
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↓	↓
12. Minimal pollution levels	↓	↓	↓↓
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	~	~	~
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanced development	↑↑	↑	↓
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	~	~	~

SP5: Employment Land - Scale			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy - Scale**	**Option 1: Allocate less land** Whilst there is no certainty about employment projections and resultant estimates of need for land, allocating a smaller quantity may well not provide a sufficient range and choice to sustain the local economy during the plan period.	**Option 2: Allocate more land** Given the uncertainties, yet further provision risks diluting the strategic focus on the settlement hierarchy and the key locations, and would be likely to conflict increasingly with environmental objectives.
16. Local needs met locally	~	~	~
Commentary	Like the scale of housing development, a similar balance needs to be struck for employment development. An insufficient supply of land limits the prospect of future employment opportunity for the local population and increases the likelihood of longer distance commuting. Equally an oversupply will have environmental consequences, promote in-commuting and weaken the strategic focus sought in this Core Strategy. **Impact on Sustainability Appraisal** Although the scale of employment land required for new development has been reduced, this assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment.		

SP5: Employment Land – Employment Sectors		
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy - Employment Sectors**	**Option 3: Take a differing approach.** Alternative dimensions of the economy could be supported, and in different ways.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑↑	↑
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑↑	↑
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	↑↑	↑
4. Quality housing available to everyone	~	~
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	~	~
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	~	~
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	~	~
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	~	~
12. Minimal pollution levels	~	~
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	~	~
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanced development	~	~
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	~	~
16. Local needs met locally	~	~

Commentary	The selected option takes its direction from the Prosperous Communities Strategy. It is unlikely that alternative Core Strategy approaches could demonstrate a better fit for the local economy than one underpinned by the analysis and local debate which produced the Prosperous Communities Strategy. SP5 previously included assessments of potential employment sites. These have been removed from the Submission version as they are now incorporated within Core Policy CP4 (was CP14) Supporting Sites for Development. **Impact on Sustainability Appraisal** This assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment.

Sub Area Strategies

CRSS: Central Richmondshire Sub Area Strategy			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Be more prescriptive.** This might for example involve a more prescriptive set of requirements in terms of identifying specific sites and also set out a stringent set of targets.	**Option 2: Be less prescriptive.** Determination of the development strategy could, for example, rely on the one hand on the advice of Government guidance through the NPPF, and also on market forces. However, Government advice is requiring Local Plans to get involved in this priority area, and not rely on market forces to necessarily address issues adequately.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑↑	↑	↑
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑↑	↑	↑
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	~	~	~
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑	↑↑	↑
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	~	~	~
7. Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	↑	↑↑	↓
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	↑	↑↑	↓
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions & a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑	↑↑	↓
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	↑	↑↑	↓
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	~	~	~
12. Minimal pollution levels	~	~	~
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	~	~	~

CRSS: Central Richmondshire Sub Area Strategy			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Be more prescriptive.** This might for example involve a more prescriptive set of requirements in terms of identifying specific sites and also set out a stringent set of targets.	**Option 2: Be less prescriptive.** Determination of the development strategy could, for example, rely on the one hand on the advice of Government guidance through the NPPF, and also on market forces. However, Government advice is requiring Local Plans to get involved in this priority area, and not rely on market forces to necessarily address issues adequately.
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanced development	↑↑	↑	↓
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	↑↑	↑	↓
16. Local needs met locally	↑↑	↑↑	↓
Commentary	The Sub Area Strategy maximises the potential for a wider range of services to be sustained in the plan area. The alternatives reduce this potential. Treating Richmond and Catterick Garrison as complementary joint principal towns maximises their economic and sustainability potential. Whilst there may be more control over development, its benefits and its impact on the local area by adopting Option 1, the stringent requirements of developers through a more prescriptive strategy would likely mean less development proposals being achieved. Equally, a less restrictive approach would reduce the level of control on development which may cause significant adverse impacts on the local environment, economy and social aspects.		

Strategic Areas of Search – Options: Richmond Town

The following Sustainability Assessment (Table 3A) provides an analysis of the strategic development options for the key settlement of Richmond. Firstly, it considers the compatibility of each option with the relevant Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and then informs the selection of the chosen option, where appropriate, against the range of options that have not been pursued. At this stage, given the strategic nature of the options, the sustainability appraisal assessment is based on the provision of mixed development in each option and does not specifically distinguish between particular types of development (e.g. housing or employment). Further details of the various site options can be found within the CP14 consultation documents, September/October 2011.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Option A** Within Richmond	**Option B** West (South)	**Option C** West (North)	**Option D** North West	**Option E** North	**Option F** North East	**Option G** East	**Option H** South	**Comments**
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all.	↑↑	↑	↑↑	↑↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	Options A, B, C, D and E score positively given their proximity to existing employment opportunities, with C and D being the best related. Option A is also scored positively given its relationship to existing employment provision within Richmond. Options F-H score negatively given their relationship to existing employment opportunities is limited.
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not applicable. Assessment of this is covered under Objective 1.
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not applicable. Difficult to assess this objective at this strategic stage.
4. Quality housing available to everyone.	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	All options score positively as quality housing development is a requirement of relevant development policies.
5. Safety and security for people and property.	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓	↑	↑	↓↓	All options score positively except Option H due to its potential for flooding to put lives and homes at risk.
6. Conditions and services to engender good health.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not applicable. Difficult to assess this objective at this strategic stage.
7. Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all.	↑↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓↓	↓↓	All options have the potential to increase and enhance such activities through their development and through increased links to existing activities. Option A contains the Richmond Conservation Area The exceptions are the development of Options G and H which could significantly adversely impact on cultural and heritage resources.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Option A** Within Richmond	**Option B** West (South)	**Option C** West (North)	**Option D** North West	**Option E** North	**Option F** North East	**Option G** East	**Option H** South	**Comments**
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources, minimal production of waste.	↑↑	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓↓	Only Option A provides potential development which will predominantly be on previously developed land in preference to greenfield areas. All other options will involve almost exclusive use of greenfield land.
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not applicable.Assessment of this is covered under Objectives 10 and 11.
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property.	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓↓	Most options have no impact on this objective. Negative impacts have been identified for Option H due to the River Swale floodplain.
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact.	↑↑	↓	↓	↓	↑	↑↑	↑↑	↓	Option A is identified as significantly positive as it maximises existing infrastructure. However, this option could raise capacity issues unforeseeable at this time. Options B to D are negative due to the problems with capacity at the Gallowgate junction and elsewhere. Option E has access potential from Gilling Road to the east and Whashton Road to the west although the latter will have an impact on capacity at the Gallowgate junction. Options F and G score most highly having good access to Darlington Road and public transport services. Option H has the poorest access to local transport services and facilities as well as being likely to maximise its detrimental impact.
12. Minimal pollution levels.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not applicable. Difficult to assess this objective at this strategic stage.
13. Bio-diverse natural environment.	↓	↓	↓↓	↓↓	↓↓	↓↓	↓	↓↓	Option A is potentially least harmful. Options B to F all have potential impacts for designations including the European SAC at Gingerfields. Option H also has multiple interests and another two SAC sites.
14. A quality built environment that protects and enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that makes good use of derelict sites,	↑	↑↑	↑↑	↓	↓	↓	↓↓	↓↓	Option A is supportive of this objective in that development will seek to improve the quality of the built environment, making efficient use of land use patterns, previously developed land and minimising travel needs as they are well

