



Sustainability Appraisal

Summary of all Policies

Fenland Draft Local Plan

August 2022

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Policy LP1 - Settlement Hierarchy..... | 1 |
| Policy LP2 – Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development..... | 5 |
| Policy LP3 – Spatial Strategy for the Location of Employment Development..... | 9 |
| Policy LP4 – Securing Fenland’s Future..... | 11 |
| Policy LP5 – Health and Wellbeing..... | 13 |
| Policy LP6 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Infrastructure..... | 14 |
| Policy LP7 - Design..... | 17 |
| Policy LP9 - Residential Annexes..... | 19 |
| Policy LP10 - Shop Frontages, Security Shutters and Canopies..... | 20 |
| Policy LP11 - Community Safety..... | 21 |
| Policy LP12– Meeting Housing Needs..... | 22 |
| Policy LP13 – Custom and Self Build..... | 25 |
| Policy LP14 – Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople..... | 26 |
| Policy LP15 – Employment..... | 27 |
| Policy LP16 – Town Centres..... | 29 |
| Policy LP17 – Culture, Leisure, Tourism and Community Facilities..... | 31 |
| Policy LP18 – Development in the Countryside..... | 33 |
| Policy LP19 – Strategic Infrastructure..... | 34 |
| Policy LP20 – Accessibility and Transport..... | 36 |
| Policy LP21: Public Rights of Way..... | 38 |
| Policy LP22: Parking Provision..... | 39 |
| Policy LP23 – Historic Environment..... | 41 |
| Policy LP24 – Natural Environment..... | 43 |
| Policy LP25 - Biodiversity Net Gain..... | 45 |
| Policy LP26 – Carbon Sinks and Carbon Sequestration..... | 47 |
| Policy LP27: Trees and Planting..... | 49 |
| Policy LP28 - Landscape..... | 51 |
| Policy LP29 – Green Infrastructure..... | 52 |
| Policy LP30 – Local Green Space and Other Existing Open Spaces..... | 54 |
| Policy LP31 – Open Space and Recreational Facilities..... | 56 |
| Policy LP32 – Flood Risk and Water Management..... | 58 |
| Policy LP33 - Development on Land Affected by Contamination..... | 59 |
| Policy LP34 – Air Quality..... | 61 |
| Policy LP41 - Land north of Knight’s End Road and East of the A141..... | 63 |
| Policy LP42 - Whittlesey – A Market Town fit for the Future..... | 64 |

Policy LP1 - Settlement Hierarchy

This policy is split into three parts:

- **Part A** – Settlement Hierarchy
- **Part B** – Settlement Boundaries
- **Part C** – Frontage Infill Development.

With alternative options considered for each part, resulting in an overall approach to the identification of settlement boundary and the supporting policies.

Part A: Settlement Hierarchy

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | No Settlement Hierarchy policy, rely on national policy and Local Plan growth strategy. |
| 2 | A Settlement Hierarchy based on a detailed survey of existing settlements services and facilities |
| 3 | A Settlement Hierarchy based on the position of settlements as set out in Policy LP3 in the adopted Local Plan (2014). |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 2: A Settlement Hierarchy based on a detailed survey of existing settlements services and facilities.**

The preferred policy (Option 2) ranks settlements based on the services and facilities contained in the settlement. This ensures that development is directed to the larger villages. The position of each village in the hierarchy is based on a survey of local services and facilities.

This option will ensure that new development is in the more sustainable locations which offer a wider range of services and facilities (1.2) and therefore reduce the need to travel (3.1). It will also help to ensure that the level of development is appropriate to the scale and character of the village (4.3). The position of a settlement in the hierarchy and the appropriate level of growth is likely to either be irrelevant or unknown for many of the SA Objectives.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



Option 2 scores significant positive effects against SA criteria 1.2 Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities and positive effects against:

- 2.1, 2.2, 2.3- Jobs, Education and Housing
- 3.1 – Transport
- 4.1, 4.3 – Place Making and Landscape

Other Options Considered

The alternative option of not having a Settlement Hierarchy (Option 1) was considered and instead rely on national policy and other Local Plan policies such as LP2 and LP18. Whilst the NPPF seeks to ensure that new development is located within the most sustainable location, without the locally specific requirements this policy approach may result in a number of negative outcomes on the SA Objectives, such as:

- 3.1 - Reduce the reliance on private motor vehicles and encourage more sustainable transport modes
- 4.1 - Conserve and where appropriate, enhance heritage assets
- 4.3 - Retain the distinctive character of Fenland's landscape

Option 3 scores similar to Option 2, but with more uncertain and unknown effects. Without an updated Settlement Hierarchy, the policy and decisions will not take into account the full range of existing services and facilities, meaning that growth may not be directed to the appropriate location.

Justification

The preferred policy (Option 2) is likely to result in a number of positive benefits as it could help to protect the character of the countryside and make efficient use of land, services and infrastructure in existing settlements. By having a locally specific policy based on an up-to-date survey of local services and facilities it ensures that investment and infrastructure are targeted in the right locations.

Part B - Settlement Boundaries

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1 | No settlement boundaries and rely on criteria-based policy and growth strategy (Same approach as adopted Local Plan - Policy LP3) |
| 2 | Settlement boundaries defined with policies that limit development outside of the boundary |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 2: Settlement boundaries defined with policies that limit development outside of the boundary.**

The preferred policy (Option 2) proposes the re-introduction of settlement boundaries. This policy restricts development in the open countryside and ensures that development is directed towards settlements with a range of local services and facilities (1.2). This approach allows for opportunities for affordable housing through rural exception sites (2.3). By directing growth to existing settlements ensures a more sustainable location for growth helping to reduce the need to travel. (3.1 and 3.2). A policy that defines settlement boundaries and restricts development in the countryside will help to conserve and where appropriate, enhance heritage assets, their setting and the wider historic environment and character (4.1, 4.2 and 4.3). A policy that defines settlement boundaries and restricts development in the countryside will minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, particularly high-grade agricultural land (6.1) and will help to utilise brownfield sites for re-development (3.2) and protect landscape character and biodiversity (6.3).

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



Option 2 scores significant positive effects against SA criteria 6.1 Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, particularly high-grade agricultural land. And positive effects against:

- 1.2 - Healthy Communities
- 2.3 - Jobs, Education and Housing
- 3.1, 3.2 - Transport
- 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 -. Heritage, Place Making and Landscape
- 6.2, 6.3, 6.4 - Land Use and Wildlife

Other options considered

The alternative option of not having settlement boundaries was considered. However, this approach resulted in some negative effects:

- 1.2 - Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities
- 3.1 - Reduce the reliance on private motor vehicles and encourage more sustainable transport
- 3.2 - Seek to ensure that all new developments can be accessed by a variety of transport modes and provide permeability
- 4.1 - Conserve and where appropriate, enhance heritage assets, their setting and the wider historic environment
- 4.2 Create places, spaces and buildings that are attractive and well designed
- 4.3 Retain the distinctive character of Fenland’s landscape
- 6.1 Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land
- 6.2 Utilise brownfield sites for re-development
- 6.3 Minimise and avoid where possible impacts to biodiversity and geodiversity.

Justification

The preferred option is Option 2, a policy that re-introduces settlement boundaries will result in more significant and positive effects. Part C assesses the options, for how this policy is applied.

Part C – Frontage Infill Development

The alternative options considered to support the re-introduction of settlement boundaries were:

| Options Considered | |
|---------------------------|---|
| 1 | Settlement boundaries defined, no frontage infill policy (see also Part B Option 2) |
| 2 | Settlement boundaries defined, with a policy which allows development outside of the boundary in exceptional circumstances and also defines infill frontage areas adjacent to the edge of some settlements to provide a more flexible approach. |
| 3 | Settlement boundaries defined, with a policy which allows development on land leading out of a settlement, but outside the defined boundary that could be suitable for residential frontage development in the settlement hinterland. This will help provide more flexibility. |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is ***Option 3: Settlement boundaries defined, with a policy which allows development on land leading out of a settlement, but outside the defined boundary that could be suitable for residential frontage development in the settlement hinterland. This will help provide more flexibility.***

Recognising the historic, linear pattern of development in the district, Option 3 allows for land leading directly or indirectly out of a settlement, but outside of the defined boundary (as shown on the Policies Map) could be suitable for residential frontage development of up to 3 new homes in the settlement hinterland.

