

Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the East Herts District Plan

**SA Report
Non-technical Summary**

September 2016

DOCUMENT DETAILS					
Rev	Date	Details	Prepared by	Reviewed by	Approved by
1	Sept 2016	Non-technical Summary of the SA Report published alongside the 'Proposed Submission' version of the East Herts District Plan.	Alastair Peattie Principal Consultant	Steve Smith Technical Director	Steve Smith Technical Director

Limitations

AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited (AECOM) has prepared this Report for the sole use of East Herts District Council ("Client") in accordance with the terms and conditions of appointment (letter and acceptance sheet) dated 04 August 2016. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this Report or any other services provided by AECOM. This Report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM. such information is accurate. Any such information obtained by AECOM has not been independently verified by AECOM, unless otherwise stated in the Report.

[Copyright © This Report is the copyright of AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.]

Introduction

AECOM is commissioned to undertake Sustainability Appraisal (SA) in support of the emerging East Herts District Plan. Once adopted, the plan will establish a spatial strategy for growth and change up to 2033, allocate strategic sites and establish the policies against which planning applications will be determined.

SA is a mechanism for considering and communicating the likely effects of an emerging plan, and alternatives, with a view to avoiding and mitigating adverse effects and maximising the positives. SA for Local Plans is a legal requirement, in-line with the EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive.

At the current time, the 'Proposed Submission' version of the District Plan is published in-line with Regulation 19 of the Local Planning Regulations, and the 'SA Report' is published alongside. The SA Report aims to inform representations, and subsequent plan-making work (see the discussion of 'next steps', below).

This is a Non-technical Summary (NTS) of the SA Report.

Structure of the SA Report / this NTS

SA reporting essentially involves answering the following questions in turn:

1. What has plan-making / SA involved up to this point?
 - i.e. in the run-up to preparing the Proposed Submission Plan.
2. What are the appraisal findings at this current stage?
 - i.e. in relation to the Proposed Submission Plan.
3. What are the next steps?

Each of these questions is answered in turn below. Firstly though there is a need to set the scene further by answering the question 'What's the scope of the SA?'

What's the scope of the SA?

The scope of the SA is essentially reflected in a list of sustainability objectives. Taken together, these objectives (which are grouped under ten topic headings) indicate the parameters of SA, and provide a methodological 'framework' for appraisal.

Table 1: Sustainability objectives and criteria (the SA framework)

Topics	Objectives
Air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve air quality in AQMAs and other areas exceeding air quality objective levels. Protect problem areas / areas of known sensitivity from traffic congestion and polluting activities.
Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect and enhance areas designated for nature conservation including key biodiversity areas and Local Wildlife Sites. Plan for multi-functional green infrastructure at different scales, including within major developments and across administrative boundaries.
Climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aim to lower per capita GHG (greenhouse gas) emissions. Increase the amount of energy generated by decentralised or renewable sources. Minimise the impact of development on surface water flooding and avoid development within areas of flood risk. Support water efficiency and energy efficiency.
Community and wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meet the needs (including health and social care) of a growing and ageing population. Plan for those with specialist needs, including the disabled population.
Economy and employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support targeted job creation, e.g. capitalising on expansion of Stansted Airport. Match job creation with the provision of appropriate facilities and infrastructure. Support greater rates of gross value added (GVA).
Historic environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the District's historic environmental assets (both designated and non-designated) from inappropriate development. Capitalise on the potential that historic assets have to contribute towards place-shaping (e.g. as the inspiration for design). Recognise the potential for unknown historic sites to act as a constraint on development.
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide for sufficient new dwellings over the plan period, including specialist housing. Increase the provision of affordable housing. Provide additional Gypsy and Traveller pitches, in appropriate locations, in line with up-to-date evidence on need.
Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support efficient use of land, including development of previously developed land (PDL). Support the remediation of contaminated land. Consider waste minimisation at the design stage of development.
Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect and enhance the district's landscape character areas and key landscape assets. Ensure that landscape assets, such as hedgerows, are protected and integrated within development (to maximise their potential amenity value).
Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate a modal shift away from the private car, with a particular focus on reducing commuting by car. Although it is recognised that all new development will add to congestion through increased vehicle movement, there is a need to ensure that the impacts are not severe. Seek to improve rural accessibility to bus services.