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Option A** Within Richmond	**Option B** West (South)	**Option C** West (North)	**Option D** North West	**Option E** North	**Option F** North East	**Option G** East	**Option H** South	**Comments**
minimises travel and promotes balanced development.									related to existing transport networks provided it does not result in town cramming. Options B & C support this objective by promoting efficient land use patterns and balanced development in areas of weakest landscape and seeking to secure environmental benefits/improvements. Options D to F are all neutral due to potential for improvements and sensitive heritage assets which could potentially be detrimental. Options G and H are both negative impacts due to the assets they could adversely affect (Scots Dyke for G and the setting of the town for H).
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not applicable. Difficult to assess this objective at this strategic stage.
16. Local needs met locally.	↑↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	Option A provides the most supportive response to this objective as it seeks development within the existing settlement and its facilities and services. All other options are all scored equally given their relatively peripheral proximity to the existing settlement.

Strategic Areas of Search – Options: Hipswell, Scotton and Colburn

The following Sustainability Assessment (Table 3A) provides an analysis of the strategic development options for the key settlements of Hipswell, Scotton and Colburn. Firstly, it considers the compatibility of each option with the relevant Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and then informs the selection of the chosen option, where appropriate, against the range of options that have not been pursued. At this stage, given the strategic nature of the options, the sustainability appraisal assessment is based on the provision of mixed development in each option and does not specifically distinguish between particular types of development (e.g. housing or employment). Further details of the various site options can be found within the CP14 consultation documents, September/October 2011.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Option A** Hipswell	**Option B** East of Hipswell	**Option C** West & North West of Colburn	**Option D** North & North East of Colburn	**Option E** South of Colburn	**Option F** South & South East of Scotton	**Option G** West of Scotton	**Option H** West of Hipswell	**Comments**
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all.	↑	↑	↑↑	↑↑	↑↑	↓	↓	↓	Options C, D and E are along the main transport routes and are near to existing traditional B1, B2, B8 employment and access to the A1. There is a potential for these sites, particularly around Colburn and Walkerville to provide for new employment opportunities. These sites are strongly supportive of this objective Option A and B are near to the town centre and or along main public transport routes. There is a potential for town centre and those sites along the A6136, to provide for new employment opportunities. Options F, G and H do not support this objective as they are located the furthest away from existing general employment provision and the main road network and the most frequently served bus routes.
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Assessment of this objective is not development area specific.
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Assessment of this objective is not development area specific.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Option A** Hipswell	**Option B** East of Hipswell	**Option C** West & North West of Colburn	**Option D** North & North East of Colburn	**Option E** South of Colburn	**Option F** South & South East of Scotton	**Option G** West of Scotton	**Option H** West of Hipswell	**Comments**
4. Quality housing available to everyone.	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	Housing provided on any of the options would support this objective of providing new housing which is of a good quality. All options are therefore considered to be supportive. Options A, B, C, D and E are near to the most frequent bus services, and the main road network. They can be considered to be more accessible to all.
5. Safety and security for people and property.	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	Development in any of the options offers the potential through good design to create safe and secure environments for the people living and or working in those areas. Further new development will provide the ability to improve the public realm, particularly if the redevelopment of derelict sites is involved or where opportunities for redevelopment allows development to better respond to the public realm.
6. Conditions and services to engender good health.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Assessment of this objective is not development area specific.
7. Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all.	↑↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	Option A is strongly supportive of this objective. It is located around Hipswell Town Centre where there are a number of leisure and recreational activities available. It is also on the main road network and Public Transport Routes with frequent services to Richmond and Darlington enabling access for all to cultural and leisure facilities offered there. Options B, C, D and E all support this objective they are located along the main road network and bus routes. Colburn Leisure centre is located in between Options C, D and E. Option F also supports this objective, but to a lesser extent than the above options. It is located on a bus route which is less frequent than those on the A 6136, and the option is adjacent to the Saddle Club and areas of natural and semi natural green space. Options G and H are less positive, they are near to a number of leisure and recreation activities such as the Golf

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Option A** Hipswell	**Option B** East of Hipswell	**Option C** West & North West of Colburn	**Option D** North & North East of Colburn	**Option E** South of Colburn	**Option F** South & South East of Scotton	**Option G** West of Scotton	**Option H** West of Hipswell	**Comments**
									Course and Nature Reserve. However they are not on or near the main road network and pubic transport routes serving the town centre and Richmond or Darlington.
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources, minimal production of waste.	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	Options A and B offer the ability to use previously developed land (there are some undeveloped sites within Option A) and therefore support this objective. Options C, D, E, F, G and H are predominantly on greenfield sites and therefore do not support this objective.
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Assessment of this objective is not development area specific. Aspects regarding transport and flood risk are dealt with under Objectives 10 & 11.
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property.	↑	↓	↑	↑	↓	↓	↓	↓	Most options do not have an impact on this objective as flood risk is minimal in Hipswell-Scotton-Colburn. There are some localised areas of flooding in Options B, Option E and access to Option F. Although limited flooding is present in these areas the extent is not significant enough to impact on the ability of the options to deliver growth. The extent of flooding in Option E is very small relative to the area covered by the option There may be land drainage issues present in Options H and G, although this has not been confirmed by SFRA or the EA. A number of land drainage channels and becks are present in this area. These options are considered not to support this objective.
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact.	↑↑	↑↑	↑↑	↑↑	↑↑ Northern part only ↑ Southern part only	↑	↓	↓	Options A, B, C, D and the northern part of Option E are located off the main public transport routes and the main road network and strongly support this objective. Southern part of Option E would score supportive rather than strongly supportive as you go further south into the site away from the main Road network. Option F is not located along the main road network and access across bridge in Scotton is likely to be constrained,