The policy states that the settlement hinterland boundary shall be defined by that existing property furthest outside the settlement boundary which is wholly and exclusively identified as being integrally part of that

settlement, as opposed to being in any way identified with another settlement or being identified as constituting an individual, isolated dwelling unconnected to any settlement.

This policy results in some uncertain and natural effects. Whilst this policy provides flexibility and some positive benefits to meeting housing growth targets. This policy scores negative effects in terms of:

1.2 - Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities

3.1 - Reduce the reliance on private motor vehicles and encourage more sustainable transport modes

And significant negative effects on:

4.1 - Conserve and where appropriate, enhance heritage assets, their setting and the wider historic environment

4.2 - Create places, spaces and buildings that are attractive and well designed

4.3 - Retain the distinctive character of Fenland's landscape

6.1 - Minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land

6.2 - Utilise brownfield sites for re-development

6.3 - Minimise and avoid where possible impacts to biodiversity and geodiversity

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



Other options considered

Option 1 - settlement boundaries defined, no frontage infill policy scores very similar to Part B Option 2. However, this approach is restrictive. Option 2 - allows development outside of the boundary in exceptional circumstances and also defines infill frontage areas adjacent to the edge of some settlements to provide a more flexible approach. Because this option identifies the proposed infill sites, this option scores less significant negative effects.

Justification

The preferred option is Option 2, a policy that re-introduces settlement boundaries which will result in positive benefits, but the supporting policy does result in a number of negative and significant negative effects, as this approach open up more development in the countryside. However, this policy options allows for more flexibility and deliverability of sites.

Policy LP2 – Spatial Strategy for the Location of Residential Development

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Growth Option 1: Sites with extant planning permission – i.e. Do nothing. A baseline showing sites with planning consent at 01 April 2021 for 5 or more new dwellings. |
| 2 | Growth Option 2: Market town-led growth - Concentrates growth principally in the towns of Wisbech, March, Whittlesey and Chatteris. Limited growth in villages, allocating only the most suitable sites. |
| 3 | Growth Option 2A: Delivery & supply – Distribute growth to settlements with an aim to deliver ‘proportionate growth’, with omission of existing strategic sites which have demonstrated poor delivery in the past in favour of alternative sites. |
| 4 | Growth Option 3: More growth in villages - Allocates more sites in villages, and excludes sites of lesser suitability in market towns. |
| 5 | Growth Option 4: Strategic growth of certain villages - As option 3, but proposes strategic growth at Wimblington and at Coates and Eastrea villages. |

Preferred Policy

The ‘Growth Options’ are differing combinations of sites intended to meet the district’s growth needs for housing. The selection of the specific sites within each Growth Option are intended to reflect differing approaches to distributing growth and have been informed by the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal of each site.

The Sustainability Appraisal of the Growth Options (as ‘reasonable alternative’ options for Policy LP2) builds on from the SA of ‘Initial Strategic Options’ (ISOs) presented in the ‘Growth Study’ report and Appendix A.

The ISOs represent the range of different ways new development could be distributed across the district; however they were ‘theoretical’ and did not reflect actual land availability. The Growth Options develop the ISOs further, with the key difference being that the Growth Options include actual specific sites. Each site has itself been subject to Sustainability Appraisal. For those sites selected for allocation in the Draft Local Plan, the SA of individual sites has informed the setting of policy requirements in the respective site allocations policy.

The SA of ISOs, presented in the Growth Study, indicates that *ISO 3: Strategic Growth at one or more settlements* and *ISO 4: Freestanding New Settlements* each received the greatest number of significant positive scores (++) , with a total of nine significant positive scores. In addition, ISO3 & ISO4 performed positively (+) against three SA objectives. Therefore, ISO3 and ISO4 is expected to have positive or significant positive effects against 12 SA objectives.

ISO 1: Proportionate Settlement Growth received the greatest number of positive scores (+), scoring positively against 13 SA objectives, but received no significant positive scores. Therefore, ISO1 performed positively against a greater number of SA objectives than ISO3 & ISO4, however those positive effects are likely to be less significant (than ISO3 & ISO4).

The Growth Study questioned the extent to which ISOs 3 and 4 are ‘deliverable’ and also gave weight to other factors, such as the strong support for ISO1 at consultation, and ultimately recommended the Draft Local Plan’s spatial strategy reflect the principles of ISO1.

The Growth Study provides a comparison of the sites-based Growth Options with the theoretical ISOs. The Growth Study concluded that Growth Option 2A was the option most aligned with ISO1.

Following Sustainability Appraisal of the Growth Options, the preferred policy option is Growth Option 2A. The key characteristics of Growth Option 2A are:

- The allocation of sites which, when combined with an assumption of windfall development, provides sufficient land to meet Fenland’s housing requirement over the plan period.
- Distributes growth to settlements in all tiers of the Settlement Hierarchy, thereby striving toward ‘proportionate settlement growth’.
- Places a strong emphasis on ‘delivery’. This involves the omission of existing site allocations and broad locations for growth which have exhibited poor progress toward delivery, in favour of alternative site allocations in the market towns and greater distribution to the rural area.

Appendix A provides a table indicating those site submissions which were included within Growth Options 1 to 4.

Growth Option 2A directs the majority of growth to the market towns, which offer best access to employment and education, and are best served by infrastructure, services and community facilities. Through promoting accessibility and reducing the need to travel, as a result of directing growth to the market towns, GO2A scores positively against a range of SA objectives.

A key characteristic of GO2A is the dispersal of a greater portion of growth to the rural area (relative to certain other Growth Options). By providing growth across most settlements has a range of positive effects, such as providing footfall and investment to support the vitality and viability of facilities and services across the district which have in the past generally suffered a lack of investment. In addition, providing opportunity for growth in more settlements could provide choice and competition in the market for land.

However, the rural area generally has limited access to public transport and offers fewer services, facilities and employment. Therefore, new development in the rural area is likely to be more car-dependent (relative to certain other GOs) as people living in the rural area will often need to travel by private motor vehicles to access employment, education and other day-to-day services. The economic and energy cost of this increased need to travel to market towns has resulted in GO2A scoring ‘positive’ against a range of SA Objectives (whereas certain other options such as GO2 and GO4 score ‘significant positive’).

There remains significant uncertainty for all Growth Options regarding the potential effects on the water environment (SA Objective 7.2). Such effects will be explored through the forthcoming ‘Detailed Water Cycle Study’.

The preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, with the relevant symbol is shown below.



Healthy Communities (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4)

Jobs, Education and Housing (2.1, 2.2, 2.3)

Transport (3.1, 3.2)

Heritage, Place Making and Landscape (4.2)

Land Use and Wildlife (6.2, 6.4)

Pollution and Waste (8.1)

Sustainable Resources (9.1)

Other Options Considered

As discussed, the Growth Options are differing combinations of sites which reflect 'principles' for distributing growth described in a set of theoretical 'Initial Strategic Options'.

Appendix A provides a table indicating those site submissions which were included within Growth Options 1 to 4. Note that sites not included in a Growth Option are not shown.

The alternative Growth Options considered through Sustainability Appraisal of Policy LP2 are:

- Growth Option 1: Sites with extant planning permission – i.e. Do nothing. A baseline showing sites with planning consent at 01 April 2021 for 5 or more new dwellings.
- Growth Option 2: Market town-led growth - Concentrates growth principally in the towns of Wisbech, March, Whittlesey and Chatteris. Limited growth in villages, allocating only the most suitable sites.
- Growth Option 3: More growth in villages - Allocates more sites in villages and excludes sites of lesser suitability in market towns.
- Growth Option 4: Strategic growth of certain villages - As Option 3 but proposes strategic growth at Wimblington and at Coates and Eastrea villages.

Growth Option 1 is in effect a 'do nothing' approach since it allocates only sites with extant planning permission for new residential development. Due to the Growth Option allocating only extant sites, the Growth Option scores 'neutral' against all SA objectives since it has no measurable effects.

Growth Option 2 concentrates most growth in the market towns with relatively limited distribution of growth to the rural area. As a result of concentrating growth in the market towns, Growth Option 2 received the greatest number of 'significant positive' scores. This is principally due to the option providing best access to employment, education, services and community facilities, and through associated reductions in energy use and pollution as a result of reducing the need to travel to such facilities typically located in market towns. GO2 includes a number of 'strategic-scale' sites. Such strategic-scale growth opportunity to design and coordinate the delivery of new services, infrastructure, and community facilities as an integrated part of the development, thereby creating new communities which are sustainable and reduce the need to travel.

However, by concentrating growth in the market towns could lead to a lack of investment within rural communities.