PLAN-MAKING / SA UP TO THIS POINT

An important element of the required SA process involves appraising 'reasonable alternatives' in time to inform development of the draft plan, and then presenting information on reasonable alternatives within the report published alongside the draft plan.

As such, Part 1 of the SA Report explains how work was undertaken to develop and appraise alternative approaches to housing growth ('alternative spatial strategies'). Specifically, Part 1 of the report -

- 1) Explains the process of establishing reasonable alternatives;
- 2) Presents the appraisal of the reasonable alternatives; and then
- 3) Gives the Council's response to the alternatives appraisal findings.

Developing reasonable alternatives

Whilst the main report provides a brief overview of the plan-making / SA process undertaken over an eight year period that led to the development of four 'reasonable' alternative spatial strategy options for appraisal (and consultation) in 2016, the aim here is to provide just a brief overview.

Key stages / inputs discussed within the main report include -

- Appraisal and consultation on six spatial strategy options and six housing distribution options at Issues and Options stage in 2010, findings set out within an Interim SA Report.
- In 2012 the Council embarked on a 'stepped' approach to spatial strategy-making. Each step corresponded with a chapter of the Supporting Document to the District Plan, which was presented at a series of committee meetings between March 2012 and December 2013. This document set out the approach and assessment of development options.
- The Supporting Document along with other evidence that helped to determine housing need informed the identification of eight spatial strategy options. These options were considered through the SA process and the findings presented in an Interim SA Report that was published alongside the Preferred Options in 2014.
- Following the Preferred Options consultation in 2014, the evidence base and technical work was progressed. It was recognised that further work was needed to refine our understanding of spatial strategy alternatives.
- Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) published in September 2015. This evidence base document determined the overall level of housing need for East Herts Council, Epping Forest District Council, Harlow Council and Uttlesford District Council. Further work carried out in August 2016 identified that more housing might be needed to meet the needs of communities in East Herts.
- East Herts Council, Epping Forest District Council, Harlow Council and Uttlesford District Council commissioned a strategic spatial options study to identify options for distributing the housing need identified in the SHMA above.
- The Supporting Document was updated to reflect new evidence and consultation responses. The findings of this work are presented in a number of settlement appraisals that helped to determine the most appropriate sites for development.
- Potential sites for development, identified through the Strategic Land Availability Assessment 2016, were assessed using Geographical Information System (GIS) software, to determine their distance from a number of different features. This included important biodiversity and heritage, bus stops and train stations, schools, employment areas and community facilities. See Appendix IV of the main report.

Ultimately, it was possible to establish four reasonable alternatives for appraisal and consultation. The reasonable alternatives are presented below and in more detail on the next page.

Alternative 1 - accommodate ~**18,000** new homes over the plan period (Housing need = 16,400¹ over the life of the plan but we know that the need is trending upwards):

- a. Preferred distribution as set out in the strategic spatial options.
- b. Preferred distribution (1a) but with ~3,000 fewer homes within the Green Belt at key settlements including Bishop's Stortford (reduction of 750 dwellings), Hertford (reduction of 750 dwellings), Sawbridgeworth (reduction of 500 dwellings) and Ware (reduction of 1,000 dwellings). The ~3,000 will instead be dispersed across the rural area.
- c. Preferred distribution (1a) but with ~3,000 fewer homes within the Green Belt at key settlements including Bishop's Stortford (reduction of 750 dwellings), Hertford (reduction of 750 dwellings), Sawbridgeworth (reduction of 500 dwelling) and Ware (reduction of 1,000 dwellings). The ~3,000 will instead be focused at two new settlements (near Little Hadham and Watton-at-Stone).