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	Option A Hipswell	Option B East of Hipswell	Option C West & North West of Colburn	Option D North & North East of Colburn	Option E South of Colburn	Option F South & South East of Scotton	Option G West of Scotton	Option H West of Hipswell	Comments
									however there is a bus route through the centre of the option. Options G and H score as unsupportive as they are distant from the main road network and pubic transport routes.
12. Minimal pollution levels.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not applicable. Difficult to assess this objective at this strategic stage.
13. Bio-diverse natural environment.	↑	↑	↓	↓	↑	↓	↓	↓↓	Most of Hipswell- Scotton-Colburn falls within the Biodiversity Opportunity Area as defined by Natural England. The majority of Option A and Option E (South of Sour Beck) do not fall within the Biodiversity Opportunity areas as defined by Natural England. Options C, D, F and G have scored negatively due to reliance on previously undeveloped sites. Option H is strongly unsupportive due the presence of the Local Nature Reserve within the area. Options A, B, C and E present opportunities to strengthen the green corridors along the becks.
14. A quality built environment that protects and enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that makes good use of derelict sites, minimises travel and promotes balanced development.	↑↑	↑↑	↑	↑	↑ Northern part only	↓	↓	↓	Options A and B are strongly supportive of this objective in that development will seek to improve the quality of the built environment making efficient use of land use patterns, involves some previously developed land and minimise travel needs as they are well related to existing transport networks Option E supports this objective in the northern part of the site, promoting efficient land use patents, balanced development and relates well to the existing transport networks. Option C and D support this objective as they are located on the A6136, part of the main road network, with frequent bus services and in close proximity to existing employment and other local services. The southern part of Option E has a neutral impact. It is further from existing public transport routes and is predominantly a greenfield site.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Option A** Hipswell	**Option B** East of Hipswell	**Option C** West & North West of Colburn	**Option D** North & North East of Colburn	**Option E** South of Colburn	**Option F** South & South East of Scotton	**Option G** West of Scotton	**Option H** West of Hipswell	**Comments**
									However there is potential for new employment within Option E as a whole and overall it would promote a mixed and balance development. Options F, G and H do not support this objective as they do not minimise travel needs or support efficient land use patterns.
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not applicable. Difficult to assess this objective at this strategic stage.
16. Local needs met locally.	↑↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	Option A is strongly supportive of this objective as it seeks development within and immediately adjacent to Hipswell Centre, reducing the reliance on the car as a mode of transport. All other options are scored supportively as they are located next to existing or within reasonable distance from the existing settlement and its local facilities such as town centre, White Shops, the Broadway, and employment at Colburn and Walkerville and Military Developments.

LWSS: Lower Wensleydale Area			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Unplanned Strategy** This strategy would be more reactive to market demands and permit development where sites were brought forward rather than promoting an amount of development in identified areas. This would undermine the overall sustainability of the whole area. It would make it more difficult to coordinate limited resources aimed at improving local services. For example school planning could not be based on an expected level of growth. A similar problem would face the already limited public transport services. It may also divert affordable housing away from Service Villages through increased development pressure on the smaller villages.	**Option 2: Restrictive Strategy** A more restrictive strategy would seek to conserve the area's existing attributes and restrict development. This approach would also undermine the sustainability of the area by limiting its capacity to change and risk settlements stagnating. This approach would compound the already strong housing market by maintaining a limited supply and exclude many potential households from settling in this area with knock on effects on local employment and local services, which would suffer from reduced numbers and reduced local opportunities.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑↑	↑	↓
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑↑	↑	↓
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	~	~	~
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑↑	↑	↓
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	↑↑	↑	↓
7.Culture, heritage, leisure & recreation activities to all	↑↑	↑	↓
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	~	~	~
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↓	↓
12. Minimal pollution levels	↓	↓↓	↓

LWSS: Lower Wensleydale Area			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Unplanned Strategy** This strategy would be more reactive to market demands and permit development where sites were brought forward rather than promoting an amount of development in identified areas. This would undermine the overall sustainability of the whole area. It would make it more difficult to coordinate limited resources aimed at improving local services. For example school planning could not be based on an expected level of growth. A similar problem would face the already limited public transport services. It may also divert affordable housing away from Service Villages through increased development pressure on the smaller villages.	**Option 2: Restrictive Strategy** A more restrictive strategy would seek to conserve the area's existing attributes and restrict development. This approach would also undermine the sustainability of the area by limiting its capacity to change and risk settlements stagnating. This approach would compound the already strong housing market by maintaining a limited supply and exclude many potential households from settling in this area with knock on effects on local employment and local services, which would suffer from reduced numbers and reduced local opportunities.
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	↑	↓	↑↑
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimises travel & promotes balanced development	↑↑	↓	↑
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	↑↑	↓	↓
16. Local needs met locally	~	~	~
Commentary	Restraint in the Lower Wensleydale area would conserve the attractive environment but would offer limited scope to support local community life. Unplanned growth would also undermine local sustainability by both diluting the focus on local services and the Local Service Centre and threatening the quality of the local environment.		

Strategic Areas of Search – Options: Leyburn

The following Sustainability Assessment (Table 3A) provides an analysis of the strategic development options for the key settlement of Leyburn. Firstly, it considers the compatibility of each option with the relevant Sustainability Appraisal Objectives and then informs the selection of the chosen option, where appropriate, against the range of options that have not been pursued. At this stage, given the strategic nature of the options, the sustainability appraisal assessment is based on the provision of mixed development in each option and does not specifically distinguish between particular types of development (e.g. housing or employment). Further details of the various site options can be found within the CP14 consultation documents, September/October 2011.

Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Option A** Within Leyburn	**Option B** North West	**Option C** North East	**Option D** East	**Option E** South East	**Option F** South	**Option G** West	**Comments**
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all.	↑↑	↑	↑	↓	↑↑	↓	↓	Options A and E score positively given their proximity to existing employment opportunities. Options D, F and G score negatively given that access to each area is restricted and their relationship to existing employment opportunities is limited. All other options score equally well given accessibility and relationship to existing employment opportunities in the town centre.
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not applicable. Assessment of this objective is not development area specific.
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not applicable. Assessment of this objective is not development area specific.
4. Quality housing available to everyone.	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	All options score positively as quality housing development is a requirement of relevant RDC development policies.
5. Safety and security for people and property.	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	All options score positively as safety and security for people and property is expected to be considered for all new development.
6. Conditions and services to engender good health.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not applicable. Assessment of this objective is not development area specific.
7. Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all.	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↓↓	All options have the potential to increase and enhance such activities through their development and through increased links to existing activities. Option A, in particular, contains the Leyburn Conservation Area and several