Growth Option 3 directs a greater portion of growth to the rural area (whilst continuing to direct the majority of growth to the market towns). By providing growth across most settlements has a range of positive effects, such as providing footfall and investment to support the vitality and viability of facilities and services across the district which have in the past generally suffered a lack of investment. In addition, providing opportunity for growth in more settlements could provide choice and competition in the market for land.

However, the rural area generally has limited access to public transport and offers fewer services, facilities and employment. Therefore, new development in the rural area is likely to be more car-dependent (relative to GO2) as people will need to travel by private motor vehicles to access employment, education and other day-to-day services. The economic and energy cost of this increased need to travel to market towns has resulted in GO3 scoring 'positive' against a range of SA Objectives, whereas GO2 scores 'significant positive'.

For most settlements, GO4 applies the same pattern of growth (by proposing allocation of the same sites) as GO3. However, GO4 also includes strategic growth at the villages of Eastrea and Coates, and Wimblington. Through concentrating strategic-scale growth at those villages the option provides opportunity to design and coordinate the delivery of new services, infrastructure, and community facilities as an integrated part of the development, thereby creating new communities which are sustainable and reduce the need to travel. Consequently, GO4 is expected to deliver a range of significant positive effects associated with accessibility, energy use, emissions, provision of infrastructure and design.

Justification

Growth Option 2A directs the majority of growth to the market towns, which offer best access to employment and education, and are best served by infrastructure, services and community facilities. Through promoting accessibility and reducing the need to travel, as a result of directing growth to the market towns, GO2A scores positively against a range of SA objectives.

A key characteristic of GO2A is the dispersal of a greater portion of growth to the rural area (relative to certain other Growth Options). By providing growth across most settlements has a range of positive effects, such as providing footfall and investment to support the vitality and viability of facilities and services across the district which have in the past generally suffered a lack of investment. In addition, providing opportunity for growth in more settlements could provide choice and competition in the market for land.

Policy LP3 – Spatial Strategy for the Location of Employment Development

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1 | Employment Option 1: i.e. Do nothing - Baseline showing sites with planning permission for employment uses only. |
| 2 | Employment Option 2: Market town-led - Sites determined to be suitable for employment development through site assessment process. NB: In addition to those sites shown, it is proposed that existing industrial estates, business parks, employment clusters, etc. will be allocated to regularise these uses and safeguard these locations for future employment development. |
| 3 | Employment Option 2A: Delivery & supply - Increase the supply of employment land to encourage growth, particularly across the rural area. |

Preferred Policy

The 'Employment Growth Options' are differing combinations of sites intended to meet the district's growth needs for future employment land. The selection of the specific sites within each Employment Growth Option are intended to reflect differing approaches to distributing growth and have been informed by the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal of each site.

Following Sustainability Appraisal of the Employment Growth Options, the preferred policy option is: **Employment Option 2A (EO2A): Delivery & supply - Increase the supply of employment land to encourage growth, particularly across the rural area.**

Appendix A provides a table indicating those site submissions which were included within Employment Growth Options 1 to 2A.

Employment Growth Option 2A directs the majority of growth to the market towns, which offer best access to services and community facilities and is best serviced by infrastructure. Through promoting accessibility and reducing the need to travel, as a result of directing growth to the market towns, EO2A scores positively against a range of SA objectives.

A key characteristic of EO2A is the dispersal of a greater portion of growth to the rural area (relative to certain other Growth Options). By providing growth across most settlements has a range of positive effects, such as providing footfall and investment to support the vitality and viability of facilities and services across the district which have in the past generally suffered a lack of investment. In addition, providing opportunity for growth in more settlements could provide choice and competition in the market for land.

However, the rural area generally has limited access to public transport and offers fewer services and facilities. Therefore, new development in the rural area is likely to be more car-dependent (relative to certain other EOs) as people living in the rural area will often need to travel by private motor vehicles to access employment, education and other day-to-day services. The economic and energy cost of this increased need to travel to market towns has resulted in EO2A scoring 'positive' against a range of SA Objectives (whereas EO2 scores 'significant positive').

There remains significant uncertainty for all Employment Options regarding the potential effects on the water environment (SA Objective 7.2). Such effects will be explored through the forthcoming 'Detailed Water Cycle Study'.

The preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant symbol is shown below.



1.1 , 1.3 - Healthy Communities

2.1, 2.2 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.1 – Transport

4.2 - Heritage, Place Making and Landscape

6.2, 6.4 - Land Use and Wildlife

9.1 - Sustainable Resources

Other Options Considered

As discussed, the Growth Options are differing combinations of sites which reflect 'principles' for distributing growth described in a set of theoretical 'Initial Strategic Options'.

Employment Option 1 is in effect a 'do nothing' approach, since it allocates only sites with extant planning permission for new residential development. Due to the Growth Option allocating only extant sites, the Employment Option scores 'neutral' against all SA objectives since it has no measurable effects.

Employment Option 2 concentrates most growth in the market towns with relatively limited distribution of growth to the rural area. As a result of concentrating growth in the market towns, Employment Option 2 received the greatest number of 'significant positive' scores. This is principally due to the option providing best access to employment, education, services and community facilities, and through associated reductions in energy use and pollution as a result of reducing the need to travel to such facilities typically located in market towns. EO2 includes a number of 'strategic-scale' sites. Such strategic-scale growth opportunity to design and coordinate the delivery of new services, infrastructure, and community facilities as an integrated part of the development, thereby creating new communities which are sustainable and reduce the need to travel.

However, by concentrating growth in the market towns could lead to a lack of investment within rural communities.

Justification

Employment Option 2A directs the majority of growth to the market towns, which offer best access to employment and education, and are best served by infrastructure, services and community facilities. Through promoting accessibility and reducing the need to travel, as a result of directing growth to the market towns, EO2A scores positively against a range of SA objectives.

A key characteristic of EO2A is the dispersal of a greater portion of growth to the rural area (relative to certain other Employment Options). By providing growth across most settlements has a range of positive effects, such as providing footfall and investment to support the vitality and viability of facilities and services across the district which have in the past generally suffered a lack of investment. In addition, providing opportunity for growth in more settlements could provide choice and competition in the market for land.

Policy LP4 – Securing Fenland’s Future

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1 | Overarching policy establishing sustainable development and climate change principles |
| 2 | Retain ‘A Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development’ policy from current 2014 Local Plan |
| 3 | No policy: rely on National policy and guidance |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is Option 1 - **Overarching policy establishing sustainable development and climate change principles**

While this policy option is not predicted to have any significant positive impacts in relation to any of the SA objectives, it scored the most favorably of the three policy options.

Policy Option 1 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 15 of the SA objectives. Of the remaining objectives, a mixed neutral / positive score is deemed likely in relation to 6 objectives: 3.1, 3.2, 4.3, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1. While positive impacts may arise in relation to these objectives, it is more likely if the policy is implemented alongside other, more detailed local policy.

Positive effects are however predicted in relation to 4 SA objectives, due primarily to the inclusion of the climate change principles alongside the sustainable development principles. These are summarised below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



5.1 and 5.2 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

8.1 Pollution and Waste

9.1 Sustainable Resources

Other Options Considered

Two alternative policy approaches were considered.

Option 2 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon the majority of the SA objectives. Mixed neutral/ positive scores are predicted in relation to some SA objectives, specifically: 3.1; 3.2; 4.3; 6.3; and 6.4.

Similarly, to policy Option 1, while positive impacts may arise in relation to these objectives, it is more likely if the policy is implemented alongside other, more detailed local policy.

Option 3, though not predicted to have any adverse effects, is not likely to have any notable positive impacts in relation to any of the SA objectives: the policy approach was considered likely to either have negligible effects, or no effect in relation to the objectives.

Justification

Overall, Option 1 demonstrates a positive approach to minimising, mitigating and adapting to climate change, as required by NPPF chapter 14, para 153, and embeds sustainable development principles into local policy.

While Option 2 demonstrates prioritisation of the delivery of sustainable development, it fails to embed climate change considerations: Option 1 in comparison highlights FDC's commitment to the net zero agenda.

While Option 3 would not result in any adverse effects, and indeed the matter of sustainable development would be addressed by the Local Plan as a whole, and climate change addressed via various specific Local Plan policies, it is considered that an overarching policy is beneficial as it puts sustainable development, and response to the climate challenge at the forefront of the Local Plan.

