APPENDIX 2

Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan

Sustainability Appraisal Report

SUMMARY REPORT

June 2007

CONTENTS

.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This summary highlights the process and key findings of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Aire Valley Leeds (AVL) Area Action Plan (AAP). The SA has been undertaken to assess the environmental, social and economic effects which are likely to arise from implementing the Preferred Options for the AAP. The SA also maximises the AAP's potential to support the delivery of social, environmental and environmental objectives, with the SA providing a systematic way of checking and improving on the AAP as it develops.

1.2 The approach adopted in undertaking the SA is based on Government guidance set in 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks (DCLG, 2005).

1.3 The SA was undertaken by a team with a background in planning, economic development, transport policy, environmental health, regeneration and sustainability issues. The initial appraisal of the "Alternative Options" was carried out in March 2006. Appraisal of the "Preferred Options" was carried out in April 2007.

How to comment on the SA

1.4 Comments are invited on the Aire Valley Leeds AAP Preferred Options and on the SA. The detailed SA Report will accompany the Aire Valley Leeds AAP documents when it goes out for public consultation during a six week period in August to October 2007.

2. BACKGROUND

Background to the Aire Valley Leeds AAP

2.1 Following changes to the planning system, brought about by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), the Unitary Development Plan (Review, 2006) for Leeds will gradually be replaced by the Leeds Local Development Framework (LDF). The LDF will be made up of a number of land use documents which will guide and control development. Area Action Plans are part of the LDF and are drawn up for areas where significant change is anticipated.

2.2 The strategic vision for the Aire Valley Leeds is to create "the Window to Leeds, strengthening and delivering, through partnership, the City's role as regional capital by diversifying its economic base and offering innovative opportunities for living, working and recreation, bringing maximum benefit to local residents and the City of Leeds as a whole". The Area Action Plan for Aire Valley will show the location and type of land use change within the area over the next 15-20 years. The AAP will complement the Aire Valley Leeds regeneration initiative, by providing the statutory planning position to guide the implementation of proposals and to ensure that local people and other interested parties have the opportunity to help shape the plan before it is adopted. The AAP will ensure that sufficient land is available to maximise the regeneration of the area and deliver the plan's objectives ensuring that appropriate land is available for employment, greenspace, new housing, schools, shops, health, and community facilities and will provide details on when and how proposals will be developed.

2.3 Preparation of the AVL AAP has been progressing since 2005. In April – June 2006 the Council published alternative options for the type, scale and location of development in AVL across seven strategic themes. This document was subject to public consultation. The City Council has refined those proposals and prepared the "Preferred Options – Unlocking the Potential" for the AVL, for public consultation in September and October 2007.

Purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

2.4 The overall SA objective, of assessing the AAP is to ensure that the AAP maximises its potential to support the delivery of social, economic and environmental objectives. The SA provides a systematic way for checking and improving on the AAP as it develops.

SA Process

2.5 The following process has been followed when undertaking the SA of the AAP:
Stage A – Setting the context, objectives, aseline and scope of the appraisal
Stage B – Developing and refining options and assessing effects
Stage C – AAP Preferred Options assessment and mitigation measures
Stage D – Reporting and consultation
Stage E – Monitoring

Stage A: Setting the context, objectives, baseline and scope

2.6 When setting the context, a review of relevant plans, policies and programmes affecting or influencing the AAP was undertaken. Baseline data was also collected (where available) to establish the social, economic and environmental characteristics of the area to assist in the prediction of impacts. The SA objectives were taken from the already established SA framework for the Leeds LDF and it was against these objectives that the performance of the AVL AAP objectives was tested.

2.7 To ensure that the SA covered the relevant scope and detail, a Scoping Report was prepared in June 2005 and was sent to the statutory SA consultees for their comment. The Scoping Report outlined the SA objectives and the key sustainability issues for the SA to address. A number of alterations were made to the appraisal framework to take account of comments made by the four statutory consultees. This SA has been carried out using the revised appraisal framework.

Stage B: Developing and Refining Options

2.8 The SEA Directive and the new Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004 place considerable emphasis on the consideration of a range of alternative approaches. Consequently, a number of options were developed across a range of seven strategic themes. These alternative options were subjected to an appraisal and the detailed SA matrix tables and the commentary summarising the results of the SA were published on the Council's website. This enabled people to make an informed choice about the full effects of each of the alternative options when they were commenting on them. The findings of the initial SA were used to help the City Council refine and develop the options into Preferred Options.

Stage C: AAP assessment and mitigation

2.9 The following strategic themes in the AAP were assessed against the SA framework:

PO1 Employment uses
PO2 Housing
PO3 Town centre uses
PO4 Transport
PO5 Waste management
PO6 Recreation
PO7 Design & Environment

2.10 Predicted effects of the seven themes of the Aire Valley Leeds AAP Preferred Options were evaluated and the results recorded using matrix tables. The matrix tables (set out in Section 3) use a series of notations to describe the likely effect of the AAP Options against the SA objectives.

2.11 The purposes of the SA assessment was to demonstrate that the likely sustainability effects of the AAP have been considered, taking both the objectives of the SA and the geographical scope of the AVL area into account. The scoring enables consideration and recommendations of measures to prevent, reduce, offset significant negative effects and enhance beneficial effects.

2.12 Within the seven themes, where particular major proposals were considered to justify individual comments against the SA objectives, these have been highlighted within the matrix tables. This has helped to identify appropriate mitigation measures to minimise the risk of negative effects in the future.

Stage D: Reporting and Consultation

2.13 This summary report has been produced to provide a summary of the key findings and to illustrate the process undertaken to complete the SA. A full SA Report, including baseline information, will be published for comment with the Preferred Options. The consultation period will be for six weeks. Following consultation, comments received will be used to determine whether any changes need to be made to the AAP.

Stage E: Monitoring

2.14 When the AAP is adopted and implemented it will require regular monitoring to ensure that any significant effects are identified and, where necessary, remedied at the earliest opportunity. It is proposed that monitoring of the SA effects are linked to the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) which forms part of the LDF. The Sustainability Appraisal Report will set out a more detailed monitoring framework for the AVL AAP.

Statement on the difference the process has made

2.15 The purpose of the SA is to ensure that social, economic and environmental considerations have been taken into account in developing the AAP Preferred Options. A review of the relevant plans, programmes and policies at a national, regional and local level has assisted in informing the objectives . The baseline data compilation has helped to establish the existing economic, social and environmental context for the AAP and identify the opportunities and challenges facing the AVL area.

2.16 The SA process has also helped in making a comparison between a broad range of options for the strategic themes, ranging from a ‘business as usual’ approach to transformational change, which informed the development of the Preferred Options.

