



AIRE VALLEY LEEDS AREA ACTION PLAN

Leeds Local Development Framework

Development Plan Document

**Sustainability Appraisal - Addendum 1: SA of Pre-submission
Changes and Non Technical Summary**

September 2016

Contents	Page
Non-Technical Summary to Sustainability Appraisal Addendum	2
Submission Sustainability Appraisal Addendum	4
Habitats Regulations Assessment	18

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY TO SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL ADDENDUM

Introduction

1. Leeds City Council is preparing the Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan in accordance with the LDF Regulations. As such the plan has been subject to sustainability appraisal throughout its preparation. This has been documented in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report - 'the SA Report' which was published for formal consultation along with the Publication Draft Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan (AVLAAP) from September to November 2015. As a result of the consultation and to update factual information, the Council is proposing a small number of pre-submission changes to the Publication Draft Plan. Further sustainability appraisal has been carried out on the changes and the results of this work are documented in the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum September 2016. The Addendum should be read in conjunction with the SA Report.

Methodology

2. The Addendum provides two main updates. Firstly, it provides an update to the SA methodology, including an additional SA sub-objective for land instability, and updates baseline data and re-assesses all plan options, objectives, policies and site allocations against the revised SA framework. A distinction has been made between offices and general employment which allows a more accurate assessment to be made against accessibility and transport objectives.
3. Secondly, the Addendum assesses the proposed pre-submission changes against the SA framework, including the additional new sub-objective for land instability. This is done in two steps. The first step screens the proposed changes to identify where the change may require an alternation to the original SA scoring and results. The second step provides a detailed assessment of the proposed change against the SA framework where the 'screening exercise' determined that the proposed change may alter the SA scoring.
4. Where there is considered to be a need to revise the results of the SA, the Addendum then considers whether this alters the assessment of the cumulative effects of the plan and recommendations for proposed mitigation and monitoring.
5. The pre-submission changes have also been screened to determine if they would lead to any significant impacts under the Habitats Regulations.

Results of the SA

6. Supporting principles and plan policies have been amended to reflect a negative score where the plan is allocating development sites or proposing other development in areas identified as having potential issues with land instability.

7. The screening exercise showed that ten of the seventy-one pre-submission changes needed to be re-assessed against the SA Framework as follows:
 - i. Site AV68 has a new site boundary and therefore the SA needs to be revised accordingly,
 - ii. The removal of the Skelton Gate area as a specified location for office development has the potential to change the results of the SA of Policy AVL3,
 - iii. Site AV83 has a new site boundary and therefore the SA needs to be revised accordingly,
 - iv. The capacity of three of the sites allocated under Policy AVL7 has been amended. This alters the spatial distribution of housing and increases the number of units and therefore has potential to change a number of scores,
 - v. Four changes to the transport proposals , including the deletion of the NGT trolley bus have the potential to change scores in the SA framework, particularly those relating to accessibility,
 - vi. Changes to Policy AVL16 could affect scores under SA21 (heritage),
 - vii. Changes to Policy SB2 have the potential to improve scores under SA21 (heritage),
 - viii. The proposed change to a bus based park and ride facility (from the refused NGT scheme) has the potential to change scores relating to accessibility,
 - ix. Site requirements for site AV111 have been amended to safeguard views of the Temple Newsam Estate and this has the potential to improve scores under SA 21 (heritage),
 - x. Changes to Policy SG1 and accompanying paragraphs have the potential to change SA scores.
8. The assessment of these changes (found in Appendix 9 of the Addendum) showed that the majority are considered to be beneficial overall. However, potential negative SA effects are noted in terms of the deletion of the NGT trolleybus scheme and the impact on school provision and flood risk due to the proposed changes to capacity of housing sites, particularly with regard to sites within and close to the city centre.
9. Mitigation measures resulting from the review of the SA framework and proposed changes to the submission plan include the insertion of wording into the Resilient and Safe Development Section. This wording cross-refers to other policies in existing adopted plans that have requirements in relation to land stability in areas of coal mining legacy.
10. The pre-submission changes were not found to lead to any significant impacts under the Habitats Regulations.

SUBMISSION SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL ADDENDUM

1. INTRODUCTION

Background

- 1.1 In September 2015, a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report - 'the SA Report'; was prepared to accompany the Publication Draft Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan (AVLAAP). A consultation on the Publication Draft AVLAAP was undertaken in September to November 2015. A number of representations were received raising issues relating to the soundness and legal compliance of the plan.
- 1.2 In response the Council has proposed a number of pre-submission changes to address matters relating to the soundness of the plan. In addition the Council is proposing other changes for clarification and to update factual information in the plan. These proposed changes must be reviewed under the SA for potential changes to the SA results and recommendations published in the SA Report.
- 1.3 Some responses to the consultation also raised issues relating to the SA methodology and assessment results. These responses have been considered and revisions to the methodology and assessment made where appropriate.

Purpose of the addendum

- 1.4 This document forms an addendum to the original SA Report to support the submission version of the AVLAAP and should be read in conjunction with that report.
- 1.5 The addendum provides two main updates. Firstly, it provides an update to the SA methodology, including inclusion of an additional SA sub-objective. It then updates baseline data, as necessary, and re-assesses all plan options, objectives, policies and site allocations against the revised SA framework.
- 1.6 Secondly, the addendum assesses the proposed pre-submission changes against the SA framework. This is done in two steps. The first step screens the proposed changes to identify where the change may require an alternation to the original SA scoring and results. The second step provides a detailed assessment of the proposed change against the SA framework where the 'screening exercise' determined that the proposed change may alter the SA scoring. This assessment considers the changes in the context of the objective / policy / allocation as a whole.
- 1.7 Where there is considered to be a need to revise the results of the SA, the Addendum then considers whether this alters the assessment of the cumulative effects of the plan and recommendations for proposed mitigation.

Structure

- 1.8 This addendum presents the following information:
 - Section 1: Background
 - Section 2: Revision to SA methodology and baseline data

- Section 3: Assessment of the plan against the revised SA framework
- Section 4: Methodology for assessing proposed pre-submission changes
- Section 5: Assessment of the proposed pre-submission changes for their potential to alter the SA
- Section 6: Habitats Regulations Assessment update

2. REVISIONS TO SA METHODOLOGY AND BASELINE DATA

- 2.1 Sections 2, 3 and 5 and Appendix 4 of the SA Report set out the overall methodology and framework for assessment of the likely significant effects of the AVLAAP, including the 22 SA objectives. The methodology has been used to assess alternative options, objectives, policies and site allocations.
- 2.2 This section sets out two modifications to the SA methodology which are then applied to the site assessments and assessment of the plan options, objectives and policies, where relevant, in Section 3 of this addendum. These modifications have been made to reflect the collection of additional, more detailed, baseline information and in response to representations received to the Publication Draft AVLAAP consultation.

Accessibility to potential employment sites

- 2.3 As part of the update of the Employment Land Assessment and in conjunction with the West Yorkshire Combined Authority, the Council has updated the scoring system for employment sites in terms of accessibility of sites to public transport. Accessibility to public transport is used as the basis of the score for employment sites against SA objectives 13 and 16 and forms part of the score against SA15 alongside other transport related issues.
- 2.4 The scoring criteria outlined in the SA Report was open to significant interpretation as it made reference to meeting Core Strategy standards when there are two separate standards for employment depending on whether the end use is offices or a general employment use.
- 2.5 The revised scoring system has been devised to remove this ambiguity using the Core Strategy office accessibility standard as the basis for achieving the highest score for this measure (5) and the general employment accessibility standard as the minimum level of accessibility (scoring 2). Sites which fail to meet the general employment accessibility standard are the least sustainable; scoring 1 (or a double negative score) against the relevant SA objectives. The criteria for scoring 3 or 4 lies between the office and general employment standard and thus provides a good or very good level of accessibility for general employment but marginally fails the accessibility standard for office development. These changes capture the intent of national and local guidance to ensure that offices, which in general generate high numbers of trips are located in highly accessible locations.

The following revisions are made to Section 5, Table 3 - Guide to ranking criteria (for transport related SA objectives)

Transport issue	Score	Criteria
Accessibility to public transport	1	Average time to access public transport services ¹ >40 mins (fails to meet Core Strategy standard)
	2	Average time to access public transport services >20 mins and <=40 mins (equivalent to Core Strategy standard for general employment uses)
	3	Average time to access public transport services >15 mins and <=20 mins
	4	Average time to access public transport services >12.5 mins and <=15 mins
	5	Average time to access public transport services <= 12.5 mins (equivalent to Core Strategy standard for office uses)
Highway access	1	No access achievable
	2	Highway frontage but adequate access / visibility not achievable
	3	Requires development of adjacent site for access
	4	Access achievable with mitigation works e.g. signalised junction
	5	Adequate frontage/s for suitable access/es and visibility splays within site / adopted highway
Impact on local highway network	1	Unsuitable local network and no potential for mitigation
	2	Unsuitable local network but mitigation potential
	3	Local congestion issues
	4	Spare local capacity and suitable network but likely cumulative impact issues
	5	Spare local network capacity and suitable network

Land instability

2.6 The Council received a representation from the Coal Authority as part of the consultation on the Publication Draft AVLAAP. This noted that the SA of the AVLAAP did not include consideration of land instability issues. The Coal Authority considered this to be a fundamental deficiency in the SA which rendered it unsound as paragraphs 109,120,121 and 166 of the NPPF which require the issue to be addressed as part of the preparation of plans. The Coal Authority suggested an amendment to the SA framework to include further sub-objectives under objective SA18 to consider land instability issues. SA18 covers 'pollution' and already considers contamination and Health & Safety Executive major hazards as well as air quality.

¹ Under the accessibility to public transport criteria average time to access public transport factors in walk time to a bus stop and the frequency of services serving that stop. It is calculated using the following formula (Average time = x min walks = (0.5 x y min bus frequency) e.g. 5 min walk and 15 min frequency (the Core Strategy accessibility standard for offices) = 5 + (0.5 x 15) = 12.5 mins. Any site within 10 mins walk (800 m) of a railway station also scores 5. See Employment Land Assessment for further details.