Option 1 is therefore preferred and taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP5 – Health and Wellbeing

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have a policy with the expectation that development will promote, support and enhance physical and mental health and wellbeing. |
| 2 | Have a policy on health and wellbeing, including the requirement for Health Impact Assessment (HIA) for developments of 100 dwellings or more. |
| 3 | No policy specifically relating to health and wellbeing, instead rely on other Local Plan policies and national policy. |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 1: *Have a policy with the expectation that development will promote, support and enhance physical and mental health and wellbeing***

Whilst the majority of effects score neutral, the preferred option is likely to result in significant positive effects in relation to the following SA criteria:

- Providing for an ageing population and redresses health inequalities (1.1)
- Improve the quality, range and accessibility of services and facilities (1.2)

The proposed policy includes requirements for the provision of open and space and green infrastructure (1.3). Requirements promoting or protecting allotments and farm shops, scores positive effects against SA objective 1.4. It also has positive effects in helping people gain access to a range of employment opportunities and in creating sufficient homes, in the right location, and of the right mix to meet people's needs, as well as transport objectives 3.1 and 3.2.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 - Healthy Communities

2.1, 2.3 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.1, 3.2 - Transport

5.1 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

Other Options Considered

Two other options were considered. For Option 2 there are a large number of neutral effects but there are 4 objectives which have positive effects (1.3, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2) and 2 which have significantly positive effects, namely 1.1 and 1.2.

For Option 3 all of the effects are neutral.

Justification

Whilst there are similarities in benefits between Options 1 and 2, the largest number of positive and significantly positive effects occur with Option 1 and this is therefore taken forward in the draft Local Plan.

Policy LP6 – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Infrastructure

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | <p>Policy supporting principle of renewable and low carbon energy development and setting policy considerations for all proposals.</p> <p>Policy <u>sets</u> additional considerations specific to solar proposals and wind proposals.</p> <p>Policy <u>does not</u> allocate sites/ identify broad areas for wind turbine development or support domestic / non-commercial wind turbine development that requires planning permission across the district.</p> <p>Policy includes considerations for wider energy infrastructure, decommissioning and safeguarding.</p> |
| 2 | <p>Policy supporting principle of renewable and low carbon energy development and setting policy considerations for all proposals.</p> <p>Policy <u>sets</u> additional considerations specific to solar proposals and wind proposals.</p> <p>Policy <u>does</u> allocate sites/ identify broad areas for wind turbine development and supports domestic / non-commercial wind turbine development that requires planning permission across the district.</p> <p>Policy includes considerations for wider energy infrastructure, decommissioning and safeguarding.</p> |
| 3 | <p>Policy supporting principle of renewable and low carbon energy development and setting policy considerations for all proposals.</p> <p>Policy <u>does not</u> set additional considerations specific to solar proposals and wind proposals.</p> <p>Policy <u>does not</u> allocate sites/ identify broad areas for wind turbine development or support domestic / non-commercial wind turbine development that requires planning permission across the district.</p> <p>Policy includes considerations for wider energy infrastructure, decommissioning and safeguarding.</p> |
| 4 | <p>Policy supporting principle of renewable and low carbon energy development and setting policy considerations for all proposals.</p> <p>Policy <u>does not</u> set additional considerations specific to solar proposals and wind proposals.</p> <p>Policy <u>does</u> allocate sites/ identify broad areas for wind turbine development and supports domestic / non-commercial wind turbine development that requires planning permission across the district.</p> <p>Policy includes considerations for wider energy infrastructure, decommissioning and safeguarding.</p> |
| 5 | No local policy, rely on national policy |

Note:

There are several variables for this policy. To streamline the assessment process, there are two elements that we have made consistent across the first four policy options, namely:

- *'Policy supporting principle of renewable and low carbon energy development and setting policy considerations for all proposals'*: the alternative would be to not include 'Part A' (as presented in the Draft Local Plan) in the policy. This option was discounted because national policy clearly requires that the planning system 'support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure' (NPPF para 152). Furthermore, the policy considerations set out in the wider Local Plan are not specific to renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure, and do not reflect the specific considerations of such developments.
- *'Policy includes considerations for wider energy infrastructure, decommissioning and safeguarding'*: this is consistent across the policy options as it is felt that these are important considerations for all developments involving renewable and low carbon energy generation infrastructure. The alternative would be to not include these requirements in the Local Plan policy: however, this option has been discounted because:
 - There are no other policies/ criteria within the Local Plan that address wider energy infrastructure, nor does national policy set any policy in relation to this.
 - There are no other policies/ criteria within the Local Plan that address site restoration, nor does national policy set any policy in relation to site restoration following decommissioning of renewable or low carbon energy infrastructure.

- There are no other policies/ criteria within the Local Plan that address safeguarding of such infrastructure, nor does any explicit national policy exist in relation to this matter.
- Therefore, in relation to the above, specific local level policy is the only mechanism to obtain preferable outcomes in relation to each of these matters.

Preferred Policy

Policy Option 2, as set out above, is the preferred policy approach: as such it is proposed that the Draft Fenland Local Plan will include a policy on renewable and low carbon energy that will compose of four parts, 'Part A' Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Infrastructure, 'Part B' Wider Energy Infrastructure, 'Part C' Decommissioning Renewable and Low Carbon Infrastructure, and 'Part D' Safeguarding Renewable and Low Carbon Infrastructure. Part A will set out requirements in relation to direct, indirect, individual and cumulative impacts, and will explain how these requirements should be met. Part A will also include separate, additional, considerations for solar proposals and for wind proposals, and will identify sites for commercial wind turbine development, as well as set out that development of small to medium scale wind turbines is acceptable, in principle, across the whole Fenland District.

Option 2 scored the best in the SA scoring process, and is preferred over the other 4 options identified because:

- It has the greatest potential for significant positive benefits, scoring '++' in relation to more SA objectives than any other option.
- The identification of sites for medium to large scale wind turbine development, and the potential for small to medium scale turbines across the district provides greater potential for significant positive benefits in relation to objectives 5.1 (limit or reduce vulnerability to the effects of climate change), 8.1 (reduce emissions of greenhouse gasses and other pollutants) and 9.1 (reduce energy consumption and increase the use of renewable and low carbon energy sources) than options 1 and 3 which do not allocate sites/ identify areas for wind turbine development and thus prevent such development under current national policy.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant symbol is shown below.



Heritage, Place Making and Landscape (4.1 ++; 4.3 ++)
 Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk (5.1 ++; 5.2 +)
 Land Use and Wildlife (6.1 ++; 6.3 +/++)

Policy option 2 is not likely to have any negative impacts in relation to any of the sustainability objectives.

Other Options Considered

Option 1 was discounted because while it had potential for major positive effects in relation to some objectives (specifically 4.1, 4.3, 5.1, 6.1, 6.3, 8.1 and 9.1). Option 2 scored preferably in relation to several objectives: for objective 5.1, policy Option 1 scored mixed minor/ major positive effects (+ / ++), while Option 2, scored major positive benefits (++) , and for objectives 8.1 and 9.1, option 1 scored '~+/++' yet option 2 scored '~/++'.

Option 3 was discounted for the same reasons as Option 1, though this policy option scored less favourably against SA objective 6.1 than policy Options 1 and 2, scoring only positive effects, rather than major positive effects.

Option 4 scored largely the same as option 2 but was discounted because of a lesser score in relation to objective 6.1 'minimise the irreversible loss off undeveloped land, particularly high grade agricultural land'.

Option 5 was discounted because the lack of local level policy would not demonstrate a 'proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change' as required by the NPPF (para 153).

Justification

Policy Option 2 scored preferably in the sustainability appraisal and is therefore taken forward in the Local Plan as the preferred policy option. In summary:

- Option 2 is likely to deliver significant positive benefits in relation to several of the sustainability objectives, namely 4.1 and 4.3 in relation to 'heritage, place making and landscape; 5.1 in relation to 'resilience to climate change and flood risk'; 6.1 'land use and wildlife'.
- In relation to the other sustainability objectives, option 2 either scores '~' (no impact), or '+' positive, or mixed positive score. The scoring does reveal some uncertainty, as there is no certainty that renewable and/ or low carbon energy development will take place.