2.17 The SA process has also helped identify areas where the AAP can be strengthened to ensure it delivers sustainable development. Where recommendations have been suggested, these are highlighted in the table in Section 4.

2.18 The SA has also assisted in identifying mitigation measures where relevant , and has highlighted areas where there are gaps in baseline data and areas where future monitoring is required.

Compliance with national, regional and local plans, policies and programmes

2.19 The AVL AAP sits within the wider context of the Local Development Framework and the emerging Core Strategy, which will gradually replace the adopted Unitary Development Plan (Review, 2006), as well as other national and regional guidance such as Planning Policy Statements and the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Compliance with the SEA Directive/|Regulations

2.20 The EU Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive for the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes was transposed into English law in the form of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. The objective of the SEA Directive is:

"To provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental consideration into the preparation and adoption of plans with a view to promoting sustainable development"

2.21 It has been determined that the AVL AAP is required to meet the provisions of the SEA Directive. The SA encompasses the SEA of the Preferred Options of the AAP.

2.22 SA applies to all Local Development Documents (including Area Action Plans) prepared as part of the LDF. The SA requires that the social and economic effects of the AAP are considered as well as the environmental effects.

3. SUMMARY OF THE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS OF THE AAP OPTIONS

Main options considered and their significant effects

3.1 Table 3.1 below identifies the alternative options considered under the seven strategic themes and compares them in terms of their likely social, environmental and economic effects. This is a summary of an exercise undertaken in April 2006 which involved assessing each option against the 22 objectives in the Leeds LDF SA Framework. The full result of this appraisal were published in the document entitled *Sustainability Appraisal Assessment of Options (April 2006).*

Table 3.1: Main social, environmental and economic effects of the AAP options

Offices	**Options**	**Description**
	Option O1	Promote new office development in those areas in AVL that are within easy walking distance of the main railway station.
	Option O2	Promote some office development in mixed use developments on the fringe of the City Centre (in addition to locations identified in Option 1)
	Option O3	Promote office development on 'out-of-centre' sites in AVL (in addition to locations identified in Options 1 and 2) A. Skelton Moor Farm (Area 3) – frontage development B. Bellwood (Area 4) – frontage development C. Skelton Business Park (Area 5) – business park D. Leeds Valley Park (Area 7) – business park E. Stourton North (Area 8) - business park or frontage development
	Significant sustainability effects	
	Economic	All the options scored positively against the economic objectives, although there was some uncertainty under Option 1 as to whether it would offer a sufficient range of sites and whether it is important to do so. Option 3 scored the most positively because if offered the broadest range of sites to accommodate the perceived different types of office development. It was recognised that not all businesses would want, or be able to afford, City Centre prime office premises. If other premises are not available it could potentially deter inward investment and/or the expansion of local businesses.
	Social	There was little to choose between the options in terms of their effects against the social objectives. Where there were significant effects these were positive. Option 1 promoted positive linkages between new office development and other facilities in the City Centre.
	Environmental	The environmental effects of the options were more mixed, with the options promoting offices in locations closer to the City Centre generally performing the best. Options 1 and 2 scored positively for promoting development of brownfield land and reducing the need to travel by car. A negative effect was identified in terms of promoting development in a flood risk zone although this can be mitigated against through various measures including the detailed design of schemes. Option 3 scored less well although there was considerable variation between the locations promoted in the option. In general it was considered that the Option 3 sites were less accessible than those in Options 1 and 2 and would therefore generate more travel by car. It is recognised however that providing frequent, attractive and efficient public transport services and good cycling and walking routes can and should help mitigate against this. Site B (Bellwood) scored best out of all the locations identified under Option 3 because it is mainly brownfield and contaminated and could be enhanced significant by new development.

Industry and Distribution	**Options**	**Description**
	Option IW1	Allocate most of the development land in AVL for industrial and warehousing uses.
	Option IW2	Allocate sufficient land for industrial and warehousing uses to meet the longer term needs of Leeds and re-allocate remaining areas for other land uses.
	Significant sustainability effects	
	Economic	Both options are positive because they are allocating land for employment uses which will generate new jobs and economic investment. In the short to medium term, Option 2 was considered to be more beneficial because bringing in other uses, particularly if they generate higher values, is likely to help pump-prime infrastructure investment. In the longer term an adequate supply of industrial land must be retained.
	Social	Option 1 has no significant social effects because it is a business as usual approach. Option 2 is likely to be more beneficial because it offers more opportunity to provide a wider range of uses to help meet people's needs e.g. health, cultural/leisure facilities, new housing, small-scale shops.
	Environmental	Both options have positive and negative effects. Option IW2 is likely to be more positive in terms of creating greenspace, making efficient use of brownfield land, remediation of contaminated land and for the quality of the built environment. This is because it is likely to bring forward more mixed and higher quality development. On the negative side, Option IW2 could promote the development of more vulnerable uses such as housing in a flood risk zone.
Housing	**Options**	**Description**
	Option H1	Focus new housing development on the fringe of the City Centre, including the Hunslet Riverside site (Areas 1 and 2).
	Option H2	In addition to the sites identified in Option H1, allocate one or more of the following sites for new housing development: A. Skelton Moor Farm (Area 3) B. Bellwood and Haigh Park Road (Areas 4 and 6) C. Skelton Business Park (Area 5)
	Significant sustainability effects	
	Economic	Option 1 was considered to have generally positive economic effects. It should encourage job creation in the construction sector (as would housing in any location). Housing could be provided as part of mixed use developments (with offices for example) and help make those schemes more viable. Any displacement of existing businesses could be mitigated by providing alternative sites elsewhere in AVL. Option 2 was less positive on the basis that it would involve the loss of land which is currently allocated for employment although it was recognised that a higher value use such as housing could help to pay for infrastructure improvements which in turn could help to make development sites more attractive for businesses. Much depends on the scale and location of housing development. Site C scored the worst because it was considered that part of the site would probably come forward for office development unless it was to be brought forward for housing and thus job creation opportunities would be lost. This has to be tempered with the actual need for more offices, over and above the existing supply.
	Social	The social effects of Option 1 are generally positive. It was considered that locating new housing close to the City Centre would encourage mixed use development with a range of facilities or with good access to existing facilities. There was some uncertainty as to whether new development would 'integrate' well with existing communities. The effects of Option 2 are more uncertain and depend on the type of development proposed and what facilities are provided. Any major housing proposals would need to exhibit a degree of self-containment and provide its own local services and facilities; in order for it to be considered a sustainable options. Generally, however, the effects are positive particularly against the quality of housing objective. Site A (Skelton Moor Farm) scored the best because it was considered that new housing could have a positive influence over regeneration ambitions