- 2.7 To rectify this omission, an additional sub-objective (SA18D) has been added to SA18 'Pollution' relating to land instability. This is reflected in an additional decision making criterion under SA18 in Appendix 4 of the SA Report as follows:

18. Reduce pollution levels	d. Will it prevent unacceptable risks from land instability?
-----------------------------	--

- 2.8 To assess the plan against this sub-objective baseline data has been obtained from the Coal Authority relating to development high risk areas (DHRAs, associated with historic coal mining activity), mine entries and mine entry areas of influence (MZIs). The baseline data update is set out in the Addendum to Appendix 3 of the Publication Draft SA report.
- 2.9 There is a need to assess the likely significant effects of plan proposals on land instability using sub-objective SA18D. The SA Report assessed alternative options, objectives and policies against SA18 as a whole (Sections 4 and 5 and Appendices 5 and 9). This assessment now also needs to consider land instability. For site assessments the sub-objectives of SA18 were broken down into individual scores as explained in Section 5, Table 4 of the SA Report. A further separate scoring system is therefore required for SA18D based on the baseline data available. The following approach to the assessment of sites has been used in this addendum:

Update to Section 5, Table 4: Scoring criteria of sites applying SA objectives

SA Objective	Assumptions used	Scoring
SA18 Pollution	Sub-divide SA18 into 4 parts (SA18A, SA18B, SA18C and SA18D to consider whether site affected by air quality designations, HSE Major Hazard Zone, contamination or land instability issues.	
SA18D Land instability	Coal Authority Development High Risk Areas and Mine Entry Zones of Influence	<p>O Less than 5% of the site is located within a Coal Authority Development High Risk Area</p> <p>- More than 5% of the site is located within a Coal Authority Development High Risk Area</p> <p>-- One or more mine entries and mine entry zones of influence located within the site boundary</p>

- 2.10 Additionally, the summary of significant effects, cumulative effects and proposed mitigation measures set out in Section 5 and Appendices 7, 8, 10 and 11 need to be reviewed where assessment of land instability produces a negative sustainability effect or alters the outcome of the previous consideration of the plan against objective SA18.

3. ASSESSMENT OF PLAN AGAINST THE REVISED SA FRAMEWORK

- 3.1 This section sets out the results of the assessment of the plan against the revised SA framework including the revised methodology for assessing the accessibility of employment sites to public transport (relevant to SA objectives SA13, SA15 and SA16) and the new sub-objective SA18D relating to land instability as set out in Section 2.

Sustainability appraisal of alternative options (see Addendum to Appendix 5)

- 3.2 The two alternative options proposed as part of the February 2011 consultation (see Section 4.1 of the SA Report) were assessed against the revised SA framework. The assessment concluded that there was not a need to amend the scoring and results of the original SA. The conclusions of this assessment are set out in the Addendum to Appendix 5 of the SA Report set out at the back of this report.

Sustainability appraisal of sites proposed for allocation and sites not proposed for allocation (see Addendum to Appendices 7 & 8)

- 3.3 All proposed allocations and alternative site suggestions have been reassessed using the revised methodology for site assessments set out in Section 2. This has resulted in a number of changes to the scoring of SA13, SA15 and SA16 and produced a set of scores against SA16. The assessment results are set out in the Addendum to Appendices 7 and 8.

Sustainability Appraisal of supporting principles and plan policies (see Addendum to Appendix 9)

- 3.4 All the supporting principles and plan policies have been assessed against the revised SA framework. This has resulted in a number of changes to the scoring against revised Objective SA18 where the plan is allocating development sites or proposing other development in areas identified as having potential issues with land instability. The assessment results are set out in the Addendum to Appendix 9 (Schedule 1).

4. METHODOLOGY FOR ASSESSING PROPOSED PRE-SUBMISSION CHANGES

- 4.1 In conducting SA of the proposed changes, the following tasks have been undertaken:
- i. An initial SA 'screening': each proposed change has first been compared against the original Publication Draft AVL AAP policies and supporting information to check whether or not it changes what the original policy or other statements intended (and thus if it could change the SA results), and also whether or not it changes any of the assumptions of the original SA Report.

- ii. Where necessary, further SA assessment work of proposed changes: where the screening exercise confirmed that the proposed change required further attention under the SA, the proposed changes have been assessed against the SA framework in order to identify potential effects and inform the proposed changes and their future implementation.

5. ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED PRE-SUBMISSION CHANGES FOR THEIR POTENTIAL TO ALTER THE SA

Screening assessment of proposed pre-submission changes (see Schedule of pre-submission changes document for details)

- 5.1 The tables below set out the results of the screening of the proposed pre-submission changes for their potential to alter the results and outcome of the SA. This has been done in two parts.

Screening assessment of pre-submission changes (Part 1: Schedule of proposed changes to Draft Plan)

- 5.3 The table below shows the results of the screening of pre-submission changes (Part 1 – Schedule of proposed changes to Draft Plan). To simplify the process related changes, for example, changes to the supporting text to a policy and changes to the policy have been screened together. The screening exercise shows the need to re-assess a number of policy changes against the SA framework.

Change No.	Change	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
1	Section 1.6	No	This section was included in the Publication Draft for information but is not required in the final document. Deletion has no effect on SA outcomes.
2	Section 2 Vision, Principle 6	No	The proposed change is positive in terms of the effect on heritage. As the objective already scored a double positive for heritage there would be no change to overall scores against the SA framework.
3 & 4	Paras 3.2.2 & 3.2.8	No	Deletion a result of NGT trolleybus scheme refusal - factual change. Sustainability effects of deletion of NGT considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12.
5	Para 3.2.14 & Table 1	No	Reflects planning information update to include new planning approvals up to April 2016. Factual change with no effect on SA outcomes.
6	Paras 3.2.15, & Table 2	Yes	The SA of site AV68 needs to be revised to reflect new site boundary (see revised Appendix 7). Other changes reflect a planning information update to include new planning approvals up to April 2016.
7, 8 & 9	Paras 3.2.16, 3.2.17, 3.2.18 & Table 3	No	These are consequential changes to totals for each category of employment site. Each site is appraised separately (see Appendix 7). The Natural Resources & Waste Local Plan sites have been subject to a separate SA process detailed in the SA

Change No.	Change	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
			report for that plan. Deletion of allowance for Stourton Park & Ride site (employment) a result of NGT trolleybus scheme refusal - factual change. Sustainability effects of deletion of NGT depot at Stourton considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy CAV1
10,11 & 12	Paras 3.2.20, 3.2.21 Policy AVL3	Yes	The removal of the Skelton Gate area as a specified location for office development has potential to change the results of the SA of Policy AVL3.
13 & 14	Para 3.2.23 & Policy AVL4	Yes	The SA of site AV83 needs to be revised to reflect new site boundary (see revised Appendix 7). Other changes reflect planning information update - with sites now included in identified sites schedule under Policy AVL2.
15	Para 3.2.24	No	A consequential change reflecting updates to Tables 1-4 and Policies AVL2 & AVL4.
16 & 17	Para 3.3.7 & Table 5	No	Reflects planning information update to include new planning approvals up to April 2016. Factual change with no effect on SA outcomes.
18, 19 & 20	Paras 3.3.9, 3.3.10 & Policy AVL7	Yes	The capacity of three of the sites allocated under Policy AVL7 has been amended. This alters the spatial distribution of proposed housing within the AVL and increases the overall number of housing units proposed in the AVLAAP. Potential to change interpretation and scores against a number of SA objectives.
21	Para 3.3.13 & Table 6	No	A consequential change reflecting the update to Table 5 and Policy AVL7. No change to SA outcome.
22	Table 7	No	A consequential change reflecting the update to Table 5 and Policy AVL7. No change to SA outcome.
23	Para 3.3.15	No	The change provides clarification. No change to SA outcome.
24	Policy AVL8	No	The change corrects a typo. No change to SA outcome.
25	Para 3.4.22	No	Deletion a result of NGT trolleybus scheme refusal - factual change. Sustainability effects of deletion of NGT considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12.
26	Para 3.4.23	No	A consequential change reflecting change to site capacity proposed in Policy AVL7. No change to SA outcome.
27	Para 3.4.26	No	The change provides potential mitigation for the additional housing proposed in the South Bank area under the proposed amendment in Policy AVL7. As delivery of a primary school is subject to further detailed masterplanning work and identifying a delivery route, a specific site has not been identified, the school has not been added to the list of sites set out in Policy AVL10. This policy already scored a double positive for education (SA3) and other scores would be depend on the specific site e.g. flood risk.
28	Para 3.4.28	No	The change provides clarification. No change to SA outcome.
29 & 30	Para 3.4.33 & Policy AVL11	No	The proposed change improves the clarity and effectiveness of the policy and is positive in terms of the effect on heritage. As the objective already scored a double positive for heritage there would be no change to overall scores against the SA

Change No.	Change	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
			framework.
31	Paras 3.4.35 – 3.4.37	No	The additional text provides a cross reference to other LDF policies which address land instability issues. These have been subject to a separate SA process.
32	Para 3.5.2	No	Deletion a result of NGT trolleybus scheme refusal - factual change. Sustainability effects of deletion of NGT considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12.
33 & 34	Para 3.5.4 & 3.5.5	No	Factual updates relating to HS2 and the Yorkshire Hub concept reflecting updates since the Publication Draft Plan was prepared. Future decisions on these proposals are beyond the scope of the AAP. No change to SA outcome.
35, 36 & 37	Paras 3.5.6 to 3.5.10	No	Deletion of previous NGT trolleybus scheme text reflects the refusal of the scheme and the Council's current position on identifying the future direction of transport provision. The sustainability effects of deletion of NGT considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12.
38, 39 & 41	Paras 3.5.21, 3.5.25 & Policy AVL12	Yes	There are four significant changes to the transport proposals identified in the policy, including deletion of the NGT trolleybus scheme and potential extension. The policy needs to be re-assessed against the SA framework to identify any changes to the significant effects.
40	Para 3.5.38	No	The additional text provides a cross reference to the adopted NRWLP which has been subject to a separate SA process.
42 & 43	Para 3.7.7 & Policy AVL16	Yes	The proposed change to the Policy AVL16 needs to be re-assessed against the SA framework as there is potential different interpretation of the effects under objective SA21 (heritage).
44	Section 4.2 (Spatial Vision)	No	The vision was not appraised in the original SA because it amplifies the overall plan objectives within the area which have been assessed separately. Deletion a result of NGT trolleybus scheme refusal is a factual change. Sustainability effects of deletion of NGT considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12.
45 & 46	Section 4.2 (Objectives)	No	The area objectives were not appraised in the original SA because they amplify the overall plan objectives within the area. No change to SA outcome.
47, 48 & 49	Paras 4.2.18 & 4.2.20 & Policy SB1	No	<p>Changes in 4.2.18 & 4.2.20 refer to changing context relating to HS2, Yorkshire Hub and the South Bank Masterplan. These provide factual updates which have no effect on SA outcomes.</p> <p>Other deletion in Para 4.2.20 a result of NGT trolleybus scheme refusal is a factual change. Sustainability effects of deletion of NGT considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12.</p> <p>Proposed changes to Policy SB1 are minor but help to clarify the intent of the policy. There may be slightly more positive outcomes in terms of SA15 (Transport) but this would not change overall SA scores and outcome.</p>
50	Policy SB2	Yes	The proposed changes needs to be re-assessed against the SA framework as the additional reference to heritage issues could result in a more positive score against objective SA21