Alternative 2 - accommodate ~**19,500** new homes over the plan period (updated housing need = 19,500² over the life of the plan):

- a. Preferred distribution (1a) plus other sites around settlements identified through the evidence base, including additional sites in Buntingford and north of Harlow.

¹ Opinion Research Services (September 2015) West Essex and East Hertfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment: Report of Findings

² Opinion Research Services (August 2016). Updating the Overall Housing Need Based on 2014 projections for West Essex & East Herts

Table 2: The reasonable spatial strategy alternatives - (NB. significantly differentiating figures from Option 1a are highlighted in red)

Spatial area		Spatial options to deliver ~18,000 new homes			Spatial options to deliver ~19,500 new homes
		Option 1a: Preferred Option identified through the Strategic Spatial Options Study	Option 1b: Removal of ~3,000 dwellings from the GB and instead direct towards rural area	Option 1c: Removal of ~3,000 dwellings from the GB and instead direct towards two new settlements	Option 2a: 1a plus other sites Buntingford & north of Harlow identified through evidence
'Givens' (up to July 2016)	Completions	2625	2625	2625	2625
	Permissions	2435	2435	2435	2435
	Windfall assumption	800	800	800	800
	Sub-total	5860	5860	5860	5860
Potential allocations / broad locations ('choices')	Bishop's Stortford	4142	3392	3392	4142
	Buntingford	0	0	0	400
	East of Stevenage	600	600	600	600
	East of Welwyn	1350	1350	1350	1350
	Harlow fringe (Sites A and E)	3050	3050	3050	3050
	Harlow fringe (Site B) City and Country	0	0	0	160
	Harlow fringe (Site C) Land north of Pye Corner	0	0	0	50
	Harlow fringe (Site G) Land north of the Stort/ south Gilston	0	0	0	900
	Hertford	950	200	200	950
	Sawbridgeworth	500	0	0	500
	Ware	1000	0	0	1000
	Larger villages / NP (Group 1 Villages)	500	3500	500	500
	Other (SLAA (over 10 dwellings) deliverable sites in existing urban areas)	88	88	88	88
	New settlement (option 2 - Little Hadham)	0	0	1500	0
	New settlement (option 4 - Watton-at-Stone)	0	0	1500	0
Sub-total	12180	12180	12180	13690	
Total	18040	18040	18040	19550	

Summary alternatives appraisal findings

Summary appraisal findings are presented within Table 3. Within each row (i.e. for each of the topics that comprise the SA framework) the columns to the right hand side seek to both categorise the performance of each option in terms of ‘significant effects’ (using **red** / **green**) and also rank the alternatives in relative order of performance. Also, ‘=’ is used to denote instances where the alternatives perform on a par (i.e. it not possible to differentiate between them).

Table 3: Summary spatial strategy alternatives appraisal findings

Summary findings and conclusions				
Topic	Rank of performance / categorisation of effects			
	Option 1a Preferred distribution	Option 1b Redirect growth in GB towards rural area	Option 1c Redirect growth in GB to two new settlements	Option 2a Preferred distribution & additional sites
Air quality	★1	4	3	2
Biodiversity & GI	=			
Climate Change	★1	4	3	★1
Community and Well-being	★1	4	3	★1
Economy and Employment	★1	4	3	★1
Historic Environment	★1	4	★1	3
Housing	2	3	3	★1
Land	★1	★1	★1	4
Landscape	=			
Transport	★1	4	3	★1
Water	=			

Summary findings and conclusions

Options 1a and 2a were found to perform better against topics relating to community and wellbeing, Economy and Employment and housing as they propose a more balanced distribution of housing across the District compared to Options 1b and 1c. They are more likely to meet the needs of communities in both urban and rural areas and support opportunities for new employment in key growth areas. Option 2a has the potential for enhanced positive effect against housing compared to the other options as it proposes a higher level of overall growth and will meet the estimated OAHN for the District.