								listed buildings which will need to be considered with any new development. Good design, materials and layout can enable enhancement of the heritage assets within the option area. Options B, C, D, E and F all offer the potential to increase (leisure and recreation) activities though incorporation within new development. The exception is the development of Option G which would significantly have an adverse impact on recreation and leisure resources in and around Leyburn (e.g. Leyburn Shawl).
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources, minimal production of waste.	↑↑	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	Only Option A provides potential development which will use previously developed land in preference to Greenfield areas. All other options will involve almost exclusive development on greenfield land.
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not applicable. Assessment of this objective is not development area specific. Aspects regarding travel and flooding considerations are dealt with under Objectives 10 and 11
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property.	↑	↑↑	↑	↓	↑	↓	↓	Most options have no impact on this objective as flood risk is minimal in the Leyburn area. Negative impacts have been identified for Option D due to Harmby Mill Beck running through the area, Option F due to potential surface water run off issues southwards to identified flood zone areas and Option G due to potential surface water run off issues likely across the A684 down the sloping landscape at Chapel Flatts.
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact.	↑↑	↑	↓	↓	↑↑	↓	↓↓	Options A and E are strongly supportive of this objective due to the proximity of existing transport networks (road, rail and public transport). All other options are positively scored with the exception of Options C and D due to limited potential direct access to the area and Option F due to concerns on the potential traffic capacity at the Harmby Road / Middleham Road junction. Option G is scored significantly

								negatively as access to this area is very difficult to achieve and will also have major detrimental impact on the option area.
12. Minimal pollution levels.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not applicable. Assessment of this objective is not development area specific.
13. Bio-diverse natural environment.	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓↓	Option G is significantly negative when assessed against this objective due to the potential impact of development on the Leyburn Shawl and landscape and countryside character. Options B, C, D, E and F have scored negatively for their potential adverse impacts on identified natural areas (e.g. the local nature reserve within Option C, springs, woodland and water). Option A. although scored negatively, has been identified as having relatively no effect on biodiversity given that its focus is on mostly previously developed sites within the existing settlement.
14. A quality built environment that protects and enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that makes good use of derelict sites, minimises travel and promotes balanced development.	↑↑	↑	↓	↓	↑↑	↓	↓	Options A and E are strongly supportive of this objective in that development will seek to improve the quality of the built environment, making efficient use of land use patterns, previously developed land and minimising travel needs as they are well related to existing transport networks. Option B supports this objective by promoting efficient land use patterns and balanced development. Option G is not supportive of this objective. Development would have an adverse impact on historic assets (e.g. Leyburn Hall) and existing land use patterns and would not provide a balanced development in Leyburn in terms of settlement form. All other options have been assessed as having a broadly neutral impact as some have positive benefits in terms of land use patterns but score negatively on the protection and enhancement of historic assets or do not promote balanced development or minimise travel in comparison to other options.

15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not applicable. Assessment of this objective is not development area specific and will apply equally to all options.
16. Local needs met locally.	↑↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	↑	Option A provides the most supportive response to this objective as it seeks development within the existing settlement and its facilities and services. All other options are all scored equally given their relatively peripheral proximity to the existing settlement.

NRSS: North Richmondshire Area			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Unplanned Strategy.** This strategy would be more reactive to market demands and permit development where sites were brought forward rather than promoting an amount of development in identified areas. This would undermine the overall sustainability of the whole area. It would make it more difficult to coordinate limited resources aimed at improving local services. For example school planning could not be based on an expected level of growth. A similar problem would face the already limited public transport services. It may also divert affordable housing away from Service Villages through increased development pressure on the smaller villages.	**Option 2: Restrictive Strategy.** A more restrictive strategy would seek to conserve the area's existing attributes and restrict development. This approach would also undermine the sustainability of the area by limiting its capacity to change and risk settlements stagnating. This approach would compound the already strong housing market and exclude many potential households from settling in this area with knock on effects on local employment and local services, which would suffer from reduced numbers and reduced local opportunities.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑↑	↑	↓
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑↑	↑	↓
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	~	~	~
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑↑	↑	↓
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	↑↑	↑	↓
7.Culture, heritage, leisure & recreation activities to all	↑↑	↑	↓
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	~	~	~
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↓	↓
12. Minimal pollution levels	↓	↓↓	↓

NRSS: North Richmondshire Area			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Unplanned Strategy.** This strategy would be more reactive to market demands and permit development where sites were brought forward rather than promoting an amount of development in identified areas. This would undermine the overall sustainability of the whole area. It would make it more difficult to coordinate limited resources aimed at improving local services. For example school planning could not be based on an expected level of growth. A similar problem would face the already limited public transport services. It may also divert affordable housing away from Service Villages through increased development pressure on the smaller villages.	**Option 2: Restrictive Strategy.** A more restrictive strategy would seek to conserve the area's existing attributes and restrict development. This approach would also undermine the sustainability of the area by limiting its capacity to change and risk settlements stagnating. This approach would compound the already strong housing market and exclude many potential households from settling in this area with knock on effects on local employment and local services, which would suffer from reduced numbers and reduced local opportunities.
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	↑	↓	↑↑
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimises travel & promotes balanced development	↑↑	↓	↑
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	↑↑	↓	↓
16. Local needs met locally	~	~	~
Commentary	Restraint in the North Richmondshire area would conserve the attractive environment but would offer limited scope to support local community life. Unplanned growth would also undermine local sustainability by both diluting the focus on local services and threatening the quality of the local environment.		

Core Policies

CP1: Responding to Climate Change			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Be more ambitious and prescriptive** This might for example involve a more prescriptive set of requirements and interventions, and a stringent set of targets. As far as renewable and low carbon energy developments, this approach could potentially deliver greater mitigation through its effects on energy production. Given the circumstances in the plan area it is unlikely to be practical or effective – apart from the opportunities in the Catterick Garrison area, which are included within the strategy. Similarly, reflecting the characteristics of the plan area, greater ambition in adaptation measures is unlikely to be necessary, particularly given the proposed location of development.	**Option 2: Be less ambitious** This could for example rely on the one hand on the advice of the extensive Government guidance reviewed in this section, and on the other, on the ingenuity and commercial judgement of market forces. However, Government advice is itself requiring Local Plans to get involved in this priority area, and not rely on market forces to necessarily address these issues adequately.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑	↑↑	↓
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑	↑↑	↓
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	~	~	~
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑	↑↑	↑↑
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	~	~	~
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	~	~	~
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	↑	↑↑	↓
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions & a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑	↑↑	↓
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	↑	↑↑	↓
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	~	~	~