Change No.	Change	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
			(heritage).
51 & 52	Paras 4.2.30 & 4.2.31	No	<p>The proposed changes in para 4.2.30 are providing further clarification in terms of the implementation of Core Strategy Policy G5 which has been subject to a separate SA process.</p> <p>The changes to the description of proposed green routes in para 4.2.31 provide clarification in relation to the routes shown on the area maps. No change to SA outcome.</p>
53 & 54	Paras 4.2.46 & Policy SB4	No	<p>Deletion in Para 4.2.46 a result of NGT trolleybus scheme refusal is a factual change. Sustainability effects of deletion of NGT considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12.</p> <p>The proposed changes widens range of employment uses but no significant change to SA outcome which is overall double positive for SA1 and SA2 (employment / economic growth objectives)</p>
55	Policy AVL7/SB3 (Site AV94)	No	<p>The requirement relating to older persons housing for this site was included in the Publication Draft Plan as a result of an error. It was to be removed on flood risk grounds (and the designation was taken off the area map) so was not taken into account in the original SA.</p> <p>The strengthened site requirement is mitigation for potential impact on heritage assets and does not change the SA outcome significantly.</p>
56	Policy AVL7 (Site AV7)	No	<p>The requirement relating to older persons housing for this site was included in the Publication Draft Plan as a result of an error. It was to be removed on flood risk grounds (and the designation was taken off the area map) so was not taken into account in the original SA.</p>
57	Policy AVL7 (Site AV9)	No	<p>The requirement relating to older persons housing for this site was included in the Publication Draft Plan as a result of an error. It was to be removed on flood risk grounds (and the designation was taken off the area map) so was not taken into account in the original SA.</p> <p>The strengthened site requirement is mitigation for potential impact on heritage assets and does not change the SA outcome significantly.</p>
58	Policy AVL7 (Sites AV12 & AV13)	No	<p>The requirement relating to older persons housing for this site was included in the Publication Draft Plan as a result of an error. It was to be removed on flood risk grounds (and the designation was taken off the area map) so was not taken into account in the original SA.</p>
59	Policy AVL7 (Sites AV14, AV15 & AV16)	No	<p>The requirement relating to older persons housing for this site was included in the Publication Draft Plan as a result of an error. It was to be removed on flood risk grounds (and the designation was taken off the area map) so was not taken into account in the original SA.</p>
60	Policy AVL7 (Site AV17)	No	<p>The requirement relating to older persons housing for this site was included in the Publication Draft Plan as a result of an error. It was to be removed on flood risk grounds (and the designation was taken off the area map) so was not taken into</p>

Change No.	Change	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
			account in the original SA. The strengthened site requirement is mitigation for potential impact on heritage assets and does not change the SA outcome significantly.
61	Section 4.3 (Objectives)	No	The area objectives were not appraised in the original SA because they amplify the overall plan objectives within the area. No change to SA outcome.
62	Policy EB4	No	The change provides clarification as to how the policy will be assessed in relation to other plan policies. Other plan policies have been subject to a separate SA assessment.
63	Policy AVL7 (Sites AV32, AV33 & AV34)	No	The requirement relating to older persons housing for this site was included in the Publication Draft Plan as a result of an error. It was to be removed on flood risk grounds (and the designation was taken off the area map) so was not taken into account in the original SA. Other changes correct typos. No change to SA outcome.
64	Policy AVL7 (Sites AV32, AV33 & AV34)	No	The strengthened site requirement is mitigation for potential impact on heritage assets and does not change the SA outcome significantly.
65	Policy AVL7 (Site AV38)	No	The strengthened site requirement is mitigation for potential impact on heritage assets and does not change the SA outcome significantly.
66	Section 4.4 (Spatial Vision)	No	The vision was not appraised in the original SA because it amplifies the overall plan objectives within the area which have been assessed separately (see Appendix 9). No change to SA outcome.
67	Section 4.4 (Objectives)	No	The area objectives were not appraised in the original SA because they amplify the overall plan objectives within the area. No change to SA outcome.
68	Para 4.4.15	No	Deletion a result of NGT trolleybus scheme refusal and is a factual change. Sustainability effects of deletion of NGT considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12.
69	Policy AVL7 (Site AV48)	No	The change corrects a typo. No change to SA outcome.
70	Para 4.4.20	No	The change provides clarification. No change to SA outcome.
71	Policy AVL7 (Site AV98)	No	The strengthened site requirement is mitigation for potential impact on heritage assets and does not change the SA outcome significantly.
72, 73 & 74	Paras 4.4.35, 4.4.36 & Policy AVL7 (Site AV40)	No	Para 4.4.35 makes a cross reference to NRWLP site requirements for a buffer. The NRWLP has been subject to a separate SA. Para 4.4.36 makes a cross reference to the revised capacity of the site – change made under Policy AVL7 which will be re-assessed against the SA framework. The strengthened site requirement is mitigation for potential impact on heritage assets and does not change the SA outcome significantly.

Change No.	Change	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
75	Policy AVL7 (Site AV46)	No	<p>The requirement relating to older persons housing for this site was included in the Publication Draft Plan as a result of an error. It was to be removed on flood risk grounds (and the designation was taken off the area map) so was not taken into account in the original SA.</p> <p>The strengthened site requirement is mitigation for potential impact on heritage assets and does not change the SA outcome significantly.</p>
78 & 79	Para 4.4.43 & Policy HU4	No	Deletions a result of NGT trolleybus scheme refusal and are factual changes. Sustainability effects of deletion of NGT considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12.
80	Para 4.4.53	No	Deletion a result of NGT trolleybus scheme refusal and is a factual change. Sustainability effects of deletion of NGT considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12.
81	Section 4.5 (Spatial Vision)	No	Deletion a result of NGT trolleybus scheme refusal and is a factual change. Sustainability effects of deletion of NGT considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12.
82 & 83	Section 4.5. (Objectives)	No	<p>Deletion a result of NGT trolleybus scheme refusal and is a factual change. Sustainability effects of deletion of NGT considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12.</p> <p>The area objectives were not appraised in the original SA because they amplify the overall plan objectives within the area (see Appendix 9). No change to SA outcome.</p>
84, 85 & 86	Paras 4.5.28, 4.5.29 & Policy CAV1	Yes	The proposed change to a bus based park and ride facility (from the refused NGT scheme) is a significant change. The policy needs to be re-assessed against the SA framework to identify any changes to the significant effects.
87	Policy CAV2	No	Policy wording amended as a result of the NGT trolleybus scheme refusal but is not likely to have a significant on the SA outcome. The sustainability effects of deletion of NGT considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12.
88 & 89	Para 4.5.33 & Policy CAV3	No	<p>Change to para 4.5.33 is a minor change to the site description which has no effect on SA outcomes.</p> <p>The revision to Policy CAV3 improves the benefits of the policy in terms of green space (SA10) and biodiversity (SA12) but as the policy already scored a double positive there is no significant change to the SA outcome.</p>
90, 91 & 92	Paras 4.5.51, 4.5.52 & 4.5.54	No	Paras 4.5.51 & 4.5.52 - the change to site area is a cross reference to the change to Policy AVL4 (Site AV68) which is subject to a revised SA based on the amended site boundary. The additional text provides a cross reference to the adopted NRWLP rail spur designation and the potential of the site to incorporate rail served development. The NRWLP has been subject to a separate SA process. The change is minor and will result in no significant change to the SA outcome.

Change No.	Change	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
			Para 4.5.54 - deletion a result of NGT trolleybus scheme refusal and is a factual change. Sustainability effects of deletion of NGT considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12.
92	Para 4.5.59	No	Deletion a result of NGT trolleybus scheme refusal and is a factual change. Sustainability effects of deletion of the NGT service to Stourton considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12 and CAV1.
93	Policy AVL4 (Site AV83)	No	The amended site requirement in relation to green infrastructure reflects the mitigation measures required based on the proposed change to the site boundary. This has no effect on SA outcomes. The revised site has been assessed against the SA framework (see Appendix 7).
94	Section 4.6 (Spatial Vision)	No	The vision was not appraised in the original SA because it amplifies the overall plan objectives within the area which have been assessed separately (see Appendix 9). No change to SA outcome.
95	Section 4.6 (Objectives)	No	The area objectives were not appraised in the original SA because they amplify the overall plan objectives within the area (see Appendix 9). No change to SA outcome.
96	Para 4.6.15	No	A consequential change reflecting change to site capacity proposed in Policy AVL7.
97	Para 4.6.16	No	Deletion a result of NGT trolleybus scheme refusal and is a factual change. Sustainability effects of deletion of NGT considered as part of assessment of proposed changes to Policy AVL12.
98	Para 4.6.20	No	Design principles were not subject to SA in original report but they support overall plan objectives which have been assessed separately (see Appendix 9).
99	Para 4.6.29	No	Change to description of site access. Factual change with no effect on SA outcomes.
100	Para 4.6.30	No	Factual update to reflect that planning permission for business park lapsed in April 2016.
101	Policy AVL7 (Site AV111 – site requirements)	Yes	Local centre: change clarifies mitigation measures relating to local services. No effect on SA outcomes as principle of providing local services as mitigation for poor access to existing services remains. Ecological assessment: the requirement has been included in error. It repeats another site requirement under bullet 3 and is unnecessary. No effect on SA outcome Historic park and garden: this requirement is added as mitigate to uncertain impacts against SA21 (heritage) to ensure key views of the Temple Newsam estate are safeguarded (see Appendix 7).
102, 103, 104 & 105	Paras 4.6.36, 4.6.37, 4.6.39 & Policy SG1	Yes	There are several changes to this policy which are considered to be significant and have potential to affect the SA scoring and outcome.
106 & 107	Paras 4.6.44, 4.6.47	No	Para 4.6.44 makes a cross reference to the revised capacity of the site – change made under Policy AVL7 which will be re-

Change No.	Change	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
			assessed against the SA framework. Para 4.6.47 changes provide clarification as to the interpretation of the policy requirement in Policy SG3.
108, 109 & 110	Paras 4.6.49, 4.6.50 & Policy SG4	No	Proposed changes are for clarify and consistency and to reflect further discussions between the Council, wildlife groups and developers regarding to type of facility required at Skelton Lake. This has no effect on the SA outcome.
111	Appendix 2	No	This has been assessed through the SA of Policy AVL11. The appendix listed specific buildings.
112 to 120	Maps 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13 & 14	No	Map changes generally reflect changes screened above which have a spatial element. Two changes to maps not assessed are the deletion of landmark buildings and changes to pedestrian/ cycle routes on Map 8. These changes are not considered to significantly change the SA outcome.