Options 1a and 2a direct a greater proportion of development towards the main settlements where there is good accessibility to services/facilities, employment opportunities and sustainable transport modes. This will help to reduce the need to travel and help mitigate the potential impacts of increased traffic on the existing road network. Option 1b was considered less likely to achieve this as a greater proportion of development would be dispersed across the rural area where there is poor access to facilities/services and employment opportunities. Development in the rural area is also likely to be small scale and therefore less likely to result in significant improvements to facilities/services and transport infrastructure. Given the scale of the proposed new settlements under Option 1c they were considered unlikely to be self-contained. Ultimately, it was concluded that the residents of new development provided through Options 1b and 1c would still need to travel to the main settlements in order to access facilities/services and employment opportunities. This would have implications for the transport, climate change and air quality topics.

All of the options have the potential for a significant residual negative effect on the land topic through the loss of agricultural land (particularly the best and most versatile) and greenfield land. At this stage it is not possible to predict which option would result in the greatest loss of best and most versatile agricultural land as the precise location of development under Options 1b and 1c is not specified.

The appraisal found no significant differences between the options in relation to biodiversity, landscape and water. While all of the options were identified as having the potential for a significant negative effect on the landscape, mitigation could help to reduce the significance of the residual effect but this would be dependent on a number of factors, including the design and layout of development as well as the precise location of development under Options 1b and 1c. While each of the options will have different effects at a local scale, it is difficult to differentiate between them at a District level.

Given uncertainties in relation to the location of growth under Option 1c, there is little to differentiate between Options 1a, 1c and 2a with respect to the historic environment. The slightly higher level of overall growth proposed under Option 2a through additional development in Buntingford and in the Gilston area, is not considered likely to result in negative effects of greater significance when compared to options 1a and 1b. If the new settlements proposed under Option 1c could be directed away from sensitive areas then this option has the potential to perform better than the others in relation to the historic environment but this is uncertain at this stage. Option 1b performs poorly compared to the other options given the greater likelihood for cumulative negative effects as a result of the dispersed distribution of development in the rural area. This appraisal also highlighted this point under the landscape topic.

The Council's response / justification for the preferred approach

The following text is in the form of a general discussion of the reasoning and justification behind the preferred option, which is [Option 1a](#).

The Council has taken a 'stepped approach' to the development of a preferred spatial strategy since 2012. This process has been informed by an extensive range of technical evidence including consultation with a range of key stakeholders. The details of this work are presented in the Supporting Document and recent settlement appraisals.

The Council's preferred approach (Option 1a) provides a balanced distribution of housing in order to meet the identified needs of both rural and urban communities compared to other alternatives. It directs development towards the areas where it is needed most and that also have good accessibility to services and facilities as well as employment opportunities, which should help to reduce the need to travel. Importantly it reflects the updated technical evidence, including the Green Belt Review and availability and deliverability of sites identified through the SLAA, as well as constraints within the Plan area. The SA found that the preferred approach (Option 1a) performed well against the majority of SA topics when compared to alternatives.

Alternatives to the release of Green Belt land around the main towns for development have been considered and rejected by the Council (Options 1b and 1c). The options included redirecting this growth towards the rural area (Option 1b) or two new settlements near Watton-at-Stone and Little Hadham (Option 1c).

The dispersal of smaller scale housing sites across the rural area would not represent a sustainable form of development. Housing would be located in areas that have poor access to services/ facilities and employment opportunities. This would increase reliance on the private vehicle and would not provide the scale of development necessary to deliver the infrastructure improvements required to accommodate development. This alternative would also not help to meet the identified needs for communities in a number of the main towns. The findings of the SA support this conclusion.

Alternatives for new stand-alone settlements have been considered at various stages in plan-making by the Council. The current SLAA indicates that there is no land available within the 'areas of search' near Watton-at-Stone and Little Hadham to deliver new settlements. Along with the lack of available land, there are also serious concerns about the infrastructure required to deliver new settlements in these areas. The SA found that given the level of development proposed (1,500 dwellings for each settlement) the settlements would not be self-contained and that residents would still need to travel to the main towns in order to access the greater range of community facilities and employment opportunities on offer.