CP1: Responding to Climate Change			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Be more ambitious and prescriptive** This might for example involve a more prescriptive set of requirements and interventions, and a stringent set of targets. As far as renewable and low carbon energy developments, this approach could potentially deliver greater mitigation through its effects on energy production. Given the circumstances in the plan area it is unlikely to be practical or effective – apart from the opportunities in the Catterick Garrison area, which are included within the strategy. Similarly, reflecting the characteristics of the plan area, greater ambition in adaptation measures is unlikely to be necessary, particularly given the proposed location of development.	**Option 2: Be less ambitious** This could for example rely on the one hand on the advice of the extensive Government guidance reviewed in this section, and on the other, on the ingenuity and commercial judgement of market forces. However, Government advice is itself requiring Local Plans to get involved in this priority area, and not rely on market forces to necessarily address these issues adequately.
12. Minimal pollution levels	~	~	~
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	~	~	~
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanced development	↑↑	↑	↓
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	~	~	~
16. Local needs met locally	~	~	~
Commentary	The submission strategy for CP1 now demands higher standards for climate change mitigation through more efficient design than it did within the preferred strategy. It was previously considered that a higher standard would increase build costs, however the policy provides for consideration of viability to ensure that the requirements are realistic and not too onerous. **Impact upon the Sustainability Appraisal** The change in policy has resulted in changes to scores against the Sustainability Appraisal Objectives. The submission strategy still adopts the mid range approach as the option for additional standards could still be applied, however these are thought unreasonable and would certainly increase build costs and discourage development.		

CP2: Achieving Sustainable Development & CP0: Planning Positively			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Be more restrictive and prescriptive** This approach might remove doubt, and clarify matters of principle. However, further restriction might miss or restrict opportunities to achieve much needed development. The proposed policy already incorporates a fair amount of detail and many dimensions	**Option 2: Be less restrictive and prescriptive** This could rely on the one hand on the advice of Government and on the other, on the ingenuity and commercial judgement of market forces. This approach might be valid, since in many cases Government guidance may be sufficient in itself. However there are often aspects where local differences or wishes need clarification. In addition, experience suggests that market forces will by themselves often not address these issues adequately, and could well fail to take into account sustainable development principles, which are the cornerstone of both the new planning system and the Sustainable Community Strategy.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑↑	↑	↑
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑↑	↑	↑
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	↑↑	↑	↑
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑↑	↑	↑
5. Safety and security for people and property	↑↑	↑	↑
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	↑↑	↑	↑
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	↑↑	↑	↑
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	↑↑	↑	↑
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions & a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑↑	↑	↑
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	↑↑	↑	↑
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↑	↑
12. Minimal pollution levels	↑↑	↑	↑
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	↑↑	↑	↑

CP2: Achieving Sustainable Development & CP0: Planning Positively			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Be more restrictive and prescriptive** This approach might remove doubt, and clarify matters of principle. However, further restriction might miss or restrict opportunities to achieve much needed development. The proposed policy already incorporates a fair amount of detail and many dimensions	**Option 2: Be less restrictive and prescriptive** This could rely on the one hand on the advice of Government and on the other, on the ingenuity and commercial judgement of market forces. This approach might be valid, since in many cases Government guidance may be sufficient in itself. However there are often aspects where local differences or wishes need clarification. In addition, experience suggests that market forces will by themselves often not address these issues adequately, and could well fail to take into account sustainable development principles, which are the cornerstone of both the new planning system and the Sustainable Community Strategy.
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanced development	↑↑	↑	↑
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	↑↑	↑	↑
16. Local needs met locally	↑↑	↑	↑
Commentary	The submission strategy for CP2 seeks to maintain a sustainable balance for local communities in a high quality environment. The alternatives considered here tip this balance, either to promote greater conservation at the cost of adaptation to future social and economic change, or in favour of development at the cost of the environmental quality. Although minor amendments to this policy have been made, it is considered that there would be no impact upon scoring against the Sustainability Objectives. **Impact upon the Sustainability Appraisal** This assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment.		

CP3: Supporting the Settlement Hierarchy		
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: No Development Limits** The absence of Development Limits would risk eroding the nature of existing villages and towns by enabling development to proceed without a clear relationship to established community and physical infrastructure. This approach would also risk over extending some villages and divert development away from the main settlements with the best range of services and facilities.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑↑	↑
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑	↑↑
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	↑↑	↑
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑↑	↑
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	↑↑	↑
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	↑↑	↑
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑↑	↑
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↑
12. Minimal pollution levels	↓	↓↓
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	~	~
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanced development	↑↑	↓
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	↑↑	↑

CP3: Supporting the Settlement Hierarchy		
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: No Development Limits** The absence of Development Limits would risk eroding the nature of existing villages and towns by enabling development to proceed without a clear relationship to established community and physical infrastructure. This approach would also risk over extending some villages and divert development away from the main settlements with the best range of services and facilities.
16. Local needs met locally	↑↑	↑
Commentary	The submission strategy seeks to support the roles of settlements in the SP1 Settlement hierarchy by enabling an appropriate scale of development in each settlement through the review and implementation of Development Limits. The absence of these would lead to a loss of focus in the overall strategy and limit its capacity to deliver necessary infrastructure improvements. It would also risk unplanned impacts on smaller villages and the surrounding countryside. **Impact upon the Sustainability Appraisal** The Sustainability Appraisal remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal, but for the addition of arrow symbols at 3, which were omitted from the Preferred Core Strategy in error.	

CP4: Supporting Sites for Development		
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: No Policy on Supporting Sites for Development** The absence of a policy to guide the release of sites for development pending the production of the Delivering Development Plan with site allocations and revised Development Limits would restrict development opportunities over a significant period and, in particular, reduce new housing choice. It could also lead to pressures for development in less sustainable locations.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑	↑
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑	↑
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	~	~
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑↑	↑
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	↑	↑
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	↑	↑
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑↑	↑
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↑
12. Minimal pollution levels	↓	↓
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	~	~
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanced development	↑↑	↓

CP4: Supporting Sites for Development		
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: No Policy on Supporting Sites for Development** The absence of a policy to guide the release of sites for development pending the production of the Delivering Development Plan with site allocations and revised Development Limits would restrict development opportunities over a significant period and, in particular, reduce new housing choice. It could also lead to pressures for development in less sustainable locations.
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making		
16. Local needs met locally		
Commentary	The submission strategy seeks to support the release of sites for development in accordance with other policies in the plan, listing the considerations which would apply. It focuses development on the settlement hierarchy as set out in Spatial Principle SP2 and enables an appropriate scale of development. It also links to the Central Richmondshire and Lower Wensleydale Sub Area Strategies by seeking development in the broad locations identified. The absence of this policy would restrict immediate development opportunities and could lead to pressure for development in less sustainable locations. It would also limit the provision of new sites for housing and other development. **Impact upon the Sustainability Appraisal** As this is a new policy, there was no previous Sustainability Appraisal.	