Policy LP7 - Design

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | No design policy and rely on national policy, the National Design Guide and local design code or policies in made Neighbourhood Plans |
| 2 | A strategic design policy setting out overall principles for design, supported by the national design guide and local design code or policies in made Neighbourhood Plans |
| 3 | A detailed design policy setting out specific requirements for different areas of the district |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy (Option 2) sets out design principles based on the National Design Guide's 10 Characteristics. The policy scores several significant positive effects as the proposed policy includes specific requires retaliating to:

- Creating places, spaces and buildings that are attractive and well designed (4.2)
- Minimise water consumption (7.1)
- Reduce emissions of greenhouse gasses (8.1)
- Reduce energy consumption (9.1)

The preferred policy also includes requirements that could result in some positive effect. Such as requirements to ensure buildings are flexible and adaptable over their lifespan (1.1). requirements to improve accessibility of local services and facilities (2.1).

Proposed policy includes requirements relating to reducing the reliance on the car and to ensure new developments are accessible by a variety of transport modes (3.1 and 3.2). The design principles include requirements retaining the distinctive character of the fenland landscape (4.3), limit or reduce effects of climate change (5.1), mminimise and avoid where possible impacts to biodiversity and geodiversity (6.3) and achieve net gain in biodiversity (6.4) and the proposed policy includes the requirement to minimise the need for resources both in construction and operation of buildings and be easily adaptable to avoid unnecessary waste (9.2).

The proposed policy score mixed or neutral effects for other SA objectives but does not score any negative or significant negative effects.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA is shown below.



Other Options Considered

Option 1 relies on national policy and the National Design Code, this approach sets out general policies that scores some positive effects (3.1 and 4.1), whilst the majority of effects are neutral or unknown.

Option 3 proposes a prescriptive policy setting out more detailed design policies for different areas. This option score significant positive effects in relation to conserving and enhancing local character, landscape and distinctiveness, but overall the effects are mainly neutral or unknown.

Justification

The preferred option provides overall design principles which results in many positive and significantly positive effects and with no negative effects. Option 2 is therefore included in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP8 - Amenity Provision

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | No policy about amenity provision, rely on general design policy (LP7) and national policy |
| 2 | A policy that sets out provision for amenity standards |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy includes criteria relating to residential amenity of occupiers and neighboring occupiers. This policy will have positive effects in creating and enhancing open space (1.3), and could have a positive effect on ensuring buildings are attractive and well designed (4.2). However, this policy will result in a natural affect against most criteria.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



Other Option Considered

The alternative option (Option 1) results in neutral effects.

Justification

Option 2 is the preferred policy as it provides more criteria to ensure amenity provision of occupiers as well as neighbours being considered and is taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP9 - Residential Annexes

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1 | No policy relay on national policy |
| 2 | Have a specific policy relating to residential annexes |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy will protect the area from unsympathetic residential annexes that could potentially harm the character of the original building and the area in which it located. This policy scores positively against several SA objectives. It has positive effects by providing for an ageing population and redressing inequalities relating to health (1.1) creating places and spaces and buildings that are attractive and well designed (4.2) and minimising the loss of undeveloped land (6.1)

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



Other Option Considered

Option 1 does not provide locally specific guidance, overall, the effects for this option are neutral.

Justification

Option 2 addresses the specific needs of the district. The criteria-based policy would permit annexes to build for the benefits of the residents so that the house can be adapted to the changing needs of the occupant and is therefore included in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP10 - Shop Frontages, Security Shutters and Canopies

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1 | Have no detailed policy, relay on design policy and NPPF |
| 2 | A policy that sets out broad principles for design of shop frontages and canopies |
| 3 | Have a more detailed design policy including requirements for listed buildings and concertation areas |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy (Option 2) is: ***A policy that sets out broad principles for design of shop frontages and canopies***

Option 2 sets our criteria for dealing with planning applications for security shutters, canopies and other development which affects shop frontages. This policy scores significant positive effects in terms of creating places, spaces and buildings that are attractive and well designed, contribute to a high-quality public realm and maintain and enhance diversity and local distinctiveness of townscape character (4.2). All other effects are considered to be neutral as not relevant to this policy.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



4.1, 4.2 – Heritage, Place Making and Landscape

Other Options Considered

Option 1 relies on national policy, therefore, is unlikely to have the same positive effects as preferred policy (Option 2) which identifies specific criteria. The majority of the SA objectives are not relevant to this policy.

Implementing a more detailed policy (Option 3) would also score positively in the same areas as Option 2, and additional design guidance reference to conservation and listed building will result in significantly positive effects against objectives 4.1 and 4.2. However, the added burden on development could impact negatively on other areas, for example by restricting some businesses from occupying certain locations due to the additional requirements imposed.

Justification

Option 2 is preferred as it scores well on the sustainability objectives and strikes a balance between having no specific policy relating to shop fronts and being over prescriptive. It is therefore taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP11 - Community Safety

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | A policy setting out criteria to create safe environments and prevent crime |
| 2 | Issue is covered by design policy, no additional criteria |
| 3 | No policy instead rely on NPPF |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy (Option 1) is: **A policy setting out criteria to create safe environments and prevent crime**

Option 1 specifically relates to community safety whilst Option 2 and Option 3 rely on other policies or national policy.

The proposed policy scores significant positive effects against criteria 1.2 as it includes requirements to ensure safe environments and to prevent crime. The policy also includes requirements to maintain and enhance permeability and connectivity of a site to aid surveillance and security and scores significantly positively against criteria 3.2.

As this policy address specific issues relating to community safety and reducing crime, most SA criteria are considered to be neutral as they are not relevant to this policy.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



1.1 - Healthy Communities

3.2 – Transport

Other Options Considered

Option 2 relies on other general design policies and principles relating to community safety. This options scores positive effects against criteria 1.2 and 3.2. Overall, the effects are considered to be neutral as not relevant to this policy. Option 3 scores neutral as not relevant.

Justification

Option 1 is the preferred option; it provides sufficient specific criteria relating to community safety and scores more significant positive effects against sustainability objectives compared to Options 2 and 3 and is therefore included in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP12– Meeting Housing Needs

This policy covers two main policy areas: the provision of affordable housing and housing standards/access standards. The alternative options considered for this policy have been split into two parts for SA purposes only and are appraised below.

Part A: Affordable Housing

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | A policy that sets a single percentage for affordable housing across the district |
| 2 | A policy that sets different thresholds for affordable housing in the north and the south of the district, with NPPF requirement of at least 10% to deliver homes available for affordable home ownership in the north. |
| 3 | Do not require any set percentage and rely on negotiation on a site-by site basis |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 2: A policy that sets different thresholds for affordable housing in the north and the south of the district, with NPPF requirement of at least 10% to deliver homes available for affordable home ownership in the north.**

Policy LP12 states that:

- For sites in the south of the district development proposals of 10 or more dwellings on greenfield sites should through negotiation, provide 20% affordable housing.
- For sites in the north of the district development proposals of 10 or more dwellings should meet the NPPF requirement for 10% affordable home ownership.

Policy Option 2 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to most of the SA Objectives. With positive effects in terms of providing for an ageing population; and redress (1.1) and help provide decent and affordable homes that meet the various needs of all in appropriate locations (2.3)

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



- 1.2 – Healthy Communities
- 2.3 – Jobs, Education and Housing

Other Option Considered

Option 1 scores similarly to preferred option 2, but scores significant positive effect in terms of objective 2.3. As this option will result in provision of more types of affordable housing, compared to option 2 which will only result in home ownership products in the north of the district. Option 3 scores positive effects against objective 1.1, however, if affordable housing provision is based on negotiations on a site by site basis, there is no guarantee that any, or enough, affordable housing will be provided. Therefore option 3 scores positive and uncertain effects against criteria 2.3

Justification

Although Option 1 scores more significant positive effects against criteria 2.3 and is likely to result in provision of different types of affordable housing across the district. The results of the viability report show that this option can not be delivered. Therefore Option 2 is the preferred option in the draft Local Plan.

Part B: Housing Standards Higher Access

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1 | All schemes for new dwellings at least 25% of the dwellings must meet building regulations M4(2), any scheme that provides 10 or more affordable rented units 10% of affordable rented dwellings should meet building regulations M4(3)(a) (wheelchair adaptable dwellings) subject to viability |
| 2 | No policy setting out housing standard requirements; let the market decide. |
| 3 | A policy that sets a lower M4(2) requirement (i.e. a % below all dwellings). |
| 4 | A policy that sets a lower threshold for M4(3)(2)(a). |
| 5 | A policy that sets a higher threshold for M4(3)(2)(a). |
| 6 | A policy that sets a higher % requirement for M4(3)(2)(a). |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 1: All schemes for new dwellings at least 25% of the dwellings must meet building regulations M4(2), any scheme that provides 10 or more affordable rented units 10% of affordable rented dwellings should meet building regulations M4(3)(a) (wheelchair adaptable dwellings) subject to viability**

The policy seeks additional higher access standards so that sufficient choice is available in the market for people with particular needs, such as the requirement for wheelchair accessible homes and homes which can be adapted to suit people's needs over time. This option scores significant positive effects against criteria 2.3 positive effect 1.1



Help provide decent and affordable homes that meet the various needs of all in appropriate locations

1.1 – Healthy Communities

2.3 – Jobs, Education and Housing

Other Option Considered

Option 2 includes no policy setting out access standards and instead could result in uncertain effects and also negative effects in terms of helping provide decent and affordable housing (2.3). Option 3 and 5 also score minor negative effects against criteria 1.1 and 2.3. Compared to options 4 and 6 which score minor positive effects.