The higher growth option (Option 2a) includes additional land in Buntingford and north of Harlow. It has been rejected by the Council as the additional sites to the north of Harlow are subject to significant constraints, including designated heritage and areas of high flood risk. The Council also considers that the level of development for Buntingford should be equal to that already committed in the town through the approval of recent planning applications.

APPRAISAL FINDINGS AT THIS STAGE

Part 2 of the SA Report answers the question – *What are appraisal findings at this stage?* – by presenting an appraisal of the Proposed Submission District Plan. Appraisal findings are presented under ten Sustainability Topic headings (see Table 1, above), with each narrative ending in a concluding paragraph. The ten concluding paragraphs are repeated here.

Air Quality

The broad spatial strategy, viewed in isolation, does give rise to a risk of increased traffic congestion in Bishop's Stortford, Hertford and Sawbridgeworth; all of which are towns with designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs). The proposed strategic infrastructure improvements within Policy DPS4 are vital to ensuring that the residual effects of increased traffic on air quality as a result of proposed development are reduced. It is important to note that mitigating the impacts of additional traffic within the town centres will also be reliant on the achievement of modal shift through successful take up of the improved sustainable transport modes and the successful application of travel planning. Taking account of the evidence available, including mitigation provided through draft plan policies and available at the project level, it is predicted that there is the potential for a **residual minor negative effect** on air quality. It will be important to continue monitoring air quality and use the early review of the District Plan (Policy DPS5) to reflect on the effectiveness of proposed mitigation and take the opportunity to consider further measures if necessary.

Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

The broad spatial approach to growth performs well from a biodiversity perspective. The most sensitive locations are avoided, the scale of growth at some locations reflects the need to 'work around' and integrate (within green infrastructure) biodiversity assets, and growth is also proposed where it has the potential to support the delivery of biodiversity enhancement initiatives (e.g. country park initiatives at Panshanger and north of Bishop's Stortford). On this basis, **significant negative effects are not predicted**. On a more local scale, there will be some significant negative effects, but also significant positive effects.

Climate Change

Mitigation - The broad spatial approach to growth reflects a desire to support larger developments, where there will be the potential to fund and design-in low carbon and renewable energy schemes. The policy approach to ensuring that development demonstrates how carbon dioxide emissions will be minimised; that carbon reduction is met on-site and that existing materials are re-used and recycled in construction is supported. Given that new developments that are relatively 'low carbon' will often replace older buildings that do not perform well in this respect, it should be the case that carbon emissions from the built environment fall over time. Overall, although it is **not possible to conclude significant effects** on the baseline, the proposed approach performs well in terms of climate change mitigation objectives.

Adaptation - The broad spatial approach to growth seeks to avoid development in areas at risk of flooding; however, it is inevitably the case that development on this scale can lead to increased run-off and hence increased flood risk, and it is the case that growth is allocated to towns (e.g. Hertford) that sit within river valleys. The majority of the site specific policies that relate to greenfield locations include a requirement for sustainable urban drainage and provision for flood mitigation. These policies will be implemented in line with WAT5 (Sustainable Drainage) which requires applications of the 'Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) hierarchy' and states that: "*Development should aim to achieve Greenfield run-off rates and ensure that surface water run-off is managed as close to its source as possible.*" **Significant effects on the baseline are unlikely.**

Community and Wellbeing

The broad spatial approach to growth reflects a desire to avoid over developing those towns with limited capacity for town centre expansion. A desire to direct growth to locations with sufficient school capacity is another key driver of the spatial strategy. Furthermore, the spatial strategy reflects a desire to focus on larger developments that will support the parallel delivery of social infrastructure. In terms of the site specific policies and area-wide 'topic' policies, a suitably ambitious approach is proposed. For example, it is clear that the available evidence-base in relation to access to natural green space, open space and sports pitches has been reflected. Overall, the proposals are likely to result in **significant positive effects** on the baseline.