CP5: Providing a Housing Mix		
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: No policy on housing mix.** If the LDF does not promote certain types of development where it is most needed then it is possible that development may be profit led rather than meeting the demands of the local market. This would perpetuate the existing problems of the mismatch in the housing stock. However, it is recognised that a balance may need to be struck between the desire to meet dwelling type demands, both now and in the future, and site viability.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	~	~
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	~	~
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	~	~
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑↑	↓
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	~	~
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	~	~
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	~	~
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	~	~
12. Minimal pollution levels	~	~
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	~	~
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanced development	~	~

CP5: Providing a Housing Mix		
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: No policy on housing mix.** If the LDF does not promote certain types of development where it is most needed then it is possible that development may be profit led rather than meeting the demands of the local market. This would perpetuate the existing problems of the mismatch in the housing stock. However, it is recognised that a balance may need to be struck between the desire to meet dwelling type demands, both now and in the future, and site viability.
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	~	~
16. Local needs met locally	↑↑	↓
Commentary	Failure to include a policy to address housing mix loses the opportunity to address current and future mismatches in the range of housing types available in the plan area. **Impact upon the Sustainability Assessment** The Sustainability Assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment.	

CP6: Providing Affordable Housing			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy - Thresholds**	**Option 1: A lower threshold.** A lower threshold would assist to deliver a higher number of affordable housing units, subject to viability and site specific considerations, but there may be a risk with a lower threshold impeding development on smaller sites. Outside of the principal towns these are areas with a high affordable housing need and a lower rate of development than the main growth area.	**Option 2: A higher threshold.** A higher threshold would exclude many sites and limit the opportunities to deliver affordable housing, and would therefore conflict with the important objective to maximise the opportunities to meet this need.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	~	~	~
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	~	~	~
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	~	~	~
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑↑	↑	↓
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	~	~	~
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	~	~	~
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions & a managed response to the effects of climate change	~	~	~
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	~	~	~
12. Minimal pollution levels	~	~	~
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	~	~	~

CP6: Providing Affordable Housing			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy - Thresholds**	**Option 1: A lower threshold.** A lower threshold would assist to deliver a higher number of affordable housing units, subject to viability and site specific considerations, but there may be a risk with a lower threshold impeding development on smaller sites. Outside of the principal towns these are areas with a high affordable housing need and a lower rate of development than the main growth area.	**Option 2: A higher threshold.** A higher threshold would exclude many sites and limit the opportunities to deliver affordable housing, and would therefore conflict with the important objective to maximise the opportunities to meet this need.
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanced development	~	~	~
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	~	~	~
16. Local needs met locally	↑↑	↑	↓
Commentary	The preferred strategy recognises that affordable housing need arises across the whole plan area. It also recognises that much development in the more rural areas is small scale. Therefore the threshold at which affordable housing measures are invoked seek as far a practical to retain this balance. The lower threshold in Option 1 risks preventing smaller sites coming forward, while the higher threshold in Option 2 would curtail the opportunities to bring affordable housing options forward in the rural areas. **Impact upon the Sustainability Assessment** This assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment, however the previous CP5 and CP5A have been merged, whilst CP5B has been deleted.		

CP7: Promoting a Sustainable Economy			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Less directive – rely on market forces.** This approach might leave guidance solely at the level of the Strategic Principle SP5. It would be flexible, but would not utilise the opportunity that the LDF provides to integrate and co-ordinate a wide range of economic measures with the spatial planning approach being advanced.	**Option 2: Be more prescriptive.** More specific detail could be provided under each heading, which would provide more clarity. However, given the rapidly changing and diverse nature of the economy, this could rapidly prove to be inflexible and restrictive. Further detail is generally therefore neither appropriate nor feasible.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑↑	↑	↑
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑	↑↑	↑
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	↑↑	↑	↑
4. Quality housing available to everyone	~	~	~
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	~	~	~
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	~	~	~
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	↑↑	↑	↑
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions & a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑↑	↑	↑
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↑	↑
12. Minimal pollution levels	↓	↓↓	↓↓
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	~	~	~

CP7: Promoting a Sustainable Economy			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Less directive – rely on market forces.** This approach might leave guidance solely at the level of the Strategic Principle SP5. It would be flexible, but would not utilise the opportunity that the LDF provides to integrate and co-ordinate a wide range of economic measures with the spatial planning approach being advanced.	**Option 2: Be more prescriptive.** More specific detail could be provided under each heading, which would provide more clarity. However, given the rapidly changing and diverse nature of the economy, this could rapidly prove to be inflexible and restrictive. Further detail is generally therefore neither appropriate nor feasible.
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanced development	~	~	~
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	~	~	~
16. Local needs met locally	↑↑	↑	↑
Commentary	The preferred strategy seeks to balance the need for continuing economic activity to help sustain local communities with that to maintain the high quality environment locally. The alternative approaches tip this balance in favour of either economic pressures or environmental protection, both of which would impact on the overall sustainability of local communities. **Impact upon the Sustainability Assessment** The Sustainability Assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment.		

CP8: Achieving Rural Sustainability			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: No development in areas outside the SP1 hierarchy.** A more restrictive approach could be taken, effectively restricting almost all future change in the plan area to locations within the defined settlement hierarchy. Whilst there could be arguments that a more sustainable pattern of development would be achieved, and overall access to facilities for all sectors and communities maximised, this approach would be very severe on all the non hierarchy communities – potentially leading to their stagnation if not actual decline, and thus not responding to needs and opportunities throughout the whole area, and ultimately not maximising sustainability, taking the plan area as a whole.	**Option 2: More development in areas outside the SP1 Hierarchy.** A less restrictive approach could allow a significantly greater proportion of development outside the defined sustainable settlement hierarchy. This would move to the other extreme from option SP2B – and would fail to maximise the benefits of locations within the hierarchy – for example in terms of access to facilities, and greater potential for growth in these locations, in relation to existing and proposed infrastructure. It would conflict with the benefits described under Spatial Principle SP1.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑↑	↑	↓
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑	↓	↑↑
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	~	~	~
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑↑	↑	↓
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	↑↑	↑	↓
7.Culture, heritage, leisure & recreation activities to all	↑↑	↑	↓
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑	↑↑	↓
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↑	↓