Screening assessment of pre-submission changes (Part 2 – Schedule of factual and grammatical changes to Draft Plan)

- 5.2 The table below shows the result of the screening of the schedule of minor grammatical and factual pre-submission changes proposed by the Council. These have been considered together because the same conclusion has been reached for all the modifications in the schedule.

Change No.	Change	Potential to change SA outcome?	Reason
1 to 46	All modifications	No	The changes are all factual or grammatical in nature and have no effect on SA outcomes

Assessment of proposed changes ‘screened in’ against the SA framework

- 5.4 The seven proposed changes that were ‘screened in’ as part of the exercise detailed above have been assessed against the SA framework. All these proposed changes related to plan policies and supporting text. The results of this exercise are set out in the Addendum to Appendix 9 (Schedule 2).
- 5.5 The majority of proposed changes are considered to be beneficial overall. However, potential negative SA effects are noted in terms of the deletion of the NGT trolleybus scheme and the impact on school provision and flood risk with the proposed changes to capacities of housing sites with more of a focus on sites within and on the city centre.

Consideration of cumulative impacts

- 5.6 This section of the original SA Report examined the cumulative impact of the plan policies and proposals against the 22 SA objectives. As a result of revisions to the SA framework and amended SA outcomes relating to proposed changes (see

Addendum to Appendices 7,8 & 9) the cumulative impacts of the plan have been reconsidered. The results of this exercise are set out in the Addendum to Appendix 10.

Proposed mitigation measures

- 5.7 Appendix 11 of the original SA report set out a schedule of proposed mitigation measures to prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse effects of implementing the plan. These have been amended to reflect the updates to the SA Framework (see Addendum to Appendix 11). Mitigation measures related to individual sites are set out in revised Appendix 7.

HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT UPDATE

- 6.1 Having reviewed the proposed changes to the AVL AAP submission draft, there are no changes which present risks to the nature conservation objectives of Natura 2000 sites. There are also no material changes to these policies in terms of the mitigation they provide.
- 6.2 It is therefore concluded that the existing HRA Screening decision would be expected to apply, and no further HRA / Appropriate Assessment is required.

ADDENDUM TO APPENDICES

ADDENDUM TO APPENDIX 3 OF SA REPORT

Land instability

Land instability is known to be a potential issue in AVL particularly in relation to former coal mining activities in the area. Data has been obtained from the Coal Authority which shows two types of areas of potential land instability. These are:

1. **Development High Risk Areas (DHRAs)** - This includes areas subject to surface mining (past and current); past shallow coal mine working; probable shallow coal mining workings and coal outcrops.
2. **Mine Entries Zone of Influence (MZIs)** – a buffer area around known former mine entries.

According to the data 48% of the AVL area falls within a DHRA and there are 116 separate MZIs within the AVL. Site assessments indicate which development sites (proposed and not proposed) fall within a DHRA and/or include MZIs.

ADDENDUM TO APPENDIX 5

ASSESSMENT OF ADDITIONAL ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS PROPOSED IN FEBRUARY 2011 CONSULTATION

AVLAAP Alternative Options	Potential Change to SA18 outcome	Reason
Boundary extension	No	Some land within the extension area lies with DHRAs and MZIs but if it was not within the AVLAAP the potential sites would be considered for allocations within the Leeds SAP (or other plan) in order to ensure the Core Strategy housing and employment targets are met.
Urban Eco Settlement	No	The UES approach does not promote the development of specific sites and is neutral in terms of land instability issues. The overall positive score against pollution remains the same.

REVISED APPENDIX 7

Appendix 7

Aire Valley Leeds AAP Submission Draft: Sustainability Appraisal of Proposed Employment Allocations																													
HMCA	Ref	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17	SA18a	SA18b	SA18c	SA18d	SA19	SA20	SA21	SA22a	SA22b	SA22c	Comment
City Centre	AV7	+	++	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	--	++	0	++	-	++	++	0	+	0	0	-	0	+	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Mixed use allocation also includes housing. SA14: Flood Zone 2 (94%); Flood Zone 3 (6%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land instability issues. SA21: Development unlikely to affect the setting of any listed building as site is separated from nearest listed buildings by other development sites and buildings.
City Centre	AV12	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	--	+	0	+	-	++	+	0	+	-	0	0	0	+	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Mixed use allocation also includes housing. SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G5 to provide open space provision within new development. SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA18b: AAP has a number of policies which promote the creation of new open space and greening of pedestrian routes including planting street trees e.g. Policies SB2 (New City Park) and SB3 (New and enhanced green routes and spaces in the South Bank). This should help to improve air quality in the South Bank and mitigate the impact of new development proposed. Site requirements include provision of open space within the development. SA21: Development unlikely to affect the setting of any listed building.
City Centre	AV13	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	--	+	0	++	-	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Mixed use allocation also includes housing. SA14: The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document).
City Centre	AV14	+	++	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	--	++	--	++	-	++	++	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Mixed use allocation also includes housing. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document)
City Centre	AV15	+	++	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	--	++	0	++	-	++	++	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Mixed use allocation also includes housing. SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document)
City Centre	AV16	+	++	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	--	++	0	++	-	++	++	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Mixed use allocation also includes housing. SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document) SA21: Development unlikely to affect the setting of any listed building.

Aire Valley Leeds AAP Submission Draft: Sustainability Appraisal of Proposed Employment Allocations

HMCA		Ref	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17	SA18a	SA18b	SA18c	SA18d	SA19	SA20	SA21	SA22a	SA22b	SA22c	Comment	
City Centre	AV18		+	++	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	-	++	-	+	++	+	+	0	+	-	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Mixed use allocation also includes housing. SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G5 to provide open space provision within new development. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA15: Shannon Street may need widening: site frontage available. Pedestrian access improvements. SA18b: AAP includes a policy to maintain and improve green space and green infrastructure provision in the East Bank area (Policy EB2) to improve air quality in the area mitigate the impact of new development proposed. Site requirements include provision of open space within the development.
City Centre	AV94		+	0	0	0	0	++	-	+	0	--	+	0	++	-	++	++	0	+	-	0	-	0	0	u	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Mixed use allocation also includes housing. SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G5 to provide open space provision within new development. SA14: Flood Zone 2 (27%); Zone 3 (73%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document) SA18b: AAP has a number of policies which promote the creation of new open space and greening of pedestrian routes including planting street trees e.g. Policies SB2 (New City Park) and SB3 (New and enhanced green routes and spaces in the South Bank). This should help to improve air quality in the South Bank and mitigate the impact of new development proposed. Site requirements include provision of open space within the development. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues. SA21: Mitigation set out in site requirements. Retention of listed buildings and undesingated heritage assets on the site.
East Leeds	AV51		+	+	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	-	--	0	+	+	++	+	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Site required to meet Aire Valley employment land target set out in Core Strategy Policy SP5. SA11: Site required to meet Aire Valley employment target. SA17: Employment use compatible with neighbouring waste uses. SA18c: Noted in site requirements. SA19: Self seeded trees on site potential to retain some within landscaping scheme.
East Leeds	AV54		+	+	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	-	+	0	+	++	+	+	0	+	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Site required to meet Aire Valley employment land target set out in Core Strategy Policy SP5. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues.
East Leeds	AV72		0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	--	+	0	0	-	+	0	-	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	-	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall marginal positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Site required to meet Aire Valley employment land target set out in Core Strategy Policy SP5. SA14: Flood Zone 2 (12%); Flood Zone 3 (88%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA17: Employment use compatible with neighbouring waste uses. SA22d: Next to proposed canal wharf but employment uses are compatible.

Aire Valley Leeds AAP Submission Draft: Sustainability Appraisal of Proposed Employment Allocations																													
HMCA	Ref	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17	SA18a	SA18b	SA18c	SA18d	SA19	SA20	SA21	SA22a	SA22b	SA22c	Comment
East Leeds	AV74	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	--	--	-	+	--	+	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall marginal positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Site required to meet Aire Valley employment land target set out in Core Strategy Policy SP5. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA22d: Next to proposed canal wharf but employment uses are compatible.
East Leeds	AV76	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	--	++	0	0	-	+	0	-	+	0	0	--	0	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Site required to meet Aire Valley employment land target set out in Core Strategy Policy SP5. SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA17: Employment use compatible with neighbouring waste uses. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues. This will identify where mine entries are present on site and which will need to be kept free from development.
East Leeds	AV80	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	--	+	-	+	-	+	+	0	+	0	0	--	0	0	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Site required to meet Aire Valley employment land target set out in Core Strategy Policy SP5. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA14: Flood Zone 3 (45%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues. This will identify where mine entries are present on site and which will need to be kept free from development.
East Leeds	AV83	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	--	++	-	-	-	0	-	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against a number of SA objectives. Overall neutral score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Site required to meet Aire Valley employment land target set out in Core Strategy Policy SP5. SA8: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12). SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA13: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12). SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA16: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12).

Aire Valley Leeds AAP Submission Draft: Sustainability Appraisal of Identified Employment Allocations (UDP Employment Allocations)																													
HMCA	Ref	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17	SA18a	SA18b	SA18c	SA18d	SA19	SA20	SA21	SA22a	SA22b	SA22c	Comment
East Leeds	AV52																												Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Site required to meet Aire Valley employment land target set out in Core Strategy Policy SP5. SA11: Two thirds of site is brownfield. Existing allocation required to meet Aire Valley employment target. SA12: Site located next to green corridor within green infrastructure network (Policy AVL13 applies) SA17: Employment use compatible with adjoining waste use. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues.
East Leeds	AV55																												Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7:Site required to meet Aire Valley employment land target set out in Core Strategy Policy SP5. SA11: Existing allocation required to meet Aire Valley employment target. SA17: Employment use compatible with neighbouring waste uses. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues.
East Leeds	AV56																												Positive or neutral effects against a number of SA objectives. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Site required to meet Aire Valley employment land target set out in Core Strategy Policy SP5. SA11: Existing allocation required to meet Aire Valley employment target. SA12: Site located next to green corridor within green infrastructure network (Policy AVL13 applies). SA17: Employment use compatible with waste designation under NRWLP Policy Waste 5 (Industrial estates suitable for waste management uses). SA18c: Noted in site requirements. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues. SA19:
East Leeds	AV62																												Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Existing allocation required to meet Aire Valley employment land target set out in Core Strategy Policy SP5. SA8: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12). SA11: Existing allocation required to meet Aire Valley employment target. SA12: Site located next to green corridor within green infrastructure network (Policy AVL13 applies). SA13: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12). SA14: Flood Zone 2 (54%); Flood Zone 3 (44%): The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA16: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12). SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues. SA22a: Shown on DEFRA map as 3 but is not farmed and has been allocated since adopted UDP 2001.