		on the adjacent Halton Moor estate.
	Environmental	Both options have positive and negative environmental effects. Option 1 promotes development of previously-developed land and is very positive in terms of maximising access to jobs and facilities and supporting the vibrancy of the City Centre. A major negative is that it promotes development in a flood risk zone, although this can be mitigated against in the detailed design of developments. The effects of Option 2 vary considerably depending on which location is being considered. Sites A and B and to some extent B perform better than Site C because they are less isolated from existing residential communities. In general the larger sites promoted by Option H2 were considered to have more scope for incorporating renewable energy and sustainable drainage systems and for creating new areas of greenspace than smaller City Centre fringe sites. A negative effect of housing on Sites A and C is that it would encourage development of greenfield land. Site B scores negatively because the proposed development would span both sides of the river in a flood risk zone. There are also noise pollution issues with Sites B and C given their proximity to the M1 and the effect this might have on future residents. It was considered that all options would increase greenhouse gas emissions and the amount of waste generated although new housing development anywhere would do the same and mitigation measures could be put in place e.g. recycling facilities.
Leisure	**Options**	**Description**
	Option L1	Focus new leisure development in locations within or on the edge of the City Centre
	Option L2	Provide small-scale leisure facilities as part of larger developments in the wider Aire Valley Leeds area (in addition the locations identified in Option 1)
	Option L3	Identify a site or sites to accommodate major new leisure development in the wider Aire Valley Leeds area (in addition the locations identified in Option 1)
	Significant sustainability effects	
	Economic	Each of the three options are broadly positive as they are promoting leisure development which would help to create jobs and encourage investment. Option 2 scores well because it is considered that it is likely to help make development of employment uses, such as business parks, more viable and attractive to potential occupiers. Option 3 could bring major regeneration prospects (depending on the use and operation e.g. a regional casino) by virtue of the land values created.
	Social	The options score positively because they should help to improve culture, leisure and recreational activities. Option 1 is the most beneficial because it would ensure that leisure opportunities are located in the most accessible location.
	Environmental	Option 1 is generally beneficial as it promotes development of previously-developed land and is very positive in terms of maximising access to leisure facilities and supporting the vibrancy of the City Centre. Option 2 is generally positive as it would create linkages between employment development and leisure facilities. Option 3 may promote major leisure facilities in a less accessible location to many people and therefore scores negatively in this respect. However, it may be possible to mitigate this impact through the promotion of sustainable transport measures, particularly good public transport.
Recreation	**Options**	**Description**
	Option REC1	Protect, maintain and promote existing recreational facilities and routes
	Option REC2	Open up the entire length of the river corridor for recreational uses and improve access to the river corridor from the City Centre and surrounding communities
	Option REC3	Create a new riverside park in Aire Valley Leeds (in addition to proposals identified in Option 2)
	Significant sustainability effects	

	General	All the options have beneficial effects, although Options 2 and 3 which are more ambitious in terms of creating new recreational opportunities are considered to be the most beneficial. The most positive effects are on health, leisure and recreational activities, greenspace provision, biodiversity, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, reducing flood risk and climate change, maximising access, meeting local needs locally, reducing pollution, enhancing landscape quality and making efficient use of natural resources.
Waste Management	**Options**	**Description**
	Option W1	Aire Valley Leeds is not a suitable location for a Sustainable Energy Park. Other sites outside the area should be considered.
	Option W2	Aire Valley Leeds is the most appropriate area for the Sustainable Energy Park to be located and appropriate sites should be identified.
	Significant sustainability effects	
	General	The two options were difficult to assess against the SA objectives because many of the significant effects of a sustainable energy park will very much depend on its location which is not specified in the options. In this context the effects of the two options were considered to be very similar.
	Economic	In the main the effects of both options were positive because of the potential to create jobs both directly and indirectly. The number of jobs created by a SEP would need to be balanced against the loss of land available to other types of employment use and, in the case of AVL, the potential impact on the ability to bring in a wider mix of uses into the area particularly housing.
	Social	No significant effects.
	Environmental	Both options scored positively against a number of environmental objectives in particular reducing greenhouse gas emissions, reducing the growth in waste land filled, increasing the proportion of local needs that are met locally and making an efficient use of energy. The effects against a number of other objectives depend on the specific location of the park.
Transport	**Options**	**Description**
	Option T1	Continue the development of transport infrastructure on an incremental basis responding to development as it proceeds.
	Option T2	High level approach to infrastructure investment designed to cater for all prospective travel demand into the area by both private and public transport.
	Option T3	Planned to implement a balanced package of measures geared to support travel plans by providing a mix of public and private transport investments.
	Significant sustainability effects	
	Economic	All the options have positive effects because each would help to make the area more accessible and therefore more attractive to potential investors. Option 3 is considered to be the most beneficial because its balanced approach to private and public transport will do the most to make the area and jobs created there accessible to the greatest range of people, including those that do not have access to a car.
	Social	Option 1 is considered to have little significant effect because it is the business as usual approach. Option 2 is likely to have negative effects in terms of health, culture and recreation and social inclusion because it is encouraging much higher car use which could impact negatively on local communities and cultural assets such as Temple Newsam. Option 3 is the most positive because of its emphasis on improving public transport.
	Environmental	Option 1 has minor negative impacts against a number of the environmental objectives. Option 2 was more positive than Option 1 in terms of maximising access but was considered to have major negative effects because it would significantly increase transport related greenhouse gas emissions and pollution and encourage commuting by car into the area. Option 3 was the most beneficial overall, particularly in terms of encouraging local needs to be met locally and providing a transport network which maximises access whilst

		minimising detrimental impacts.

Rejected Options

3.2 The following options were rejected from further consideration at the preferred options stage:

3.3 **Offices: Options O1 & O2 –** Option 1 has been excluded from consideration as a result of the alteration of the AAP boundaries which in effect excludes any areas identified as being within easy walking distance of the main railway station. Option 2 was considered to be a generally sustainable approach but not one which would maximise economic benefits or reflect existing realities, such as sites which already have planning consent for office development.