CP8: Achieving Rural Sustainability			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: No development in areas outside the SP1 hierarchy.** A more restrictive approach could be taken, effectively restricting almost all future change in the plan area to locations within the defined settlement hierarchy. Whilst there could be arguments that a more sustainable pattern of development would be achieved, and overall access to facilities for all sectors and communities maximised, this approach would be very severe on all the non hierarchy communities – potentially leading to their stagnation if not actual decline, and thus not responding to needs and opportunities throughout the whole area, and ultimately not maximising sustainability, taking the plan area as a whole.	**Option 2: More development in areas outside the SP1 Hierarchy.** A less restrictive approach could allow a significantly greater proportion of development outside the defined sustainable settlement hierarchy. This would move to the other extreme from option SP2B – and would fail to maximise the benefits of locations within the hierarchy – for example in terms of access to facilities, and greater potential for growth in these locations, in relation to existing and proposed infrastructure. It would conflict with the benefits described under Spatial Principle SP1.
12. Minimal pollution levels	↓	↓↓	↓↓
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	↑	↑↑	↓
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimises travel & promotes balanced development	↑↑	↑	↓
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	↑↑	↑	↓
16. Local needs met locally	~	~	~
Commentary	This assessment reflects the tensions between supporting rural communities while at the same time preventing stagnation through choking off the capacity for change. The laissez-faire option considered in Option 2 of allowing market forces to prevail would risk damaging the rural fabric of the area. Option 1 would conserve the high quality environment but at the cost of restricting the local rural economy and communities which sustain it. The selected option strikes a balance between these two options and is supported by the rest of the Submission Core Strategy in a way that seeks to retain sustainable rural communities. Although the retail floorspace threshold has been lowered to better reflect the existing mix of retail floorspace in the existing town centres, the assessment of options remains unchanged. Core Policy CP12 mitigates the impact on Sustainability Objective 13. **Impact upon the Sustainability Assessment** The Sustainability Assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment.		

CP9: Town and Local Centres			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Lower threshold for retail studies.** A lower threshold would put a burden on smaller developments that would risk deterring investment in Richmond or Leyburn.	**Option 2: Higher threshold for retail impact studies.** A higher threshold would ignore the current scale of retail floorspace in the traditional town centres and risk overlooking proposals that could have an adverse impact on the existing mix.
1. Good quality employment opps. available to all	↑↑	↑	↑
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑	↑	↑↑
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	~	~	~
4. Quality housing available to everyone	~	~	~
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	~	~	~
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	~	~	~
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions & a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑	↑↑	↑
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↑	↑
12. Minimal pollution levels	~	~	~
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	~	~	~
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanced development	↑↑	↑	↑

CP9: Town and Local Centres			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Lower threshold for retail studies.** A lower threshold would put a burden on smaller developments that would risk deterring investment in Richmond or Leyburn.	**Option 2: Higher threshold for retail impact studies.** A higher threshold would ignore the current scale of retail floorspace in the traditional town centres and risk overlooking proposals that could have an adverse impact on the existing mix.
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making			
16. Local needs met locally			
Commentary	The preferred strategy for CP9 seeks to balance the need for continuing economic activity to help sustain local town centres with that to maintain the high quality environment locally. The alternative approaches tip this balance in favour of either economic pressures or environmental protection, both of which would impact on the overall sustainability of local communities. **Impact upon the Sustainability Assessment** The Sustainability Assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment.		

CP10: Developing Tourism				
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Greater promotion of tourism, with an emphasis on the local economy.** Whilst economically beneficial (if commercially successful), this could lead to increasing impact on the environment, and potentially be less sustainable.	**Option 2: Restrictive approach to tourism with a greater emphasis on the environment.** This risks stifling innovation, and could be seen as inflexible. Whilst environmental concerns may result from tourist activities because of their location, design solutions may exist which could provide satisfactory mitigation.	**Option 3: Exclude specific guidance on tourism issues.** Relying on PPS4 and other national guidance would not allow the LDF to address one of the most important economic sectors in this plan area – and where a specific local policy approach, to improve quality rather than quality, could be supported through the spatial planning system.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑	↑↑	↓	↑↑
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑	↑↑	↓	↑↑
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	~	~	~	~
4. Quality housing available to everyone	~	~	~	~
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	~	~	~	~
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	↑↑	↑	↑	↑
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑↑	↑	↑	↑
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↑	↑	↑
12. Minimal pollution levels	↓↓	↓↓	↓	↓↓

CP10: Developing Tourism				
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Greater promotion of tourism, with an emphasis on the local economy.** Whilst economically beneficial (if commercially successful), this could lead to increasing impact on the environment, and potentially be less sustainable.	**Option 2: Restrictive approach to tourism with a greater emphasis on the environment.** This risks stifling innovation, and could be seen as inflexible. Whilst environmental concerns may result from tourist activities because of their location, design solutions may exist which could provide satisfactory mitigation.	**Option 3: Exclude specific guidance on tourism issues.** Relying on PPS4 and other national guidance would not allow the LDF to address one of the most important economic sectors in this plan area – and where a specific local policy approach, to improve quality rather than quality, could be supported through the spatial planning system.
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	↓↓	↓↓	↓	↓↓
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that makes good use of derelict sites, minimises travel & promotes balanced development	~	~	~	~
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	~	~	~	~
16. Local needs met locally	~	~	~	~
Commentary	The preferred strategy for CP10 seeks to balance the need for continuing economic activity through support for the locally important tourism sector with that to maintain the high quality environment locally. The alternative approaches tip this balance in favour of either economic pressures or environmental protection or discount concern for the impact of tourism development in the LDF. These alternatives increase the potential for negative impacts on the sustainability of local communities. Any undesirable impacts of the preferred strategy would be mitigated under Core Policy CP12 (Environmental Assets). **Impact upon the Sustainability Assessment** The Sustainability Assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment.			

CP11 Community & Recreation Facilities			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Greater promotion and requirement for leisure, recreation, culture and community by LDF.** Promote substantially greater levels of provision, and identify specific requirements in the Core Strategy. The feasibility of this approach in resource terms would be very doubtful, and fail to reflect the need to balance alternative planning objectives	**Option 2: Allow the loss of recreation or community assets.** This might be appropriate if sufficient genuinely accessible facilities are available, but as a principle, would tend to undermine the plan wide level of provision.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	~	~	~
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	~	~	~
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	~	~	~
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑	↑↑	↓
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	↑↑	↑↑	↓
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	↑↑	↑↑	↓
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	~	~	~
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	~	~	~
12. Minimal pollution levels	~	~	~

CP11 Community & Recreation Facilities			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Greater promotion and requirement for leisure, recreation, culture and community by LDF.** Promote substantially greater levels of provision, and identify specific requirements in the Core Strategy. The feasibility of this approach in resource terms would be very doubtful, and fail to reflect the need to balance alternative planning objectives	**Option 2: Allow the loss of recreation or community assets.** This might be appropriate if sufficient genuinely accessible facilities are available, but as a principle, would tend to undermine the plan wide level of provision.
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	↑	↑↑	↓↓
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that makes good use of derelict sites, minimises travel & promotes balanced development	↑↑	↑↑	↓
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	↑	↑↑	↓↓
16. Local needs met locally	↑↑	↑↑	↓↓
Commentary	The selected strategy for CP11 seeks to maximise the amount of leisure, recreation, culture and community assets without impairing the capacity of overall development. **Impact upon the Sustainability Assessment** At Sustainability Appraisal Objective 14. A Quality and Built Environment the score has been amended to 'strongly supportive' as this policy now protects community and recreational assets more strongly and therefore gives much stronger guidance to promote balanced dev4elopment. The policy also requires more stringent evidence for loss of facilities in order to help ensure balanced development and to prevent loss of assets in line with NPPF.		