Justification

Option 1 results in significant positive effects in terms of helping provide decent and affordable homes that meet the various needs of all in appropriate locations ensure sufficient choice is available in the housing market for people with particular needs.

Policy LP13 – Custom and Self Build

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have no policy on Custom Build and Self Build and rely on the guidance in the NPPF |
| 2 | Have a policy on Custom Build and Self Build which is specific to the local context |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 2: Have a policy on Custom Build and Self Build which is specific to the local context**

Policy Option 2 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 17 of the SA Objectives whilst there is 1 objective where the impacts are unclear.

This policy option will have positive effects on 6 of the SA objectives: 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 4.2, 6.2 and 6.4. In addition, there are likely to be significantly positive effects for 1 of the objectives (2.3). All of these are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



1.1 - Healthy Communities

2.1, 2.2, 2.3 - Jobs, Education and Housing

4.2 – Place Making and Landscape

6.2, 6.4 - Land Use and Wildlife

Other Option Considered

One other policy approach was considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact on 17 of the SA objectives whilst there were 2 objectives where the effects were unclear. There were positive effects for this policy option on 6 of the SA Objectives, namely 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 6.2 and 6.4. although there were no significantly positive effects identified.

Justification

Both Options 1 and 2 demonstrate a similar number of positive effects when assessed against the SA Objectives. However, Option 2 has one more positive benefit than Option 1 and also includes 1 significantly positive benefit.

The Council considers it important that there is a statutory policy in place for decision making. Option 2 is considered the most relevant for the Fenland context and is therefore preferred and taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP14 – Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have no specific policy, instead rely on national policy and other Local Plan policies |
| 2 | Have a criteria-based policy only (as in the adopted Local Plan) |
| 3 | The preferred policy (combination of criteria-based policy and allocations) |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 3: *The preferred policy (combination of criteria-based policy and allocations)***

Policy Option 3 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 16 of the SA objectives.

This policy option will have positive benefits on 3 of the SA objectives: 1.1, 1.2, and 2.1. In addition, there are likely to be significantly positive benefits for 6 of the objectives (2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 4.3, 5.1 and 5.2). These are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



1.1, 1.2 - Healthy Communities

2.1, 2.3 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.1, 3.2 – Transport

4.3 – Place Making and Landscape

5.1, 5.2 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

Other Options Considered

Two alternative policy approaches were considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon 19 of the SA Objectives whilst for another 5 objectives the impact of having no policy is unclear. For 1 of the objectives, namely 2.1 there is likely to be a negative impact.

For Option 2, there is likely to be either a negligible or unknown impact on 16 of the SA Objectives. For a further 9 objectives (1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 4.3, 5.1 and 5.2) there are likely to be positive benefits although there are no significantly positive benefits.

Justification

In term of likely benefits Option 3 scores highest overall. Option 2 provides some positive benefits (9) but no significantly positive benefits which accrue with Option 3. There are no positive benefits for Option 1.

Option 3 provides the highest number of positive and significantly positive benefits and is therefore included in the Draft Local Plan

Policy LP15 – Employment

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1 | No policy but instead rely on guidance in the NPPF |
| 2 | A policy which seeks to retain existing employment sites and provide new employment sites to significantly increase the number of businesses, jobs and opportunities |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 2: A policy which seeks to retain existing employment sites and provide new employment sites to significantly increase the number of businesses, jobs and opportunities**

Policy Option 2 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 6 of the SA Objectives whilst there are 2 objectives where the impacts are unclear.

This policy option will have positive benefits on 10 of the SA objectives: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 6.2, 6.4 and 9.2. In addition, there are likely to be significantly positive effects for 1 of the objectives (2.1). These are summarized below.

There are likely to be negative effects for 5 of the objectives (3.1, 3.2, 5.1, 8.1 and 9.1).

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



1.1, 1.2, 1.4 - Healthy Communities

2.2, 2.3 - Jobs, Education and Housing

4.1, 4.2 – Place Making and Landscape

6.2, 6.4 - Land Use and Wildlife

9.2 - Sustainable Resources

Other Option Considered

One other policy approach was considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact on 7 of the SA objectives whilst there were 7 objectives where the effects were unclear. There were positive effects for this policy option on 11 of the SA Objectives, namely 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 6.2, 6.4 and 9.2 although there were no significant positive effects identified.

Justification

Both Options 1 and 2 demonstrate a similar number of positive effects when assessed against the SA Objectives. However, Option 2 also includes 1 objective with significant positive effects.

The Council considers it important that there is a statutory policy in place for decision making and Option 2 is considered the most relevant for the Fenland context. Whilst the policy may not sit easily with all of the SA Objectives the NPPF recognizes that rural areas such as Fenland have different challenges when it comes to locating development in sustainable locations and the strengths and key components of the local economy need to be recognized and built on. Option 2 is therefore preferred and taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP16 – Town Centres

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | No policy but instead rely on guidance in the NPPF |
| 2 | A policy which seeks to ensure that the town centre first message predominates in a sequential approach and a stricter threshold than the NPPF for new retail proposals is provided |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 2: A policy which seeks to ensure that the town centre first message predominates in a sequential approach and a stricter threshold than the NPPF for new retail proposals is provided**

Policy Option 2 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 12 of the SA Objectives whilst there is 1 objective where the impacts are unclear.

This policy option will have positive benefits on 11 of the SA objectives: 1.1, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 6.2, and 9.1. In addition, there are likely to be significantly positive benefits for 1 of the objectives (1.2) which are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



1.1, 1.2, 1.4 - Healthy Communities

2.1, 2.2 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.1, 3.2 – Transport

4.1, 4.2 – Place Making and Landscape

5.1 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

6.2 - Land Use and Wildlife

9.1 - Sustainable Resources

Other Option Considered

One other policy approach was considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact on 12 of the SA objectives. There were positive benefits for this policy option on 13 of the SA Objectives, namely 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 6.2 and 9.1 although there were no significantly positive benefits identified.

Justification

Both Options 1 and 2 demonstrates a similar number of positive benefits to a number of the SA Objectives. Option 1 has one more positive benefit that Option 2 but the second option includes a significantly positive benefit.

Option 2 includes a stricter threshold for the size of new out-of-centre proposals to trigger an impact assessment and the Council considers it important that there is a statutory policy in place for decision making. Option 2 is considered the most relevant for the Fenland context and is therefore preferred and taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP17 – Culture, Leisure, Tourism and Community Facilities

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | No policy but instead rely on guidance in the NPPF |
| 2 | A policy which seeks to ensure that existing facilities are enhanced, and new facilities provided |
| 3 | A policy which seeks to ensure that existing facilities are enhanced, and new facilities provided having regard to an Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 3: A policy which seeks to ensure that existing facilities are enhanced, and new facilities provided having regard to an Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP)**

Policy Option 3 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 12 of the SA Objectives. For 3 of the objectives (4.1, 4.2 and 5.1) the effect on the policy option is unclear.

This policy option produces 7 positive benefits for the SA Objectives (1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, and 5.2), and additionally significantly positive benefits in relation to 3 of the SA Objectives: 1.1, 1.2, and 2.2). These are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 - Healthy Communities

2.1, 2.2, 2.3 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.1, 3.2 – Transport

5.2 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

Other Option Considered

Two alternative policy approaches were considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon 12 of the SA Objectives whilst for another 8 objectives the impact of having no policy is unclear. For 5 of the objectives, namely 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1 and 3.2 there is likely to be a positive impact.

For Option 2, there is likely to be either a negligible or unknown impact on 12 of the SA Objectives and for 3 of the objectives, namely 4.1, 4.2 and 5.1 the impact of the policy is unclear. For 10 of the objectives (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2 and 5.2), there is likely to be a positive impact although there are no significantly positive benefits associated with this option.