3.4 **Industry & Distribution: Option IW1** – This option would not make the best economic use of land in view of the forecasted demand for employment land across Leeds, compared to alternative uses such as housing. Retaining an oversupply of employment uses could result in the most difficult sites remaining undeveloped by the end of the plan period given known highway capacity constraints and the likely abnormal development costs

3.5 It is also less likely to deliver environmental benefits than the Preferred Option IW2 by the end of the plan period. In particular it is less likely to:

- result in remediation of contaminated land;
- provide new areas of greenspace;
- support an efficient high frequency public transport network

3.6 **Housing: Option H1** – This option was considered to be sustainable in itself but not one which would maximise beneficial effects against the full range of sustainability appraisal objectives. Releasing more land for housing development in the eastern part of the area, as envisaged under Option H2, would help to provide key infrastructure and facilities and support frequent public transport services. This would help to overcome long term constraints on the development of employment land and offer more sustainable travel choices. Potential negative environmental effects were identified in relation to Option H2 but it was considered these can be effectively mitigated against at the same time as maximising the beneficial effects.

3.7 **Transport: Options T1 & T2** – Both options performed worse against the economic, social and environmental objectives than the Preferred Option T3. Option T2 would encourage greater use of private transport to the exclusion of public transport and other sustainable forms of travel. As a result the likely negative environmental effects include greater greenhouse emissions, air pollution and noise pollution compared to the other options. It is also more likely to exclude people who do not have access to a car from accessing new jobs created in the area. The piecemeal approach of Option 1 is not likely to provide the transport infrastructure and services that are needed to deliver the full development potential of the area and is therefore less beneficial in terms of meeting economic and social objectives.

3.8 **Waste Management: Option W1 –** Although further evaluation work on potential sites within and external to AVL is necessary, early work has clearly identified the potential of AVL as a suitable location. It is therefore not appropriate for AVL to be deleted from the area of search for waste management facilities at this stage.

3.9 The appraisal was unable to compare the significant effects of each option with any confidence in the absence of more detailed site specific locational information.

3.10 **Recreation: Option R1 and R2 –** Both options performed less well against the social and environmental objectives than the preferred option R3.

Significant social, economic and environmental effects of the Preferred Options

3.11 The Preferred Options of the AAP were assessed against the 22 Leeds LDF SA objectives and their social, environmental and economic effects were identified. The predicted effects were evaluated and the results recorded using the matrix shown in Table 3.2. The notations used are:

++ Major direct positive effect against the SA objective
+ Minor or indirect positive effect
0 Insignificant or neutral effect
- Minor or indirect negative effect
- - Major direct negative effect
? Uncertain effect

3.12 In carrying out the assessment consideration was made of the short, medium and long term effects of the proposals. These were defined as:

- Short-term 0-5 years (2007-2012)
- Medium-term 5-10 years (2012-2017)
- Long-term 10 years onwards (2017+)

3.13 This section summarises the significant effects of the preferred options, grouped under broad sustainability topic areas.

Population

3.14 The residential and mixed use proposals identified under PO2 would provide approximately 7,700 new dwellings in AVL. This is likely to increase the resident population of the area by up to 18,000 people[1]. This compares to a population increase of 4,400 under the 'business as usual' approach.

Economy & Employment

3.15 The proposals set out under PO1 to 4 are likely to bring forward significant economic benefits to the local area, surrounding communities and the wider city and city region. If each of the employment sites identified in PO1 & PO3 are developed to their full potential, an estimated net 26,000 jobs could be created, 3,200 more than under the business as usual approach which takes into account existing constraints.

3.16 On a smaller scale, additional jobs will be created by other proposals in the preferred options such as the neighbourhood centres, the transport proposals and, potentially, commercial leisure development. The construction industry will be a significant source of jobs on a temporary basis, although construction is expected to be ongoing throughout the plan period.

[1] Applying the average household size of Leeds which is 2.34 persons per dwelling (Census 2001).

3.17 Taking into account the estimated 1,900 new jobs that will be created by floorspace started between 2004 and 2006, it is anticipated that the Vision for Leeds target of 29,000 new jobs in AVL over the period 2004 to 2020 can be met.

3.18 It is expected that some of the new jobs in the area will be taken up by people living in the surrounding communities, helping to reduce the gap in unemployment rates between these areas and the rest of Leeds. However, this will only happen if current barriers to accessing employment, such as poor public transport linkages, lack of skills and inadequate provision for childcare are removed. Preferred Option 4 proposes new public transport linkages between the east and south Leeds communities. A north-south link across AVL should further improve access to employment opportunities.

Education, skills & training

3.19 The housing proposals in PO2, and the resulting increase in the resident population of the area, will bring with them a requirement for new or expanded educational facilities.

3.20 PO2 proposes two new primary schools in AVL within Character Areas 6 and 11 to support major housing proposals. No additional secondary school provision is proposed for the area. The housing proposals in Character Areas 1 and 2 will generate their own requirements for school places depending on the proportion of family-sized houses. Existing schools will have to accommodate the children not served by the proposed primary schools. Where surplus places are not available in local schools, the expansion of facilities would be required, which has obvious education service implications. The document makes no reference to securing developer contributions for provision of off-site education facilities.

3.21 The AAP proposals may indirectly benefit educational attainment in surrounding communities. There is a generally accepted link between employment rates and educational attainment but the magnitude of the benefits are uncertain and not easily measurable. The provision of training opportunities for adults, linked to the creation of new jobs in the area, would be a direct benefit of the AAP.

Health

3.22 The likely effects of the AAP on human health are complex and potentially wide ranging. There are clear disparities in terms of overall health characteristics between people living in the communities surrounding AVL and other parts of Leeds. The SA has identified a number of potential effects of the AAP proposals on health in these communities.

3.23 There is an accepted link between employment and health. By increasing employment opportunities for local people, through the employment development proposed in PO1 & 3, the AAP should have a beneficial effect in reducing health disparities. This is dependent on local people being able move into new jobs and, therefore, on overcoming existing barriers. The proposals in PO4 address physical linkages through provision of public transport, walking and cycling links. Issues relating to the need for training opportunities and childcare facilities are addressed in Section 8 (Delivery & Implementation).

3.24 The recreation proposals in PO6 are likely to be beneficial to health by promoting recreational uses of the riverside and access to it. The riverside park will be a major asset which will encourage existing and future residents to take part in outdoor activities.

3.25 The housing proposals in PO2 and the resulting increase in the resident population of the area will bring with them a requirement for new or expanded health facilities. Two

new health centres are proposed in Areas 6 and 11, which will provide accessible facilities to future residents of the new housing. There will also be an additional requirement for health facilities generated by new housing in Areas 1 and 2. This need is not currently directly addressed by the AAP but detailed or generic policies should be included in the draft plan to address increased demand generated by this development and the pressures on existing services.

Crime

3.26 The development proposals in the Preferred Options will have an effect on crime levels in the area but the effect is uncertain and not measurable. Applying the urban design principles promoted by PO7 in new development, particularly the 'secured by design' principles, should help to reduce opportunities for crime.