Aire Valley Leeds AAP Submission Draft: Sustainability Appraisal of Identified Employment Allocations (UDP Employment Allocations)																													
HMCA	Ref	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17	SA18a	SA18b	SA18c	SA18d	SA19	SA20	SA21	SA22a	SA22b	SA22c	Comment
East Leeds	AV68	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	-	-	--	--	-	0	--	-	+	0	0	--	0	0	0	0	0	--	Positive or neutral effects against a number of SA objectives. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Site required to meet Aire Valley employment land target set out in Core Strategy Policy SP5. SA8: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12). SA11: Existing allocation required to meet Aire Valley employment target.. SA12: Site located next to green corridor within green infrastructure network (Policy AVL13 applies) SA13: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12). SA14: Flood Zone 2 (94%) SA16: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12). SA17: Employment use compatible with neighbouring waste uses. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues. This will identify where mine entries are present on site and which will need to be kept free from development. SA22d: Slight overlap with proposed minerals rail spur (NRWLP Policy Minerals 13).
East Leeds	AV77	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	--	--	-	++	--	+	++	0	+	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Site required to meet Aire Valley employment land target set out in Core Strategy Policy SP5. SA11: Existing allocation required to meet Aire Valley employment target. SA12: Site located next to green corridor within green infrastructure network (Policy AVL13 applies) SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA19:
East Leeds	AV78	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	--	--	-	++	--	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall marginal positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Site required to meet Aire Valley employment land target set out in Core Strategy Policy SP5. SA11: Existing allocation required to meet Aire Valley employment target. SA12: Site located next to green corridor within green infrastructure network (Policy AVL13 applies). SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA19:
East Leeds	AV79	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	--	--	--	+	+	++	+	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall marginal positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Site required to meet Aire Valley employment land target set out in Core Strategy Policy SP5. SA11: Existing allocation required to meet Aire Valley employment target. SA12: Site located next to green corridor within green infrastructure network (Policy AVL13 applies) SA18b: Site next to motorway junction but general employment uses less sensitive than other uses such as housing. SA19:

Aire Valley Leeds AAP Submission Draft: Sustainability Appraisal of Proposed Housing Allocations

HMCA	Ref	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17	SA18a	SA18b	SA18c	SA18d	SA19	SA20	SA21	SA22a	SA22b	SA22c	Comment
City Centre	AV7	0	0	0	+	0	++	+	+	0	--	++	0	+	-	++	+	0	+	0	0	-	0	+	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA14: Flood Zone 2 (94%); Flood Zone 3 (6%). The flood risk sequential and exception tests have been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land instability issues. SA21: Development unlikely to affect the setting of any listed building as site is separated from nearest listed buildings by other development sites and buildings.
City Centre	AV9	-	-	+	+	0	++	+	+	0	--	+	0	++	-	++	++	0	+	-	0	-	0	+	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA1 & 2: Existing employment could potentially be retained within a comprehensive redevelopment scheme. Site is allocated as mixed use to reflect this and potential for other town centre uses as permitted under AAP Policy SB4. SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G5 to provide open space provision within new development. SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential and exception tests have been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA18b: AAP has a number of policies which promote the creation of new open space and greening of pedestrian routes including planting street trees e.g. Policies SB2 (New City Park) and SB3 (New and enhanced green routes and spaces in the South Bank). This should help to improve air quality in the South Bank and mitigate the impact of new development proposed. Site requirements include provision of open space within the development. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues. SA21: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements.
City Centre	AV12	-	-	+	+	0	++	+	+	0	--	+	0	++	-	++	++	0	+	-	0	0	0	+	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA1 & 2: Site allocated for mixed use which includes potential for employment-generating development. SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G5 to provide open space provision within new development. SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential and exception tests have been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA18b: AAP has a number of policies which promote the creation of new open space and greening of pedestrian routes including planting street trees e.g. Policies SB2 (New City Park) and SB3 (New and enhanced green routes and spaces in the South Bank). This should help to improve air quality in the South Bank and mitigate the impact of new development proposed. Site requirements include provision of open space within the development. SA21: Development unlikely to affect the setting of any listed building.
City Centre	AV13	-	-	+	+	0	++	+	+	0	--	+	0	++	-	++	++	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA1 & 2: Site allocated for mixed use which includes potential for employment-generating development. SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential and exception tests have been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document).

Aire Valley Leeds AAP Submission Draft: Sustainability Appraisal of Proposed Housing Allocations

HMCA	Ref	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17	SA18a	SA18b	SA18c	SA18d	SA19	SA20	SA21	SA22a	SA22b	SA22c	Comment
City Centre	AV14	0	0	+	+	0	++	+	+	0	--	++	--	+	-	++	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G4 to provide 80 sq m on-site provision of green space per residential unit. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential and exception tests have been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document).
City Centre	AV15	0	0	+	+	0	++	+	+	0	--	++	0	+	-	++	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G4 to provide 80 sq m on-site provision of green space per residential unit. SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential and exception tests have been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document).
City Centre	AV16	0	0	+	+	0	++	+	+	0	--	++	0	+	-	++	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G4 to provide 80 sq m on-site provision of green space per residential unit. SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential and exception tests have been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA21: Development unlikely to affect the setting of any listed building.
City Centre	AV17	-	-	+	0	0	++	+	+	0	--	+	0	++	-	++	++	0	+	-	0	0	0	0	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA1 & SA2: Existing employment could potentially be retained within a comprehensive scheme. Site is allocated as mixed use to reflect this and potential for other town centre uses as permitted under AAP Policy SB4. SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G4 to provide 80 sq m on-site provision of green space per residential unit. SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential and exception tests have been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA15: Sayner Rd/Hunslet Rd/Leathley Rd junction may require improvement as well as pedestrian accessibility. SA18b: AAP has a number of policies which promote the creation of new open space and greening of pedestrian routes including planting street trees e.g. Policies SB2 (New City Park) and SB3 (New and enhanced green routes and spaces in the South Bank). This should help to improve air quality in the South Bank and mitigate the impact of new development proposed. SA21: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. Retention of listed building and undesignated heritage assets within the site.
City Centre	AV18	0	0	+	+	0	++	+	+	0	-	++	-	+	++	+	++	0	+	-	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G5 to provide open space provision within new development. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA18b: AAP includes a policy to maintain and improve green space and green infrastructure provision in the East Bank area (Policy EB2) to improve air quality in the area mitigate the impact of new development proposed. Site requirements include provision of open space within the development.
City Centre	AV20	-	-	+	+	0	++	+	+	0	-	+	0	+	++	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA1 & 2: Site has been put forward by NHS on the basis that it will become surplus to requirements during plan period. SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G5 to provide open space provision within new development.

Aire Valley Leeds AAP Submission Draft: Sustainability Appraisal of Proposed Housing Allocations

HMCA	Ref	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17	SA18a	SA18b	SA18c	SA18d	SA19	SA20	SA21	SA22a	SA22b	SA22c	Comment
City Centre	AV22	0	0	+	+	0	++	+	+	0	-	++	-	+	++	++	+	0	0	0	0	-	0	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G4 to provide 80 sq m on-site provision of green space per residential unit. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues.
City Centre	AV94	-	-	0	0	0	++	+	+	0	--	+	0	++	-	++	++	0	+	-	0	-	0	+	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA1 & 2: Site allocated for mixed use which includes potential for employment-generating development. SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G5 to provide open space provision within new development. SA14: Flood Zone 2 (27%); Flood Zone 3 (73%). The flood risk sequential and exception tests have been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA18b: AAP has a number of policies which promote the creation of new open space and greening of pedestrian routes including planting street trees e.g. Policies SB2 (New City Park) and SB3 (New and enhanced green routes and spaces in the South Bank). This should help to improve air quality in the South Bank and mitigate the impact of new development proposed. Site requirements include provision of open space within the development. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues. SA21: Mitigation set out in site requirements. Retention of listed buildings and undesingated heritage assets on the site.
East Leeds	AV38	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0?	-	-	-	--	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	--	-	0	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against a number of SA objectives. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA9 & SA10: Loss of existing allotment site but this has been disused for a number of years. Core Strategy Policy G4 requires provision of on-site green space within housing allocations and Policy G6 requires replacement provision of on-site green space lost in redevelopment. Opportunity to provide replacement allotment provision within overall scheme. SA11: Site required to meet housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues. This will identify where mine entries are present on site and which will need to be kept free from development. SA19: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. Existing landscape can be incorporated within new development where appropriate. SA21: Adjacent to listed building. Mitigation measures set out in site requirements.