Justification

In term of likely benefits and significant benefits Options 2 and Option 3 score highest overall. Option 2 provides a similar number of overall benefits (10), albeit these are positive benefits rather than the 3 significantly positive benefits which accrue with Option 3. There are only half the benefits for Option 1.

Option 3 involves reference to an Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will provide up-to-date needs of facilities required and is therefore more likely to realize the objectives. This option is considered to be both practical and achievable and is therefore included in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP18 – Development in the Countryside

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1 | No policy but instead rely on guidance in the NPPF |
| 2 | A policy which provides clarity on the circumstances where development in the countryside will be acceptable |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 2: A policy which provides clarity on the circumstances where development in the countryside will be acceptable**

Policy Option 2 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 9 of the SA Objectives whilst there are 3 objectives where the impacts are unclear.

This policy option will have positive benefits on 7 of the SA objectives: 2.1, 2.2, 4.1, 4.3, 6.1, 6.2 and 6.4. These are summarized below. There are also likely to be negative effects on 6 of the SA objectives (2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 5.1, 8.1 and 9.1).

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



2.1, 2.2 - Jobs, Education and Housing

4.1, 4.3 – Place Making and Landscape

6.1, 6.2, 6.4 - Land Use and Wildlife

Other Option Considered

One other policy approach was considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact on 9 of the SA objectives whilst there were 5 objectives where the effects were unclear. There were positive effects for this policy option on 5 of the SA Objectives, namely 2.1, 2.2, 6.1, 6.2 and 6.4. There were likely negative effects on 6 of the SA objectives (2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 5.1, 8.1 and 9.1).

Justification

Broadly, both Options 1 and 2 demonstrate a similar number of positive and negative effects when assessed against the SA Objectives. However, Option 2 has 2 more positive effects than Option 1.

The Council considers it important that there is a statutory policy in place for decision making and Option 2 is considered the most relevant for the Fenland context. Whilst the policy may not sit easily with the SA Objectives the NPPF recognizes that rural areas such as Fenland have different challenges when it comes to locating development in sustainable locations and Option 2 is therefore preferred and taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP19 – Strategic Infrastructure

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have no policy but instead rely on guidance in the NPPF |
| 2 | A policy which seeks to ensure that new developments deliver infrastructure on site and its immediate vicinity |
| 3 | A policy which seeks to ensure that new developments deliver associated infrastructure in a timely manner with reference to an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 3: A policy which seeks to ensure that new developments deliver associated infrastructure in a timely manner with reference to an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)**

Policy Option 3 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 9 of the SA Objectives.

This policy option produces 3 significant positive benefit on the SA Objectives (2.2, 3.1 and 3.2), and additionally positive benefits are predicted in relation to 13 of the SA Objectives: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1 2.3, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 7.2, 8.1, 8.3 and 9.1. These are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant symbol is shown below.



1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 - Healthy Communities

2.1, 2.2, 2.3 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.1, 3.2 – Transport

4.2 – Place Making and Landscape

5.1, 5.2 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

7.2 - Water Resources

8.1, 8.3 - Pollution and Waste

9.1 - Sustainable Resources

Other Options Considered

Two alternative policy approaches were considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon 9 of the SA Objectives whilst for another 13 objectives the impact of having no policy is unclear. For 3 of the objectives, namely 1.2, 2.2 and 5.1 there is likely to be a negative impact.

For Option 2, there is likely to be either a negligible or unknown impact on 9 of the SA Objectives whilst for another 11 objectives the impact of this policy option is unclear. For 4 of the objectives (2.2, 2.3, 3.1 and 4.2), there is likely to be a positive impact and for 1 of them (1.2) there is likely to be a negative impact.

Justification

In term of likely benefits Option 3 scores significantly higher than the other two options.

For both Options 1 and 2 the number of negligible impacts and unknowns are similar and for all of the objectives in these two options only four objectives in Option 2 had any positive benefits. Negative impacts are seen in four of the objectives of these two policy options: 3 in Option 1, and 1 in Option 2.

Option 3 is therefore included in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP20 – Accessibility and Transport

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1 | No policy but instead rely on guidance in the NPPF |
| 2 | A policy which prioritizes the safety and convenience of users of the highway network, improves walking and cycling and provides for accessible development whilst having regard to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) |
| 3 | A more prescriptive policy which seeks to prioritise locating development in accessible public transport locations including near bus routes and provides for a wide choice of active travel infrastructure whilst having regard to the IDP |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 2: A policy which prioritizes the safety and convenience of users of the highway network, improves walking and cycling and provides for accessible development whilst having regard to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)**

Policy Option 2 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 11 of the SA Objectives whilst there are 7 objectives where the impacts are unclear.

This policy option produces 7 positive benefits on the SA Objectives (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 3.2), but no significantly positive benefits. These are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant symbol is shown below.



1.1, 1.2, 1.3 - Healthy Communities

2.1, 2.2, 2.3 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.2 – Transport

Other Options Considered

Two alternative policy approaches were considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon 11 of the SA Objectives whilst for 3 of the objectives the impact of having no policy is unclear. For 11 of the objectives, namely 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 5.1, 8.1 and 9.1 there is likely to be a positive benefit.

For Option 3, there is likely to be either a negligible or unknown impact on 11 of the SA Objectives whilst for 2 of the objectives the impact of this policy option is unclear. For 7 of the objectives (1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 4.2, 5.1, and 9.1), there is likely to be a positive impact and for 5 of them there is likely to be significantly positive benefits: 1.2, 2.1, 3.1, 3.2 and 8.1.

Justification

In term of likely benefits Option 3 scores highest overall with 12 positive or significant benefits, followed by Option 1 with 11 positive benefits but no significant benefits. Option 2 has 7 positive benefits but a relatively large number of objectives (7) where the policy impact is unclear.

Fenland is a rural district, and the current public transport infrastructure can be reasonably described overall as mediocre at best with many bus services non-existent or sporadic in nature. As a result, there is a strong reliance on the private car. Both the NPPF and policy Option 3 prioritize the existence of public transport and active travel to guide development options although the NPPF is clear that rural areas (such as Fenland) will need to be treated differently to urban areas where public transport infrastructure is much more developed and accessible for a large number of users.

Option 2 provides a number of positive benefits and whilst not as significant as Options 1 and 3, this option has no negative impacts. It is the most practical and realistic for Fenland and is therefore included in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP21: Public Rights of Way

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have a policy which seeks to protect and enhance the public rights of way and permissive path network |
| 2 | Have no policy which seeks to protect and enhance the public rights of way and permissive path network |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 1: *Have a policy which seeks to protect and enhance the public rights of way and permissive path network***

Policy Option 1 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 15 of the SA objectives.

Whilst there are no significant positive benefits on any of the SA objectives, this policy option will still have positive benefits on a number of them. These positive effects are predicted in relation to 9 SA objectives: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 5.1, which are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant symbol is shown below.



1.1, 1.2, 1.3 - Healthy Communities

2.2 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.1, 3.2 – Transport

4.1, 4.2, 4.3 – Place Making and Landscape

5.1 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

Other Option Considered

One other policy approach was considered.

Option 2 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon 15 of the SA objectives. The impact of this option was unclear on 7 of the SA Objectives, namely 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 There were no positive or significantly positive benefits of this policy option and in fact there were negative impacts identified for 3 of the objectives: 1.3, 3.2 and 5.1.

Justification

Overall, Option 1 demonstrates a positive approach to a number of the SA Objectives: Healthy Communities, Jobs, Education and Housing, Transport, Place Making and Landscape, and Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk.

Option 2 on the other hand had either neutral or unknown impacts, some negative impacts and no positive impacts on the objectives.