Housing

3.27 It is predicted that the housing proposals in PO2 would provide 7,700 new dwellings in the area. This compares to only 1,900 dwellings predicted under the business as usual scenario. The requirement for a mix of house types, sizes and tenures within development should help to ensure that the housing meets a range of housing needs identified in Leeds.

3.28 A requirement for affordable housing in new development is identified but no specific proportion is mentioned. Clearly the higher the proportion of affordable units the more beneficial it would be against this objective, given Leeds' identified need for such housing.

3.29 The principles set out in PO7 should be beneficial in respect to the overall quality of housing built in the area. The sustainable construction requirements, which include maximising energy efficiency and a proportion of on-site renewable energy generation, are particularly important to ensure that energy costs and the risk of fuel poverty is reduced.

Social inclusion & community cohesion

3.30 The effects of the preferred options in terms of social inclusion and community cohesion are difficult to assess and there are a number of uncertainties. PO1 is identified as beneficial for social inclusion in surrounding communities through the creation of a wide range of job opportunities in the local area, subject to the caveats over employment access raised above under economy and employment.

3.31 The transport and recreation proposals are likely to be beneficial by offering a greater choice of transport mode to access the area and by promoting easier access to a greater range of recreational opportunities, particularly along the waterfront.

Land & Soil

3.32 The AAP promotes 451 hectares of development and redevelopment through the proposals set out in PO1 to PO6. 230 hectares (51%) of this is on brownfield land and 221 hectares (49%) on greenfield land.

3.33 The proposals would result in the development of nearly 180 hectares of existing agricultural land. However, there would be no loss of Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land (the highest quality grades) and it is important to note that this land is already allocated for built development in the UDP Review (2006) and most of it has planning consent.

3.34 Many of the brownfield development sites identified in the preferred option coincide with areas of potentially contaminated land. It would generally be expected that the

development of the land would require the remediation of contaminated areas and in this respect the effects of the preferred options are beneficial.

Water Quality

3.35 Baseline information highlights poor water quality along stretches of the River Aire and Wyke Beck as being a significant environmental problem for the area. The appraisal identifies some possible beneficial effects of the preferred options and in particular the potential for run-off of pollutants into watercourses to be reduced as contaminated land is remediated in preparation for development.

Air Quality

3.36 The most significant effect of the preferred options on air quality is likely to relate to emissions from road traffic generated by new development. PO1 to 3 promote major development of traffic generating uses such as industry/distribution, offices and housing. It is important, however, to compare these effects with the predicted baseline position which assumes development of existing sites with planning permission for new employment uses and housing. The 'business as usual' scenario would also result in significant increases in traffic and vehicle emissions.

3.37 The transport proposals in PO4 are noted as having overall beneficial effects because they will encourage greater use of public transport, walking and cycling for people living in, working in, or visiting the area. PO4 also sets an ambitious target for non-car modes of travel. This positive effect is enhanced by the recreation proposals in PO6 and the design principles in PO7 which should also encourage more walking and cycling.

Noise

3.38 The baseline information (Section 4.2) identifies traffic noise from the M1 motorway as the most significant source of noise pollution in the area. PO2 proposes new housing development on two sites close to the motorway in Areas 6 and 11. Noise modelling indicates that a large proportion of the proposed housing allocations in Areas 6 and 11 fall within Noise Exposure Category 'C' at night-time. Government guidance in PPG24 (Planning & Noise) advises that planning permission for housing should not normally be granted in these circumstances, unless there are no alternative quieter sites available and conditions are imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise. The potential for noise pollution is, therefore, identified as a significant negative effect of the Preferred Options which will require mitigation.

Transport & accessibility

3.39 Development proposed under PO1 to 3 will significantly increase the quantity of road traffic using the strategic and local highway network. The package of transport improvements proposed in PO4 will significantly improve access to, and within, the area by a range of transport modes. The adoption of a minimum target for non-car modes of travel, the requirement for travel plans and maximum car parking standards are important to ensure trips to the area are not dominated by the car (even if alternatives are provided). The development proposals are generally considered to be well related to proposed transport improvements. The AAP also makes provision for alternatives to road based freight transport through proposals for inland dock on the Aire & Calder Navigation and a rail freight proposal at Neville Hill.

3.40 The housing proposals in PO2 are considered to be key to providing and supporting a frequent and viable public transport system in the area. The housing proposals are clearly linked to public transport initiatives and improvements to the cycle and pedestrian network. The proposals offer excellent linkages between new jobs and housing and promotes provision of community uses and neighbourhood shopping within larger housing developments.

Greenhouse gas emissions, energy consumption

3.41 The development proposed in PO1 to 3 will generate additional greenhouse gas emissions from the activities themselves and from transport to and from the developments. This will increase as development commences through the plan period. It should be noted that emissions would increase wherever these activities were located in Leeds and therefore measuring emissions at the local level is not particularly appropriate.

3.42 The effect of the transport proposals (PO4) is positive because it is encouraging the use of alternatives to the private car, thus reducing greenhouse gas emissions per journey. The creation of neighbourhood centres (PO3) can also help to offset emissions by encouraging a greater proportion of trips to be taken by non-car modes of travel. The centres are well related to the proposed improvements to the transport network.

3.43 Mitigation measures can be adopted to minimise emissions from new development. PO7 makes reference to the need for new development to maximise energy efficiency and to incorporate on-site renewable energy generation.

3.44 The construction of the types of waste management facilities referred to in PO5 would significantly reduce greenhouse gases compared to current waste disposal methods in Leeds (mainly landfill). The scale of the reduction will depend on the exact specification of the facility.

Flood risk & climate change

3.45 There are a number of housing sites within flood risk zone 3 (the highest risk zone) in Areas 1, 2 and 6. This will put a greater number of people and properties at risk of flooding in the area. The site in Area 6, phased until later in the plan period, is particularly large and therefore the effects become increasingly negative in the long term. The risk of flooding may be further increased in the future as a result of climate change.

3.46 PO7 promotes the use of sustainable drainage systems in new development which help to mitigate against flooding caused by surface water run-off.

Minerals & waste

3.47 New development will increase the amount of waste generated in the area (as it would anywhere in the City). The quantity of waste produced and the need to take it to landfill can be minimised by adopting mitigation measures. The construction of the types of waste management facilities referred to in PO5 will significantly reduce the quantity of waste sent to landfill sites. PO7 promotes minimisation of waste through building design.

Biodiversity, fauna & flora

3.48 There is no baseline data to assess sites against the biodiversity objectives although none of the major development sites has an ecological designation.

3.49 The proposed bridge crossings and cycle/pedestrian routes running along each bank of the River Aire corridor and recreational proposals relating to the waterfront may cause disturbance to natural habitats and wildlife.