Aire Valley Leeds AAP Submission Draft: Sustainability Appraisal of Proposed Housing Allocations

HMCA	Ref	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17	SA18a	SA18b	SA18c	SA18d	SA19	SA20	SA21	SA22a	SA22b	SA22c	Comment
East Leeds	AV40	-	-	+	0	0	0	+	-	0	-	+	--	-	-	+	-	-	+	0	0	--	-	+	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against a number of SA objectives. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA1 & 2: The proposed NRWLP minerals rail freight allocation to the south of the site is a potential site for the relocation of the existing aggregates processing plant on the site. SA8: Site requirements include new/improved pedestrian/cycle route to link to services/facilities south of the river, including Hunslet town centre and the South Bank area. SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G4 to provide 80 sq m on-site provision of green space per residential unit. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA13: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12) and site requirements including improved pedestrian and cycling access to the site. SA14: Flood Zone 2 (26%); Flood Zone 3 (2%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). Only a very small area of the site is situated in Flood Zone 3. This can be incorporated within the green space / green infrastructure requirements of the site without affecting the site capacity. Avoiding this area would alter the SA score to '0 - neutral'. SA16: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12) and site requirements including improved pedestrian and cycling access to the site. SA17: Site requirements include provision of an appropriate buffer between proposed housing and minerals uses to protect the amenity of future residents. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability
East Leeds	AV111	0	0	-	-	0	-	+	0?	0	0	-	--	--	--	-	--	0	+	0	0	--	-	0	u	0	0	0	Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA3: Site requirement to provide through school (primary & secondary provision) within the development. SA4: Site requirement to provide health facilities (within the local centre proposed at the site). SA6: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12) and site requirements including provision of local services, public transport services and improved pedestrian and cycling access. SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G4 to provide 80 sq m on-site provision of green space per residential unit. SA11: Majority of site was previously allocated for employment. Site required to meet housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA13: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12) and site requirements including provision of local services, public transport services and improved pedestrian and cycling access. SA14: Flood Zone 2 (2%); Zone 3 (6%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). Only a very small area of the site is situated in Flood Zone 3. This can be incorporated within the green space / green infrastructure requirements of the site without affecting the site capacity. Avoiding this area would alter the SA score to '0 - neutral'. This is set out in site requirements. SA15: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12) and site requirements including highway access, provision of public transport services and improved pedestrian and cycling access. SA16: Mitigation through proposals
Inner Area	AV22	0	0	+	+	0	++	+	+	0	-	++	-	+	++	++	+	0	0	0	0	-	0	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G4 to provide 80 sq m on-site provision of green space per residential unit. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues.

Aire Valley Leeds AAP Submission Draft: Sustainability Appraisal of Proposed Housing Allocations

HMCA	Ref	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17	SA18a	SA18b	SA18c	SA18d	SA19	SA20	SA21	SA22a	SA22b	SA22c	Comment
Inner Area	AV23	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	+	0	-	++	-	+	++	++	+	0	0	0	0	-	--	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G4 to provide 80 sq m on-site provision of green space per residential unit. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues. SA19: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. Existing landscape can be incorporated within new development where appropriate. Double negative: Impact on Biodiversity, mitigation via Policies AV 13 & 14 and site requirements, single negative impact/mitigation tbc.
Inner Area	AV28	0	0	+	+	0	++	+	0	0	-	++	0	+	++	++	+	0	+	-	0	0	0	+	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G4 to provide 80 sq m on-site provision of green space per residential unit. SA18b: AAP includes a policy to maintain and improve green space and green infrastructure provision in the East Bank area (Policy EB2) to improve air quality in the area mitigate the impact of new development proposed. Site requirements include provision of open space within the development. SA21: Site is adjacent to the Eastern Riverside Conservation Area and listed East Street Mills buildings. Mitigation measures set out in site requirements.
Inner Area	AV29	0	0	+	+	0	++	+	0	0	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	0	+	-	0	0	-	0	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification - SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G4 to provide 80 sq m on-site provision of green space per residential unit. SA11: Site required to meet housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA18b: AAP includes a policy to maintain and improve green space and green infrastructure provision in the East Bank area (Policy EB2) to improve air quality in the area mitigate the impact of new development proposed. Site requirements include provision of open space within the development. SA19: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. Existing landscape can be incorporated within new development where appropriate. SA21: Site is located adjacent to the Grade 1 listed St Saviours Church. Mitigation measures set out in site requirements.
Inner Area	AV32	0	0	+	+	0	++	+	0	0	--	+	--	+	-	++	+	0	+	-	0	0	-	+	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification - SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G5 to provide open space provision within new development. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA14: Flood Zone 2 (25%); Zone 3 (10%). The flood risk sequential and exception tests have been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA18b: AAP includes a policy to maintain and improve green space and green infrastructure provision in the East Bank area (Policy EB2) to improve air quality in the area mitigate the impact of new development proposed. Site requirements include provision of open space within the development. SA19: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. Existing landscape can be incorporated within new development where appropriate. SA21: Site is located adjacent to the listed Rose Wharf building and Eastern Riverside Conservation Area. Mitigation measures set out in site requirements.

Aire Valley Leeds AAP Submission Draft: Sustainability Appraisal of Proposed Housing Allocations

HMCA	Ref	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17	SA18a	SA18b	SA18c	SA18d	SA19	SA20	SA21	SA22a	SA22b	SA22c	Comment
Inner Area	AV34	0	0	+	+	0	++	+	0	0	--	++	--	0	-	+	0	0	+	-	0	-	-	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G4 to provide 80 sq m on-site provision of green space per residential unit. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA14: Flood Zone 2 (26%); Zone 3 (28%). The flood risk sequential and exception tests have been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA18b: AAP includes a policy to maintain and improve green space and green infrastructure provision in the East Bank area (Policy EB2) to improve air quality in the area mitigate the impact of new development proposed. Site requirements include provision of open space within the development. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues. SA19: AAP includes a policy to maintain and improve green space and green infrastructure provision in the East Bank area (Policy EB2) to improve air quality in the area mitigate the impact of new development proposed. Site requirements include provision of open space within the development.
Inner Area	AV46	-	-	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	--	+	0	+	-	++	+	0	+	0	0	-	0	+	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA1 & 2: Site has been put forward by owners. Potential for the existing business to relocate to an alternative site in the area. SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G4 to provide 80 sq m on-site provision of green space per residential unit. SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%). The flood risk sequential and exception tests have been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues. SA21: Site adjacent to listed Hunslet / Victoria Mills buildings. Mitigation measures set out in site requirements.
Inner Area	AV48	-	-	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	--	+	-	++	-	++	++	0	+	0	0	0	--	+	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA1 & 2: Site allocated for mixed use which includes potential for employment-generating development. SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G4 to provide 80 sq m on-site provision of green space per residential unit. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA14: Flood Zone 2 & 3 (
Inner Area	AV98	-	-	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	--	+	--	+	-	+	+	0	+	-	0	-	0	+	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA1 & 2: Site allocated for mixed use which includes potential for employment-generating development. SA10: Requirement in Core Strategy Policy G4 to provide 80 sq m on-site provision of green space per residential unit. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA14: Flood Zone 2 (1%); Flood Zone 3 (99%). The flood risk sequential and exception tests have been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). SA18b: AAP includes a policy to maintain and improve green space and green infrastructure provision in the Hunslet area (Policy HUS5) to improve air quality in the area mitigate the impact of new development proposed. Site requirements include provision of open space within the development. SA18D: Development is required to submit a Coal Mining Risk Assessment in accordance with Saved UDP Policy G5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 13 to address land stability issues. SA21: Site adjacent to listed Hunslet / Victoria Mills buildings. Mitigation measures set out in site requirements.

REVISED APPENDIX 8

Appendix 8

Aire Valley Leeds AAP Submission Draft: Sustainability Appraisal of Potential (not allocated) Housing Sites																													
HMCA	Ref	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17	SA18a	SA18b	SA18c	SA18d	SA19	SA20	SA21	SA22a	SA22b	SA22c	Comment
City Centre	AV8	0	0	0	+	0	++	+	0	0	--	++	0	++	-	++	++	0	+	0	0	-	0	0	u	0	0	+	SA14: Flood Risk Zone 3 (100%)
East Leeds	AV81	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	--	-	-	+	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	--	0	0	0	--	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against a number of SA objectives. Overall negative score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification:
East Leeds	AV82	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	--	-	-	+	0	--	0	+	0	0	-	0	0	u	--	0	0	
City Centre	AV95	-	-	+	+	0	--	+	+	-	-	+	0	+	++	++	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score.
City Centre	AV96	-	-	+	+	0	++	+	+	0	--	+	--	+	-	++	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification:
City Centre	AV97	-	-	+	+	0	++	+	+	0	-	+	0	+	-	++	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	u	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA14: Flood Zone 2 (
East Leeds	AV99	0	0	-	-	0	-	+	-	0	-	-	--	-	-	-	-	-	+	0	0	--	--	+	u	0	0	--	SA14: Flood Zone 2 (25%); Zone 3 (2%)
East Leeds	AV100	-	-	-	-	0	0	+	-	0	--	+	--	0	-	+	0	0	+	0	0	--	--	+	0	0	0	--	SA14: Flood Zone 2 (17%); Zone 3 (82%) SA15: Possible signalisation at Haigh Pk Rd and Skelton Grange Road and capacity improvements at Thwaite Gate.
East Leeds	AV101	0	0	0	-	0	-	+	-	0	-	-	--	-	--	0	-	--	+	0	0	--	-	+	u	--	0	--	SA14: Flood Zone 2 (5%); Zone 3 (1%)
Aire Valley Leeds AAP Submission Draft: Sustainability Appraisals of Potential (not allocated) Employment Sites																													
HMCA	Ref	SA01	SA02	SA03	SA04	SA05	SA06	SA07	SA08	SA09	SA10	SA11	SA12	SA13	SA14	SA15	SA16	SA17	SA18a	SA18b	SA18c	SA18d	SA19	SA20	SA21	SA22a	SA22b	SA22c	Comment
Inner Area	AV33	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	--	++	--	++	-	+	++	0	+	-	0	-	-	+	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall positive score. Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: SA12: SA14: SA18b: SA19:
East Leeds	AV53	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	-	--	+	+	0	+	0	+	0	0	--	-	0	0	0	0	+	Positive or neutral effects against most SA objectives. Overall negative score.
East Leeds	AV100	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	-	0	--	+	--	0	-	+	0	0	+	0	0	--	--	+	0	0	0	--	SA14: Flood Zone 2 (17%); Zone 3 (82%)
East Leeds	AV102	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	-	+	--	+	++	++	+	-	+	0	-	--	0	0	0	0	0	--	SA12: Concerns relate to one part of the site (rifle range), rest of site supported.
East Leeds	AV103	+	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	+	-	x	++	x	x	0	+	0	0	--	0	0	0	0	0	+	
East Leeds	AV104	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	--	-	-	0	--	+	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%) SA20 site is part greenfield and brownfield. Majority is of site area is brownfield.
East Leeds	AV105	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	--	--	--	-	0	--	--	+	0	0	--	0	0	u	0	0	--	SA14: Flood Zone 2 (<1%)
East Leeds	AV106	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	--	--	--	+	0	--	-	+	0	0	-	-	+	0	0	0	+	SA20 majority of site is brownfield
East Leeds	AV107	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	--	--	--	--	--	+	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	SA14: Flood Zone 3 (100%)
East Leeds	AV108	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	--	--	-	++	+	+	++	0	+	0	0	--	0	0	0	--	0	+	
East Leeds	AV109	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	--	--	++	+	+	++	--	0	0	0	--	-	0	0	0	0	+	
East Leeds	AV110	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	--	--	--	--	-	--	-	+	0	0	--	-	0	0	--	0	--	
East Leeds	AV111	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	--	--	--	--	-	--	-	+	0	0	--	-	0	0	--	0	Negative effects & mitigation/justification: SA7: Housing allocation with employment uses. SA12: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements. SA13: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12) and site requirements including provision of local services, public transport services and improved pedestrian and cycling access. SA14: Flood Zone 2 (2%); Zone 3 (6%). The flood risk sequential test has been satisfied in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF (see separate Aire Valley Leeds Flood Risk Sequential & Exception Tests document). Only a very small area of the site is situated in Flood Zone 3. This can be incorporated within the green space / green infrastructure requirements of the site without affecting the site capacity. Avoiding this area would alter the SA score to '0 - neutral'. This is set out in site requirements. SA15: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12) and site requirements including provision of local services, public transport services and improved pedestrian and cycling access. SA16: Mitigation through proposals for improvements to transport network (Policy AVL12) and site requirements including provision of local services, public transport services and improved pedestrian and cycling access. SA19: Mitigation measures set out in site requirements and Policy SG3. Existing landscape can be incorporated within new development where appropriate. SA21: Part of site within registered historic park and garden (Temple Newsam). However, this has been severed from the estate by the construction of the M1. Key views of the historic parks and garden to be safeguarded through inclusion of a site requirement.
East Leeds	AV114	+	+	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	-	--	--	--	-	--	0	+	0	0	--	-	0	u	0	0	0	SA14: Flood Zone 2 (2%); Zone 3 (6%)