CP12: Sustaining and Enhancing Environmental and Historic Assets			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Be more restrictive and prescriptive.** This approach might remove doubt, and clarify matters of principle, in order to ensure a closer respect for assets, and for their conservation. However, in a practical sense, the diversity of the topics covered here suggests that the Core Policies should be as brief as possible, to avoid a potential proliferation of extra policies – and further restriction might miss or restrict opportunities to achieve much needed development. The proposed policy already incorporates a fair amount of detail and many dimensions.	**Option 2: Be less restrictive and prescriptive.** For example this could rely on the one hand on the advice of Government guidance, and on the other, on the ingenuity and commercial judgement of market forces. This approach might be valid, since in many cases Government guidance is extensive and often sufficient in itself. However there are often aspects where local differences or wishes need clarification. In addition, experience suggests that market forces will not by themselves often address these issues adequately, and the end result could be to the detriment of the asset.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	~	~	~
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	~	~	~
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	~	~	~
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑	↓	↑↑
5. Safety and security for people and property	~	~	~
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	↑	↑↑	↓
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	↑	↑↑	↓
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	↑	↑↑	↓
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions & a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑	↑↑	↓
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	↑	↑↑	↓
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↑	↑
12. Minimal pollution levels	↓	↓	↓↓

CP12: Sustaining and Enhancing Environmental and Historic Assets			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Be more restrictive and prescriptive.** This approach might remove doubt, and clarify matters of principle, in order to ensure a closer respect for assets, and for their conservation. However, in a practical sense, the diversity of the topics covered here suggests that the Core Policies should be as brief as possible, to avoid a potential proliferation of extra policies – and further restriction might miss or restrict opportunities to achieve much needed development. The proposed policy already incorporates a fair amount of detail and many dimensions.	**Option 2: Be less restrictive and prescriptive.** For example this could rely on the one hand on the advice of Government guidance, and on the other, on the ingenuity and commercial judgement of market forces. This approach might be valid, since in many cases Government guidance is extensive and often sufficient in itself. However there are often aspects where local differences or wishes need clarification. In addition, experience suggests that market forces will not by themselves often address these issues adequately, and the end result could be to the detriment of the asset.
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	↑	↑↑	↓
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanced development	↑↑	↑	↓
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	~	~	~
16. Local needs met locally	~	~	~
Commentary	Although Option 1 clearly increases the potential to protect the plan area's high quality environment, protection must be balanced with sustainability. It is recognised that conserving and enhancing our environmental and historic assets, supporting change and development where necessary will secure social and economic sustainability, as well as protect the environment. **Impact upon the Sustainability Assessment** The Sustainability Assessment remains unchanged from the Preferred Core Strategy Sustainability Assessment.		

CP13: Promoting High Quality Design			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Set higher design standards.** Insist upon / require higher standards of design and design coding.	**Option 2: Have no design standards.** Rely upon national guidance and use broad definitions of high quality design and sustainable construction and materials.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑	↑	↑
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑	↑	↑
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	↑	↑	↑
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑↑	↑	↑
5. Safety and security for people and property	↑↑	↑↑	↑
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	↑	↑	↑
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	↑	↑	↑
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	↑↑	↑↑	↑
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions & a managed response to the effects of climate change	↑↑	↑↑	↑
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	~	~	~
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑	↑	↑
12. Minimal pollution levels	↑↑	↑↑	↑
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	↓	↓	↓
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient landuse patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanceddevelopment	↑↑	↑↑	↑

CP13: Promoting High Quality Design			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Set higher design standards.** Insist upon / require higher standards of design and design coding.	**Option 2: Have no design standards.** Rely upon national guidance and use broad definitions of high quality design and sustainable construction and materials.
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	↑	↓	↑
16. Local needs met locally	↑	↓	↑
Commentary	Option 1 provides a strict, uncompromising policy which may stifle development proposals in terms of viability. Option 2 provides a much more relaxed approach which potentially jeopardises any level of design quality and sustainability in proposals. The submission option attempts to strike a balance between these two extremes of viability and design quality and sustainability. **Impact upon the Sustainability Assessment** CP13 is a new policy and therefore this sustainability assessment is the first time the policy has been considered against the criteria.		

CP14: Providing and Delivering Infrastructure			
Richmondshire Sustainability Appraisal Objectives	**Submission Strategy**	**Option 1: Detailed scheme specific policy.** Schemes listed.	**Option 2: Do nothing**. Have no specific infrastructure policy.
1. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	↑	↑	↓
2. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	↑↑	↑↑	↓↓
3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	↑	↑	↑
4. Quality housing available to everyone	↑↑	↑↑	↑
5. Safety and security for people and property	↑	↑	↑
6. Conditions and services to engender good health	↑	↑	↑
7.Culture, heritage, leisure and recreation activities to all	↑	↑	↓
8. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	~	~	~
9. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions & a managed response to the effects of climate change	~	~	~
10. Reduction of flood risk to people and property	↑	↑	↑
11. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impact	↑↑	↑	↓
12. Minimal pollution levels	~	~	~
13. Bio-diverse and attractive natural environment	↓	↓	↓
14. A quality built environment that protects & enhances its historic assets and efficient land use patterns, that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promotes balanced development	↑	↑	↓
15. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	↑	↑	↑
16. Local needs met locally	↑↑	↑	↓

Commentary	Option 1 suggests presenting a list of specific infrastructure schemes to be delivered through the LDF. This is very inflexible and prescriptive and leaves little room for any amendments throughout the plan period. Also, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is where such a list should be presented. Option 2, the 'do nothing' option, leaves little scope to implement such infrastructure requirements in a policy context and diminishes the weight the Council has to place obligations on developers to make contributions. The proposed policy option provides a 'hook' for the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as well as an expectation of timely delivery. **Impact upon the Sustainability Assessment** CP13 is a new policy and therefore this sustainability assessment is the first time the policy has been considered against the criteria.