3.50 PO7 incorporates principles relating to biodiversity including habitat protection, creation and enhancement.

Leisure, recreation & tourism

3.51 The employment and housing allocations set out in PO1 and PO2 respectively would result in the loss of 7.8 ha of N1 greenspace and 6 ha of playing fields. However, delivering the proposals in PO2 and PO6 would create new areas of greenspace and playing fields in AVL. It is estimated that a total of approximately 33.8 hectares of new greenspace / playing fields would be provided - a net increase of 20 hectares. A significant local effect is a net loss of greenspace / playing fields provision within reasonable walking distance to the residential communities of Cross Green and Osmondthorpe.

3.52 PO4 and PO6 promote better accessibility to the culture, leisure and recreational activities in the area – both current and proposed.

Cultural heritage

3.53 There are three major historic assets within or close to the AVL area; Hunslet Mills, Thwaite Mills and Temple Newsam. Employment development is proposed in Areas 5B and 11 (has planning consent) next to Temple Newsam Park (designated as a historic park & garden). Providing this is carefully designed, to minimise impacts, the effects of the PO should generally be neutral.

3.54 The proposals in PO2 include the restoration and re-use of the derelict Hunslet Mills complex (Site 2C.1) and sympathetic uses on neighbouring sites. Proposals to enhance the waterfront should benefit the setting of listed buildings along the waterfront (Hunslet Mills and Thwaite Mills) and help to improve access to them.

Built & natural environment

3.55 The proposals are generally considered to be beneficial through the promotion of redevelopment of vacant and derelict sites. The design principles set out in PO7 are considered to be particular important in terms of these objectives.

Table 3.2: Assessment of the Effects of the Preferred Option against the SA Framework

Preferred Option / SA Objective	PO1 EMPLOYMENT USES			PO2 HOUSING			PO3 TOWN CENTRE USES			PO4 TRANSPORT			PO5 WASTE MANAGEMENT			PO6 RECREATION			PO7 DESIGN & ENVIRONMENT		
Timescale	ST	MT	LT	ST	MT	LT	ST	MT	LT	ST	MT	LT	ST	MT	LT	ST	MT	LT	ST	MT	LT
ECONOMIC																					
SA1	+	+	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	++	+	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA2	+	+	++	+	++	++	+	+	+	+	++	++	-?	+	++	+	+	+	+	+	+
SOCIAL																					
SA3	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0
SA4	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	++	0	0	0	+	++	++	+	+	+
SA5	0	0	0	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	++	++
SA6	+	+	+	+	+	++	+	++	++	+	++	++	0	+	+	++	++	++	+	+	+
SA7	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+?	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	++	++	+	++	++
SA8	+	+	+	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	++	++	0	0	0	++	++	++	+	+	+
SA9	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	++	++	++	+	+	+
ENVIRONMENTAL																					
SA10	-	-	-	0	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	++	++	+	+	+
SA11	-	-	-	+	++	++	-	+	+	+	++	++	++	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	+
SA12	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	-	-	-	0	0	0	-	-	-	+	+	+
SA13	-	--	--	?	?	?	-	-	-	+	++	++	0	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	+
SA14	0	0	0	-	-	--	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?	+	+	+	+	+	+
SA15	-	+	+	+	++	++	+	+	++	+	++	++	0	-	-	+	+	++	+	+	+
SA16	+	++	++	+	+	++	+	++	++	+	++	++	0	++	++	+	+	++	+	+	+
SA17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	++	++	0	0	0	+	+	+
SA18A	+	+	+	+	+	++	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0
SA18B	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	+	+	+	0	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+

Preferred Option / SA Objective	PO1 EMPLOYMENT USES			PO2 HOUSING			PO3 TOWN CENTRE USES			PO4 TRANSPORT			PO5 WASTE MANAGEMENT			PO6 RECREATION			PO7 DESIGN & ENVIRONMENT		
Timescale	ST	MT	LT	ST	MT	LT	ST	MT	LT	ST	MT	LT	ST	MT	LT	ST	MT	LT	ST	MT	LT
SA18C	0	0	0	0	-	- -	+	+	+	?	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+
SA18D	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
SA18E	-	- -	- -	-	- -	- -	-	-	- -	-	-	-	0	0	0	?	?	?	+	+	+
SA19	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	++	++	++
SA20	+	+	+	+	++	++	+	++	++	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	++	++	++
SA21	0	0	0	+	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	+
SA22	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	0	++	++	+	+	+	++	++	++

4. RECOMMENDATIONS, UNCERTAINTIES & RISKS

Recommendations

4.1 The scores contained in Table 4.1 identify a number of potential negatives, uncertainties and potential impacts that depend on how proposals are implemented. These need to be addressed in the AAP to ensure that policies and/or appropriate mitigation measures are put in place. The SA report provides a more detailed commentary on this, as well as highlighting any gaps in baseline information and/or the AAP, where future details or analysis is required to enable monitoring of the SA objectives.

Table 4.1: Recommendations for mitigation / improvement of the Preferred Options
Economic
AAP should consider provision of childcare facilities within larger employment developments, where appropriate (SA1)
Consider use of Section 106 agreements to introduce local labour requirements (SA1)
Creation of a local 'centre of excellence' within AVL to retrain local people with appropriate skills (SA1)
Further feasibility work required to assess the deliverability of the transport proposals particularly in terms of likely developer contributions (SA2)
Social
Contributions should be sought for primary and secondary education provision where existing supply in insufficient to meet the demand for spaces generated by new development. (SA4)
Secured by design principles should be adopted in the design and layout of the proposed housing (SA5)
Need to set out the specific proportion of affordable units required in housing developments. Further housing market assessment work should examine the implications of the proposals on the housing market in surrounding communities (previous work examined a lower number of units than is now proposed). If there are any negative implications, a scaling down of the housing proposals should be considered (SA7).
The detailed mix of housing types, size and tenures and linkages with existing communities should be considered very carefully to avoid the creation of inward looking enclaves which do not help to promote regeneration of the wider area (SA7).
Environmental
Ensure that there is replacement playing field provision in the local area to compensate for the loss of provision on the Copperfields site (SA10).
Greenfield development should be phased until after brownfield development to encourage the development of brownfield land first, unless exceptional circumstances apply. Examples may include demonstration of the overall regeneration benefits of the proposal or where brownfield development cannot be brought forward until later in the plan period due to existing constraints (SA11)
An ecological survey of each site should be carried out before development commences and appropriate mitigation measures adopted. This should be a requirement set out in the AAP. (SA12)
The AAP should take account of guidance set out in the Biodiversity & Waterfront Development SPD, for example, routes should be set back from the waterfront in appropriate places to reduce disturbance to natural habitats. (SA12)
Examine potential for other alternative sources of energy such as Combined Heat & Power (CHP). (SA13)
Consider use of sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) and balancing ponds to reduce the rate of surface water run-off associated with new development . Mitigation measures must take account of