Economy and Employment

The broad spatial strategy reflects a desire to support the achievement of established economic objectives at Bishop's Stortford and Harlow. Elsewhere, a more restrained approach is taken in-light of the objective to maintain the existing function of town centres. This is deemed to be a sound long term strategy. Overall, the proposed approach is likely to lead to **significant positive effects** on the baseline.

Historic Environment

The broad spatial strategy reflects a desire to avoid impacts to historic town centres; however, the decision to follow an ambitious growth strategy at Ware is perhaps not ideal in this respect. Uncertainties also surround the potential for growth in A414 and A1184 corridors to be delivered in such a way that avoids worsened traffic congestion in historic town centres. In terms of the site specific policies and area-wide 'topic' policies, it is thought that the proposed approach is suitably ambitious. A careful policy approach has been developed to guide development in the rural area, which should go some way to ensuring a proactive approach to management of assets. Overall, the proposed approach is **unlikely to lead to significant effects** on the baseline.

Housing

The broad spatial strategy is driven by the priority of ensuring housing supply in the long term by ensuring that sufficient housing land is allocated. Various area-wide 'topic' policies are in place to ensure that development is 'mixed' in terms of type and tenure, with a view to ensuring delivery of affordable housing and ensuring that other specialist housing needs are met. The proposed approach should lead to **significant positive effects**.

Land

There is a focus on development on greenfield land given the lack of available brownfield sites. This approach is necessitated on account of the housing need that exists within the various housing market areas. The approach to housing density reflects the ambition to achieve attractive and functioning new communities, e.g. communities that incorporate green infrastructure. The proposals, therefore, do not perform as well as they might do in terms of the objective to 'use land efficiently'. While it is clear that brownfield land has been prioritised where possible and that quality of agricultural land has been taken into account through the Supporting Document, it is still suggested that **significant negative effects** are likely in terms of the overall loss of greenfield and agricultural land.

Landscape

While topic and site allocation policies include measures to reduce the potential impacts of development on the landscape, it is considered that there is still the potential for a residual **significant negative effect**. This is particularly as a result of development at Gilston as well as the cumulative effect of all the development proposed in the South of the District. It is recognised that the strategy focusses development in the south of the District in the most sustainable locations, which helps to protect the rural landscape character in the north. However, this does not negate the potential significant effects in the south of the District. This also result in the loss of Green Belt land to the south. In terms of the approach to site specific and area-wide 'topic' policy, the proposed approach is adequate.

Transport

One of the driving 'principles' of the development strategy is: *"To promote self-containment by directing development to areas where there is reasonable proximity to services and facilities, and which reflect existing travel to work areas, school catchments, and retail spend patterns and functional geographies."* In this respect, the broad spatial strategy performs well in the sense that: the approach that seeks to maximise opportunities at Bishop's Stortford (where there is the potential for employment growth and town centre expansion); and growth is limited at Sawbridgeworth (a 'dormitory' settlement). Growth at Hertford and Ware may not support 'self-containment', but it is noted that these settlements have good access to the rail network. Allocations East of Welwyn Garden City, in the Gilston Area and East of Stevenage are set to be well connected to adjacent towns by public transport and walking/cycling; and, importantly, a restrained approach to growth is set to be taken at Buntingford, where car dependency is entrenched. Overall, the proposed site allocations are unlikely to lead to significant negative effects (given site specific and area-wide 'topic' policies). Taking into account the evidence and larger strategic allocations, **negative effects** are **possible but uncertain**.

Water

Waste water infrastructure capacity has been given careful consideration over the course of plan-making. The outcome is confidence in that there will be no 'show-stoppers', i.e. infrastructure constraints that cannot be overcome, or would be expensive to address and hence draw on funding needed elsewhere (e.g. for community infrastructure). In terms of water efficiency and the potential for water quality impacts associated with surface water run-off, it would appear that a suitably ambitious policy approach is proposed, i.e. an approach that ensures that applicants go beyond national requirements.

Next steps

Part 3 of the SA Report answers– *What happens next?* – by discussing plan finalisation and monitoring.