ADDENDUM TO APPENDIX 9

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED URBAN ECO SETTLEMENT SUPPORTING PRINCIPLES AND PLAN POLICIES

SCHEDULE 1: ASSESSMENT OF SUPPORTING PRINCIPLES AND PLAN POLICIES AGAINST REVISED SA OBJECTIVE SA18

AVLAAP Supporting principle / policies	Potential Change to SA18 outcome	SA18 score	Reason
AVLAAP SUPPORTING PRINCIPLES			
1. For the Economy	No	-	The objective will promote economic development of areas of unstable land. As the objective already scored negatively against the SA18 there is no change.
2. For Housing	Yes	-	The objective will promote housing development of areas of unstable land. The score for SA18 is changed from 0 to -
3. For Communities	No	+	Although this objective could promote development of community facilities in areas of unstable land, the overall score remains positive in terms of pollution.
4. For Connections	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and objective.
5. For Energy & Resources	No	++	No direct relationship between SA18D and objective.
6. For the Environment & Visitors	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and objective.
7. For Health	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and objective.
8. For Infrastructure	No	0	No direct relationship between SA18D and objective.
PLAN WIDE POLICIES			
AVL1. Identified Sites for Office Use	No	0	Some of sites within DHRAs but land instability issues will have been addressed through the planning application process.
AVL2. Identified Sites for General Employment Use	Yes	-	For sites carried forward from the UDP – produces negative score for SA18D because there are sites identified in areas of unstable land. Therefore overall score becomes negative.
AVL3. Office Development	Yes	-	Produces negative score for SA18D because there are sites identified in areas of unstable land. Therefore overall score becomes

AVLAAP Supporting principle / policies	Potential Change to SA18 outcome	SA18 score	Reason
			negative.
AVL4. General Employment Development	Yes	-	Produces negative score for SA18D because there are sites identified in areas of unstable land. Therefore overall score becomes negative.
AVL5. Local Job Opportunities	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
AVL6. Identified Housing Sites	No	0	Some of sites within DHRAs but land instability issues will have been addressed as through the planning application process.
AVL7. New Homes in AVL	Yes	-	Produces negative score for SA18D because there are sites identified in areas of unstable land. Therefore overall score becomes negative.
AVL8. Improving Public Health in AVL	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
AVL9. Shopping Local Services in AVL	Yes	-	Some of the locations specified in the policy are located in areas of unstable land. Therefore overall score becomes negative.
AVL10. New Schools	Yes	-	One of the locations specified in the policy are located in areas of unstable land. Therefore overall score becomes negative.
AVL11. Locally Significant Undesignated Heritage Assets	No	0	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
AVL12. Strategic Transport Infrastructure Improvements in AVL	No	+	The Stourton park and ride site is located in an area of unstable land. However, this is not considered to outweigh the positive effects identified against the other SA18 objectives.
AVL13. Aire Valley Leeds Green Infrastructure Network	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
AVL14. Protection, Improvement & Provision of New Green space in AVL	No	++	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
AVL15. Tourism & Recreation in AVL	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.

AVLAAP Supporting principle / policies	Potential Change to SA18 outcome	SA18 score	Reason
AVL16. Retrofitting of Existing Buildings	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
AVL17. District Heating Networks in AVL	No	0	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
AREA PLANS			
1. SOUTH BANK			
SB1. Pedestrian & Cycling Connectivity	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
SB2. New City Park	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
SB3. New & Enhanced Green Routes & Spaces	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
SB4. Appropriate Uses in Mixed Use Sites	No	+	Policy relates to uses rather than sites. No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
SB5. Temporary Uses	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
2. EAST BANK, RICHMOND HILL & CROSS GREEN			
EB1. Transport Improvements	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
EB2. Green space & Green Infrastructure	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
EB3. Marsh Lane Opportunity Area	No	0	Not in a DHRA.
EB4. East Street Opportunity Area	Yes	-	Area specified in the policy is located in areas of unstable land. Therefore overall score becomes negative.
3. HUNSLET			
HU1 Hunslet Town Centre	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
HU2 Hunslet Victoria Mills	Yes	-	Site located in area of unstable land. Therefore overall score becomes negative.
HU3 Hunslet Riverside Opportunity Area	No	-	In DHRA but already a negative score
HU4 Transport Improvements	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
HU5 Green space & Green Infrastructure	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.

AVLAAP Supporting principle / policies	Potential Change to SA18 outcome	SA18 score	Reason
4. CENTRAL AIRE VALLEY			
CAV1. Stourton Park & Ride	Yes	0	The Stourton park and ride site is located in an area of unstable land. However, there are positive effects noted in terms of air pollution as the proposal will reduce the need to travel by car to the city centre. Overall remains a neutral effect.
CAV2. Walking & Cycling Connections	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
CAV3. Green Infrastructure	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
5. SKELTON GATE			
SG1 Non Housing Uses	Yes	0	The policy promotes development of non-housing uses (meeting specified criteria) on site AV111 which is located within an area of unstable land. Therefore overall score becomes neutral rather than positive.
SG2. Walking & Cycling Connections	No	+	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
SG3. Green space & Green Infrastructure	No	++	No direct relationship between SA18D and policy.
SG4. New Visitor Destination Skelton Lake	Yes	-	Potential development in area of unstable land. Therefore overall score becomes negative.

SCHEDULE 2: ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED CHANGES 'SCREENED IN' AGAINST THE SA FRAMEWORK

Policy AVL3: Office development in Aire Valley Leeds			
SA Objective	Original Score	New Score	Appraisal Summary
1	++	++	SA1 & SA2 – The revised policy promotes a lower quantum of office development overall. However, this represents less than 5% of the overall level of office development promoted in the plan so is not significant enough to change the positive SA score against these objectives.
2	++	++	
3	0	0	
4	+	+	
5	0	0	
6	0	0	
7	-	-	
8	+	+	SA11 – The deleted Skelton Gate site (AV111) is greenfield. The proportion of office development promoted on brownfield land is higher as a result. As the SA score was already a double positive, because the majority of sites are brownfield, there is no change to the overall score.
9	0	0	
10	+	+	
11	++	++	
12	0	0	
13	+	+	SA13, SA15, SA16 – According to the site specific SA (see Appendix 8), AV111 scores poorly against these objectives because the site is not currently accessible by public transport. This is before proposed mitigation measures are taken into account. Removal of the site will therefore slightly improve overall sustainability effects against these objectives. However because it only represents a small percentage of total office development proposed there is no change to scores against these objectives.
14	-	-	
15	++	++	
16	+	+	
17	0	0	
18	0	0	
19	0	0	
20	+	+	
21	0	0	
22	0	0	
Summary			
The removal of the site is slightly positive against SA objectives relating to brownfield land development and transport and accessibility. It is slightly negative against the employment and economic objectives. Overall there is no change to the SA scores because the site only represents a small percentage of overall office development proposed.			

Policy AVL7: New Homes in AVL			
SA Objective	Original Score	New Score	Appraisal Summary
1	-	-	The cumulative effects of the proposed changes would deliver more housing in the South Bank (+810 dwellings) and Hunslet Riverside (+116 dwellings) areas and less in the Skelton Gate area (-817 dwellings). An overall increase of 120 dwellings.
2	-	-	
3	0	-	
4	+	+	
5	0	0	
6	0	0	SA3 – Overall increase in the need for school places particularly in the South Bank & Hunslet area. Proposed to amend the AAP to make reference for potential need for primary school in South Bank but a specific site has not been identified.
7	++	++	
8	++	++	
9	0	0	
10	+	-	
11	0	+	SA10 – More housing in higher density locations less likely to deliver 80 sqm per dwelling level of green space required by Policy G4 and put pressure on existing green space and those proposed in the AAP.
12	-	-	
13	0	+	
14	-	-	
15	+	+	
16	+	+	SA11 – Higher proportion of dwellings on brownfield land.
17	0	0	SA13 – Overall the distribution of dwellings is more focused on accessible locations and more likely to promote trips by sustainable transport modes.
18	0	0	
19	-	-	
20	+	+	
21	+	+	
22	0	0	SA14 – More development proposed in Flood Zone 3. Mitigation measures are proposed in site requirements.
			SA15 – Overall the distribution of dwellings is focused on more accessible locations. As some less accessible locations remain this does not justify increasing the current score from a single positive.
			SA16 – Overall the distribution of dwellings is more closely linked to existing centres and local services. As a lower number of dwellings is proposed at Skelton Gate this may make it more difficult to support a full range of local services within the local centre proposed in the development. Overall no justification for changing the score from a single positive.
Summary <p>The proposed changes to site capacities overall promote a higher proportion of new housing on brownfield sites in accessible locations providing significant benefits. Negative impacts are noted in terms of education provision, green space and flood risk. Mitigation measures should be reviewed to ensure these negative effects are addressed where possible.</p>			

Policy AVL12: Strategic Transport Infrastructure Improvements in AVL			
SA Objective	Original Score	New Score	Appraisal Summary
1	+	+	SA1 & SA2 – The deletion of the vehicle depot will reduce the number of potential jobs based in the area. However, the policy remains positive overall in terms of linking new jobs to surrounding communities and providing new infrastructure to support economic development.
2	+	+	
3	0	0	
4	+	+	
5	0	0	
6	+	+	
7	+	+	SA6 – The proposed change has positive benefits by helping to clarify the protection and improvement of public rights of way, which are important for recreation and access to the countryside. This is one aspect of the SA objective and therefore does not justify increasing the score to a double positive overall.
8	+	+	
9	+	+	
10	+	+	
11	0	0	
12	0	0	
13	++	+	SA13, SA15, SA16 – There are marginal benefits noted as additional transport infrastructure is identified in the proposed changes. However, the deletion of the NGT trolleybus scheme is a negative, partially mitigated by the replacement proposal for a bus-based park & ride scheme at Stourton. Overall it is considered that double positives for SA13 and SA15 should be revised to a single positive. In mitigation, the AAP refers to the emerging transport strategy for Leeds (paras 3.5.6 & 3.5.7) which will identify and deliver an alternative scheme/s to NGT to address cumulative transport issues across the city. It is not clear at this stage what specific interventions will be delivered in AVL.
14	0	0	
15	++	+	
16	+	+	
17	0	0	
18	+	+	
19	0	0	
20	0	0	
21	+	+	
22	+	+	

Summary

The proposed changes to delete the NGT trolleybus scheme reduces the positive effects of the policy against transport related objectives. The decision on NGT made through a Transport & Works Act application is beyond the scope of the AAP. Other changes are marginally beneficial but not of enough significance to change the original scores against any SA objective.