Table 4.1: Recommendations for mitigation / improvement of the Preferred Options
the likely effects of climate change. (SA14)
The sites in flood risk zone 3 should be thoroughly tested against the sequential test set out in PPS25 to ensure that there are no sequentially preferable development sites in the area which are suitable for housing. The criteria set out in the exceptions test also need to be considered. (SA14)
Appropriate flood risk mitigation measures and emergency planning procedures should be in place before units are occupied. Measures must take account of the likely effects of climate change. (SA14)
Ensure that development is well related to public transport services and is served by high quality and attractive walking and cycling routes to minimise journeys by car. (SA15)
Need to ensure that new development be connected to existing secondary schools by good public transport services. (SA15)
Provision of waste management in the area of search identified in PO5 would need to be related to appropriate improvements in the local transport infrastructure to ensure that adverse impacts resulting from an increase in HGV trips are minimised. (SA15)
The scale of facilities provided in neighbourhood centres should not detract from the offer of existing centres such as Hunslet or become a destination in their own right. (SA16)
Ensure space is provided within the boundary of properties for recycling bins etc and recycling facilities/centres are provided within larger housing developments. (SA17)
Encourage development of waste reduction strategies amongst firms in the area. e.g. recycling, aggregate and building material recovery, environmental management systems etc. (SA17)
Consider how the existing cluster of recycling facilities in the area (focused on the Cross Green estate) can be further developed. (SA17)
'Low impact' lighting should be used to reduce unnecessary light pollution. (SA18)
The proximity between housing proposals and prescribed processes and associated mitigation requirements need to be fully considered at the detailed design stage. (SA18)
A comprehensive remediation programme is required to ensure that currently contaminated land made suitable for housing development and that future risks are averted (Areas 2B, 6C, 6D & 6E have particular contamination issues). (SA18)
Mitigation measures are required against noise and air pollution where housing proposals would otherwise be unacceptable. This will affect parts of Areas 6 and 11. (SA18)
Noise mitigation measures are required to ensure that no houses are built in areas which exceed noise standards set out in PPG24. Development can be set back from the motorway and additional physical buffers can help to alleviate noise. (SA18)
Use planning conditions to restrict opening hours of uses in neighbourhood centres where there is likely to be a conflict with people living nearby. (SA18)
New development should include a structural landscaping scheme incorporating existing landscape features wherever possible. (SA19)
Transitional landscaping should be used along the boundary of Site 5B.1 and Temple Newsam Park to minimise the impact of industrial development. (SA21)
Consider setting minimum targets for energy efficiency of buildings and the generation of on-site renewable energy (SA22)

Risks and uncertainties

4.2 Uncertainties and risks exist in the process of preparing the SA, which are presented below.

4.3 The Aire Valley AAP Preferred Options is a strategic land use framework which will complement the implementation of the Aire Valley Leeds regeneration initiative. Whilst the AAP can allocate land it cannot guarantee that individual sites are

developed, this then effects the ability to fund individual infrastructure projects on which timely delivery of the plan is ultimately reliant. This means that monitoring is important for the Aire Valley AAP.

4.4 Delivery of the Aire Valley AAP proposals are reliant on the provision of a range of key, major infrastructure projects. Dealing with the odour from Knostrop Waste Water Treatment Works, an effective and efficient public transport system, a new bridge at Skelton Grange and remediation of contaminated land being some of the largest infrastructure projects. Failure to deliver any one of these elements will prevent delivery of at least one if not more of the preferred options on which this assessment is based.

4.5 In regard to specific SA objectives, uncertainty exists as to flood risk and other issues resulting from climate change. The PPS25 requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment will deal with flood risk, but changing policy and guidance on climate change needs further monitoring. In addition, the Preferred Options include proposals to increase the quality and quantity of greenspace in the area. Whilst it is assumed that this will provide land for rainwater soak away, the extent to which such spaces can fulfil this function is uncertain.

4.6 Similarly, data on greenhouse gas production, pollution and waste, which inevitably result from new development have many different and, in some sectors, uncertain variables, making it more difficult and subjective to assess. In these instances, and in others, where the effect has been described as “unknown”, this indicates that positive or negative impacts may arise from the preferred options but there is not a definitive answer, or there is an effect but its scale is difficult to determine. Further information may become available, including analysis through consultation, which can improve the prediction and evaluation of effects.

4.7 The data collected (base line report) has been used to determine key issues as well as forming the baseline for identification of effects. There is the risk that the information collected is not from the most appropriate source and/or other more reliable sources of information become available in time. This can create problems when assessing the effects over time through data comparison, particularly if the methodology differs, or if the boundaries of an area on which data is based, change. There are also uncertainties that data may not be available at a local level to determine the effects of policies, due to the nature and scale of effect.

4.8 Additional data is currently being collected and detailed studies are underway to further inform decision making where existing data are deemed inadequate. This could simply mean the data is not up-to-date or, as in the case of evaluating land costs against infrastructure, is not sufficiently detailed. The assessment can only deal with information available at that point in time.

4.9 Other risks and uncertainties may arise as the SA process develops in preparation of the Aire Valley AAP.

APPENDIX 1: LEEDS LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SA FRAMEWORK – SA OBJECTIVES & DETAILED DECISION-MAKING CRITERIA

SA OBJECTIVES	DECISION MAKING CRITERIA
ECONOMIC	
1. Maintain or improve good quality employment opportunities and reduce the disparities in the Leeds' labour market.	a. Will it maintain or improve current employment rates in Leeds? b. Will it help to raise average earnings? c. Will it support employment opportunities for people who live in or close to the area? d. Will it help develop the skills of people who live in or close to the area? e. Will it support equal employment opportunities? f. Will it reduce the disparities in employment rates between deprived and affluent parts of Leeds? g. Will it help to reduce the high rates of unemployment among black and ethnic minority groups? h. Will it improve access to affordable and quality childcare?
2. Maintain or improve the conditions which have enabled business success, economic growth and investment.	a. Will it support existing businesses? b. Will it encourage investment? c. Will it improve productivity and competitiveness? d. Will it encourage rural diversification?
SOCIAL	
3. Increase participation in education and life-long learning and reduce the disparity in participation and qualifications achieved across Leeds.	a. Will it provide accessible training and learning opportunities for adults and young people? b. Will it increase participation in education and qualifications in disadvantaged communities? c. Will it increase participation in education and qualifications among BME groups?
4. Improve conditions and services that engender good health and reduce disparities in health across Leeds	a. Will it promote healthy life-styles, and help prevent ill-health? b. Will it improve access to high quality, health facilities? c. Will it address health inequalities across Leeds?
5. Reduce overall rates of crime, and reduce the disparities in crime rates across Leeds.	a. Will it encourage crime reduction through design? b. Will it help address the causes of crime? c. Will it help reduce the fear of crime?