Plan finalisation

Subsequent to publication stage, the main issues raised will be identified and summarised by the Council, who will then consider whether the plan can still be deemed to be ‘sound’. Assuming that this is the case, the plan (and the summary of representations received) will be submitted for Examination. At Examination a Government appointed Planning Inspector will consider representations (in addition to the SA Report and other submitted evidence) before determining whether the plan is sound (or requires further modifications).

If found to be ‘sound’ the plan will be formally adopted by the Council. At that time an ‘SA Statement’ must be published that sets out (amongst other things) ‘the measures decided concerning monitoring’.

Monitoring

At the current time, there is a need only to present ‘measures envisaged concerning monitoring’.

The draft plan document includes a range of proposed monitoring indicators in Appendix C, with each indicator attached to a specific policy. Most indicators relate to whether / how often / to what extent the policy is implemented, rather than the ‘state’ of the baseline; however, there are some instances of proposals to monitor baseline information and reflect the outcomes of the SA, notably:

Table 4: A selection of the Council’s proposed monitoring indicators

Sustainability topic	Proposed indicator of note (given appraisal findings)
Air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> East Herts Council’s regular air quality review and assessment work required by the Environment Act 1995.
Biodiversity and green infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change in number and area of statutorily protected sites. This will monitor the legally protected site network of SSSIs and LNRs which are also a statutory designation. Change in number and area of non-statutory sites. These will be anything else that is considered to have some form of informal biodiversity or geodiversity recognition namely, Wildlife sites, important geological/geomorphological sites, Wildlife Trust or other reserves. Change in number and area of ancient woodlands.
Climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of new developments producing at least 10% of total predicted energy requirements in accordance with Policy CC3 Amount of new sources of renewable energy generation permitted
Community and wellbeing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of planning permissions granted on land designated for open space, sport and recreation under policy CFLR1 contrary to policy Amount of new open space, sport and recreation facilities completed by typology and settlement Number of planning permissions for residential development granted that result in meeting Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards Number of planning permissions granted on land designated as Local Green Space under policy CFLR2 which are contrary to policy Number of planning permissions granted that result in the loss of uses, buildings or land for public or community contrary to Policy CFLR8 Amount of new uses, buildings or land for public or community use completed by settlement Delivery of strategic and local infrastructure to support new development

Sustainability topic	Proposed indicator of note (given appraisal findings)
Economy and employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of additional jobs provided in the District between 2011-2033 • Amount of additional employment land allocated for Use Classes B1/B2/B8 between 2011-2033 • % of new employment floorspace completed by type on Previously Developed Land (PDL) • Net additional retail floorspace completed between 2011-2033, by settlement and primary shopping area
Historic environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in number of designated historical assets • Number of Conservation Area appraisals completed • Number of listed buildings on the national 'Buildings at Risk Register'
Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Net additional dwellings completed between 2011-2033, by settlement and broad location for growth • Net additional dwellings in future years and phasing (trajectory) • Net additional dwellings completed on Allocated sites • Net additional dwellings completed in the monitoring year, by size, type and tenure and by settlement and broad location for growth • % of affordable housing permissions completed in accordance with Policy HOU3 in terms of site capacity/size thresholds • Amount of new specialist accommodation to meet the specific needs of older and vulnerable people, falling within Use Classes C2, C3, or sui-generis • Number of new Gypsy and Traveller pitches and Travelling Showpeople plots completed
Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of new and converted dwellings on Previously Developed Land (PDL)
Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of planning permissions granted on land in the Green Belt contrary to Policy GBR1 • Number of dwellings permitted in the Green Belt contrary to Policy GBR1
Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of new residential development completed within 30 minutes public transport time of 6 key services • Amount of completed development complying with car parking standards • Delivery of strategic and local infrastructure to support new development
Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency and/or Hertfordshire County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority, on either flood defence or water quality grounds • % of new residential development achieving mains water consumption of 110 litres or less per head per day • Delivery of strategic and local infrastructure to support new development