Policy AVL16: Retrofitting of Existing Buildings			
SA Objective	Original Score	New Score	Appraisal Summary
1	+	+	SA21 – Implementation of the Publication Draft AAP policy has potential to impact negatively on listed buildings. The proposed change is considered to change the score to neutral as it refers specifically to the need to protect listed buildings.
2	0	0	
3	+	+	
4	++	++	
5	0	0	
6	0	0	
7	++	++	
8	+	+	
9	+	+	
10	0	0	
11	0	0	
12	0	0	
13	++	++	
14	0	0	
15	0	0	
16	+	+	
17	0	0	
18	+	+	
19	0	0	
20	0	0	
21*	-	0	
22	++	++	
Summary			
The proposed changes are beneficial resulting in the revision of the score for SA21 (heritage) from single negative to neutral.			

* The original score for SA21 was 0 but noting the comments of Historic England to the Publication Draft Plan this should have been scored negatively as the policy (without taking into mitigation measures) had potential to cause harm to heritage assets

Policy SB2: New City Park			
SA Objective	Original Score	New Score	Appraisal Summary
1	0	0	SA21 – The proposed changes ensure that the policy now makes clear reference to potential opportunities for enhancing listed buildings. As a result score amended from single to double positive.
2	+	+	
3	0	0	
4	++	++	
5	0	0	
6	++	++	
7	0	0	
8	+	+	
9	+	+	
10	++	++	
11	++	++	
12	+	+	
13	++	++	
14	+	+	
15	+	+	
16	++	++	
17	0	0	
18	+	+	
19	++	++	
20	++	++	
21	+	++	
22	+	+	
Summary			
The proposed changes are beneficial resulting in the revision of the score for SA21 (heritage) from single to double positive.			

Policy CAV1: Stourton Park & Ride Site (AV82)			
SA Objective	Original Score	New Score	Appraisal Summary
1	0	0	SA2 – The proposed bus based park and ride would not include a vehicle depot at the site. There would be a lower number of jobs created at the site and it would therefore be neutral overall.
2	+	0	
3	0	0	
4	0	0	
5	0	0	SA13, 15 & 16 – The proposal will result in an improved public transport system and reduce the need to travel by car into the city centre. The score against these objectives therefore remain positive.
6	0	0	
7	-	-	
8	0	0	
9	0	0	SA21 – The site requirement safeguarding the setting of the adjacent registered historic park and gardens is positive against this heritage objective
10	0	0	
11	-	-	
12	0	0	
13	+	+	
14	0	0	
15	++	++	
16	+	+	
17	0	0	
18	0	0	
19	-	-	
20	0	0	
21	0	+	
22	+	+	
<u>Summary</u> <p>The proposed changes reduce the positive effects of the NGT trolleybus scheme in terms of employment at the site. The decision is beyond the scope of the AAP. The inclusion of a site requirement on heritage is positive.</p>			

Policy SG1: Non Housing Uses			
SA Objective	Original Score	New Score	Appraisal Summary
1	+	+	<p>The potential effects of the proposed changes are summarised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Lower level of office development at the site2. Removing a motorway service area from the list of uses specifically excluded.3. Clarifying links between development of other uses and other plan policies in the area plan (Policies SG2, SG3 & SG4) and to site requirement under Policy AVL7 (Site AV111)4. Clarifying links and relationship between development of other uses and delivery of the main housing use. <p>SA1 & 2 – The removal of the potential for office development could potential reduce the number of jobs created at the site in the long term. However, other potential non-housing uses could equally create jobs so the effect of this is unknown but overall the policy remains positive.</p> <p>SA6 – The proposed change ensures that the development of non-housing uses is linked to the requirements / aspirations to improve recreation facilities such as footpaths, cycling and a visitor centre (Policies SG2, SG3 & SG4) in the Skelton Gate area.</p> <p>SA10 – The proposed change ensures that the development of non-housing uses is linked to requirements / aspirations to improve green space (Policy SG3).</p> <p>SA12 – The proposed change ensures that the development of non-housing uses is linked to requirements / aspirations to improve pedestrian and cycle access (Policy SG2).</p> <p>SA13, 15 & 16 – Office development in an out-of-centre location could promote a significant number of trips by car but also had the potential to create local job opportunities for future residents of the housing site. Other uses would have to be considered on their merits. The policy was previously adjudged to be positive overall because it promoted provision of a food store promoting local services accessible within walking distance of future residents at the housing site. This conclusion is not changed by the proposed changes.</p> <p>SA19 – The proposed change ensures that the development of non-housing uses is linked to requirements / aspirations to improve / manage important landscape assets particularly Skelton Lake (Policies SG3 & SG4). This should be positive for overall landscape quality in the area.</p>
2	+	+	
3	0	0	
4	+	+	
5	0	0	
6	0	+	
7	-	-	
8	+	+	
9	+	+	
10	0	+	
11	0	0	
12	0	+	
13	+	+	
14	0	0	
15	+	+	
16	+	+	
17	0	0	
18	+	+	
19	0	+	
20	0	0	
21	0	0	
22	0	0	
Summary			
The proposed changes are beneficial resulting in a more positive outcome against four SA objectives (SA6, SA10, SA12 & SA19).			

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS OF PLAN

Revisions resulting from the review of the SA framework and proposed changes to the submission plan

SA Objective	Geographical Scale	Permanence	Timescale	Likelihood	Assessment	Justification
SA3 Education	L	P	S-L	H	+	As a result of the proposed changes there is a higher proportion of new housing development proposed in the city centre. This may increase the pressure for school places in these areas. In mitigation, the plan makes reference to the potential need to identify a site for a new primary school in the South Bank area at revised para 3.4.26. With this change the overall assessment score remains the same.
SA11 Greenfield and brownfield land	L	P	S-L	H	0	As a result of the proposed changes to site capacities there is now more development proposed on brownfield land. This does not change the overall scoring against the objective.
SA14 Flood risk	R & L	P	S-L	H	-	<p>The SA of proposed changes notes that overall the changes to site capacities will result in a higher number of dwellings being located in higher flood risk areas. However, all proposed sites have satisfied the flood risk sequential and exception tests and the sites with increased capacities in and on the edge of the city centre will be protected by Phase 1 of the Leeds Flood Alleviation Scheme. Specific mitigation measures to make the site safe over the lifetime of development are set out in site requirements and the exception test.</p> <p>It should be noted that the housing sites with increased capacities otherwise perform very well against other SA objectives and on balance it is</p>

SA Objective	Geographical Scale	Permanence	Timescale	Likelihood	Assessment	Justification
						considered appropriate to allocate the site subject to implementation of mitigation measures.
SA13 Greenhouse emissions SA15 Transport network SA16 Local Needs	R & L	P	S-L	H	0	Although the refusal of the NGT trolleybus scheme lies outside the scope of the plan, the impact of the decision is negative in terms of these SA objectives as it was identified as one of the main proposals to deliver public transport improvements to parts of the plan area. The plan retains the objective of providing a park & ride facility at Stourton, which partially mitigates the deletion of the scheme, but there are no other specific proposals outlined in the plan. It is noted that the deletion of the scheme does not affect the ability of any development site to meet the Core Strategy accessibility standards (as this was based on existing accessibility). The plan makes reference to the emerging transport strategy in revised paras 3.5.6 and 3.5.7 but with no specific proposal for the AVL area, the uncertainty associated with mitigation the transport impacts of development proposals, justifies reducing the overall assessment score to neutral.
SA18 Pollution (land instability)	L	P	S-L	H	-	<p>The following additional wording required in relation to land instability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site allocations and other development opportunities proposed in the plan promote development in Coal Authority DHRAs and close to MZIs. Developers are already required to undertake Coal Mining Risk Assessments for development in DHRAs in accordance with saved UDPR Policy GP5 and NRWLP Policy Minerals 3. Mitigation of coal mining legacy issues may increase site development costs although this will depend on the specific site conditions. Where extraction of near surface

SA Objective	Geographical Scale	Permanence	Timescale	Likelihood	Assessment	Justification
						coal is economically viable it could help to increase the viability of site development. An overall negative score because is given but there may be a very small but inherent longer term risk where coal is left in the ground or with development around MZIs.
SA21 Historic Environment	L	P	S-L	M	0	There are a number of revisions to the wording of site requirements, new site requirements and policy wording changes which are positive against this objective. However, it is noted that a number of development sites lie within or in close proximity to heritage assets and these measures are mitigation against a negative outcome and therefore neutral overall.

PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES

Revisions resulting from the review of the SA framework and proposed changes to the submission plan

SA Objective	Score	Definition	Mitigation				
			Site Requirement	NPPF Policy	Core Strategy	AAP Policy	Other
SA18 Pollution D. Land instability	- / --	In Coal Authority DHRAs or MZIs	Insert general cross reference to other LDF policies.	Paragraphs 109, 120, 121 & 166.	N/A	Insert cross reference in Section 3.4 under Resilient & Safe Development	Saved UDPR Policy G5 & NRWLP Minerals 3 set out requirements in relation to land instability and coal mining legacy areas.