SA OBJECTIVES	DECISION MAKING CRITERIA
	d. Will it help to reduce disparities in crime rates across Leeds?
6. Maintain and improve culture, leisure and recreational activities that are available to all	a. Will it increase provision of culture, leisure and recreational (CLR) activities/venues? b. Will it increase non-car based CLR activities? c. Will it increase participation in CLR activities by (i) local people and (ii) tourists? d. Will it preserve, promote and enhance local culture and heritage?
7. Improve the overall quality of housing and reduce the disparity in housing markets across Leeds	a. Will it make housing available to people in need (taking into account requirements of location, size, type and affordability)? b. Will it reduce (the risk of) low housing demand in some parts of the city, and reduce the number of empty properties? c. Will it help improve the quality of the housing stock and reduce the number of unfit homes? d. Will it improve energy efficiency in housing to reduce fuel-poverty and ill-health? e. Will it encourage the use of sustainable design and sustainable building materials in construction?
8. Increase social inclusion and active community participation	*Social inclusion* a. Will it help to reduce poverty? b. Will it provide more services and facilities that are appropriate to the needs of ethnic minorities, older people, young people and disabled people? c. Does it enable less-well resourced groups to take part? d. Does it take steps to involve not yet reach groups? *Community participation* e. Will it give the community opportunities to participate in or towards making decisions? f. Will local community organisations be supported to identify and address their own priorities?
9. Increase community cohesion	a. Will it build better relationships across diverse communities and interests? b. Will it increase people's feelings of belonging? c. Will it encourage communities to value diversity? d. Could it create or increase tensions and conflict locally or with other communities?
ENVIRONMENTAL	
10. Increase the quantity, quality and accessibility of greenspace	a. Will it increase the quantity of publicly accessible greenspace? b. Will it address deficiencies of greenspace in areas that are under-provided? c. Will it improve the quality and management of greenspace across Leeds?

SA OBJECTIVES	DECISION MAKING CRITERIA
	d. Will it improve the security of greenspace?
11. Minimise the pressure on greenfield land by efficient land use patterns that make good use of derelict and previously used sites & promote balanced development	a. Does it make efficient use of land by promoting development on previously used land, re-use of buildings and higher densities? b. Will it promote the development of communities with accessible services, employment, shops and leisure facilities?
12. Maintain and enhance, restore or add to biodiversity or geological conservation interests	a. Will it protect and enhance existing habitats, especially priority habitats identified in the UK and the Leeds Biodiversity Action Plan? b. Will it protect and enhance protected and important species? (Important species are those identified in the UK and the Leeds BAP.) c. Will it protect and enhance existing designated nature conservation sites? d. Will it provide for appropriate long term management of habitats? e. Will it make use of opportunities to create and enhance habitats as part of development proposals? f. Will it protect / mitigate ecological interests on previously-developed sites? g. Will it protect sites of geological interest?
13. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions	Will it reduce greenhouse gas emissions from: a. Households? b. Commercial and industrial activities? c. Transport d. Agriculture, landfill & mining?
14. Improve Leeds' ability to manage extreme weather conditions including flood risk and climate change	*Flood Risk* a. Will it prevent inappropriate development on flood plains and prepare for the likelihood of increased flooding in future? *Other climate change effects* b. Will it improve the capacity to cope with the increases in strong winds and storms? c. Will it improve the capacity to cope with higher temperatures?
15. Provide a transport network which maximises access, whilst minimising detrimental impacts	a. Will it reduce the need to travel by increasing access to key services and facilities by means other than the car? b. Will it ease congestion on the road network? c. Will it provide/improve/promote information about alternatives to car-based transport?

SA OBJECTIVES	DECISION MAKING CRITERIA
	d. Will it reduce the number of journeys by personal motor transport? e. Will it make the transport/environment attractive to non-car users? f. Will it encourage freight transfer from road to rail and water? g. Will it encourage employers to develop green travel plans for staff travel to/from work and whilst at work? h. Will it reduce the causes of transport-related accidents?
16. Increase the proportion of local needs that are met locally	a. Will it support the use of more local suppliers for agriculture, manufacture, construction, retailing and other services? b. Will it ensure that essential services (e.g. employment, health services and shops) and resources to serve communities are within reasonable non-car based travelling distance? c. Will it provide appropriate housing for local needs? d. Will it support the vibrancy of city, town and village centres? e. Will it help facilitate improved ICT services and resources in isolated and disadvantaged communities?
17. Reduce the growth in waste generated and landfilled.	a. Will it minimise waste? b. Will it promote re-use, recovery and recycling of waste? c. Will it help to provide facilities for recycling and recovering waste?
18. Reduce pollution levels	a. Will it promote the clean-up of contaminated land? b. Will it reduce air, water, land, noise and light pollution? c. Will it reduce the risk of pollution incidents and environmental accidents? d. Will it help to promote neighbourhood cleanliness?
19. Maintain and enhance landscape quality	a. Will it maintain and enhance areas of high landscape value? b. Will it protect and enhance individual features such as hedgerows, dry stone walls, ponds and trees? c. Will it increase the quality and quantity of woodland features in appropriate locations and using native species? d. Will it protect and enhance the landscape quality of the City's rivers and other waterways? e. Will it take account of the geomorphology of the land?

SA OBJECTIVES	DECISION MAKING CRITERIA
20. Maintain and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the built environment	a. Will it ensure new development is well designed and appropriate to its setting? b. Will it ensure development is consistent with Leeds City Council design guidance for the built, natural and historic environment? c. Will it support local distinctiveness? d. Will it encourage local sourcing of materials?
21. Preserve and enhance the historic environment	a. Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value in urban and rural areas? b. Will it protect and enhance listed buildings, conservation areas and other designated historic features and their settings?
22. Make efficient use of energy and natural resources and promote sustainable design.	a. Will it increase energy and water efficiency in all sectors? b. Will it increase energy from renewable sources? c. Will it promote the energy, water and resource efficiency of buildings? d. Will it increase sustainable urban drainage? e. Will it increase efficiency in use of raw materials? f. Will it minimise the loss of high quality agricultural land and soils? g. Will it support reduced resource use by business?