Option 1 is therefore preferred and taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP22: Parking Provision

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | No parking policy, and no car parking standards |
| 2 | A policy that sets out parking requirements and car parking standards |
| 3 | A policy that sets out parking requirements and car parking standards including Electric Vehicle charging points for new residential development. |

Preferred Policy

The preferred option is option 3 - **A policy that sets out parking requirements and car parking standards including Electric Vehicle charging points for new residential development.**

Fenland is a predominantly rural area and therefore residents are reliant on private cars to access local services and facilities. Residential developments face pressure in respect of car parking and the impacts on highway safety. Therefore, there is a need for a policy relating to car parking and parking standards

Option 2 scores significant positive effects against criteria 8.1, as the policy promotes electric car usage by requiring electric charging points within new developments and new parking provision. Helping to reduce emissions. Indirectly this policy could also result in positive effects in terms of design and public realm (4.2) because well-designed car parking will contribute to the quality of the public realm through being well laid out and using high quality materials in keeping with the area. In addition, well designed parking can reduce obstructions to movement, especially for those walking or cycling, the elderly and disabled, and thus improve accessibility to services and other, social, facilities and opportunities for healthy lifestyles and informal social interaction for all therefore scoring positive effects against criteria 1.1.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



1.1 – Healthy communities

4.2 – Heritage, Place Making and Landscape

8.1 – Pollution and Waste

Other Option Considered

The alternative option of not having a parking policy or setting car parking standards (Option 1) mostly scores neutral as the policy is not relevant to most objectives. However, by not having a car parking policy this could result in a negative impact against criteria 4.2 because well-designed car parking will contribute to the quality of the public realm through being well laid out and using high quality materials in keeping with the area. Well-designed car parking may also reduce on road parking that can detract from the quality of the area.

Option 2 scores similarly to preferred option 3, but because this option does not specifically include the requirement for electric vehicle charging points in new residential development this option does not score as positively as option 3.

Justification

Overall option 3 results in more positive and significantly positive effects when compared against the alternative options.

Policy LP23 – Historic Environment

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1 | Have no policy on the Historic Environment and rely on the guidance in the NPPF |
| 2 | Have a policy on the Historic Environment which is specific to the local Fenland context |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 2: Have a policy on the Historic Environment which is specific to the local Fenland context**

Policy Option 2 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 13 of the SA Objectives whilst there are 2 objectives where the impacts are unclear.

This policy option will have positive benefits on 8 of the SA objectives: 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 4.3, 5.1, 6.3, 6.4 and 9.2. In addition, there are likely to be significantly positive benefits for 2 of the objectives (4.1 and 4.2) which are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



1.3 - Healthy Communities

2.1, 2.2 - Jobs, Education and Housing

4.1, 4.2, 4.3 – Place Making and Landscape

5.1 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

6.3, 6.4 - Land Use and Wildlife

9.2 - Sustainable Resources

Other Option Considered

One other policy approach was considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact on 13 of the SA objectives whilst there were 3 objectives where the effects were unclear. There were positive effects for this policy option on 9 of the SA Objectives, namely 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 6.3, 6.4 and 9.2. although there were no significantly positive benefits identified.

Justification

Both Options 1 and 2 demonstrate a similar number of positive effects when assessed against the SA Objectives. However, Option 2 has one more positive benefit than Option 1 and also includes 2 significantly positive effects.

The Council considers it important that there is a statutory policy in place for decision making. Option 2 is considered the most relevant for the Fenland context and is therefore preferred and taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP24 – Natural Environment

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have no policy on the Natural Environment and rely on the guidance in the NPPF |
| 2 | Have a policy on the Natural Environment which is specific to the Fenland context |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 2: Have a policy on the Natural Environment which is specific to the Fenland context**

Policy Option 2 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 11 of the SA objectives. There are unclear impacts on 3 of the objectives (1.1, 1.4 and 6.2).

This policy option will have positive benefits on 5 of the SA objectives: 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 5.1 and 8.1. In addition, there are likely to be significantly positive benefits for 6 of the objectives (4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 6.3, 6.4 and 7.2) which are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant Environment Capital symbol is shown below.



1.2, 1.3, - Healthy Communities

2.2 - Jobs, Education and Housing

4.1, 4.2, 4.3 – Place Making and Landscape

5.1 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

6.3, 6.4 - Land Use and Wildlife

7.2 - Water Resources

8.1 - Pollution and Waste

Other Option Considered

One other policy approach was considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon 11 of the SA objectives. The impact of this policy option was unclear on 4 of the SA Objectives, namely 1.1, 1.2, 1.4 and 6.2. There were no negative or significantly negative impacts for this option, with positive benefits for 10 of the objectives (1.3, 2.2, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.2, and 8.1) although no significantly positive benefits.

Justification

Option 2 demonstrates a positive or significantly positive benefit to a number of the SA Objectives including in relation to Healthy Communities, Jobs, Education and Housing, Place Making and Landscape,

Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk, Land Use and Wildlife, Water Resources and Resources and Waste.

Whilst Option 1 demonstrates a number of positive benefits for the objectives, but there were no significantly positive benefits which occurred with Option 2.

Option 2 is therefore preferred and taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP25 - Biodiversity Net Gain

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have no policy for Biodiversity Net Gain |
| 2 | Have a policy which seeks a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain |
| 3 | Have a policy which seeks to potentially double Biodiversity Net Gain above 10% where viability and circumstances permit |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 2: Have a policy which seeks a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain**

Policy Option 2 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 12 of the SA Objectives. For one of the objectives (6.2) the effect on the policy option is unclear.

This policy option produces one significant positive benefit on the SA Objectives (6.2), and additionally positive benefits are predicted in relation to 11 of the SA Objectives: 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 6.1, 6.3, 7.2 and 8.1. These are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



1.2, 1.3, 1.4 - Healthy Communities

2.2 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.1, 3.2 – Transport

4.2, 4.3 – Place Making and Landscape

5.1 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

6.1, 6.2, 6.3 - Land Use and Wildlife

7.2 - Water Resources

8.1 - Pollution and Waste

Other Options Considered

Two alternative policy approaches were considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon 12 of the SA Objectives whilst for another 10 objectives the impact of having no policy is unclear. For 3 of the objectives, namely 1.3, 4.2 and 5.1, there is likely to be a negative impact.

For Option 3, there is likely to be either a negligible or unknown impact on 13 of the SA Objectives. For 2 of the objectives (1.4, 2.2), there is likely to be a positive impact and for 10 of them there is likely to be significantly positive benefits: - 1.2, 1.3, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.2 and 8.1.

Justification

In term of likely benefits Option 3 scores highest overall. Option 2 provides a similar number of overall benefits (12), albeit these are positive benefits rather than the significantly positive benefits which accrue with Option 3. There are no benefits for Option 1.

Developer viability is a key issue in the district and by seeking a higher amount of Biodiversity Net Gain (Option 3), it is considered that the viability of developments will be put at risk.

Option 2 provides a high number of benefits and whilst these may not be as significant as Option 3, this option is considered to be the most practical and deliverable in the current financial climate in Fenland and is therefore included in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP26 – Carbon Sinks and Carbon Sequestration

The options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1 | A policy requiring the proportionate evaluation of the impact of a proposal on peat soils/carbon sinks, and setting out criteria that must be met in order for planning permission to be granted. Policy also supports proposals that demonstrate meaningful carbon sequestration through nature-based solutions and deliver net gain in carbon sequestration. |
| 2 | Policy requiring the proportionate evaluation of a proposal's impact on peat soils/carbon sinks, and setting out criteria that must be met in order for planning permission to be granted. |
| 3 | Policy supporting proposals that demonstrate meaningful carbon sequestration through nature-based solutions and that deliver net gain in carbon sequestration. |
| 4 | No policy, rely on national planning policy. |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy option is Option 1: ***A policy requiring the proportionate evaluation of the impact of a proposal on peat soils/carbon sinks, and setting out criteria that must be met in order for planning permission to be granted. Policy also supports proposals that demonstrate meaningful carbon sequestration through nature-based solutions and deliver net gain in carbon sequestration.***

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant symbol is shown below.



- Healthy Communities (1.3, positive effect)
- Heritage, Place Making and Landscape (4.3, positive effect)
- Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk (5.1, positive/ significant positive effect) (5.2, positive effect)
- Land Use and Wildlife (6.1 positive effect)
- Pollution and Waste (8.1, positive/ significant positive effect)

In addition to the positive/ significant positive scores against the above objectives, the preferred policy approach also has potential for positive impact in relation to several other objectives, namely: 6.3 (minimise and avoid where possible impacts to biodiversity and geodiversity, both within and beyond designated sites of international, national or local significance, and on protected species); 6.4 (achieve net gains in biodiversity and create and enhance an ecological network that is resilient to the effects of climate change); and 7.1 (minimise water consumption and encourage re-use). However, the scores in relation to these 3 objectives are uncertain, as there is potential for development to take place under criteria a) and b) which could result in some harm or loss, and in the case of the water objective, there is potential for negative impact as a result of intensive water use.

The preferred policy option is predicted to have no effect upon the remaining 16 objectives.

Overall, the preferred policy approach scored favourably over the other 3 options and is therefore taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.

Other Options Considered

Three alternative policy options were considered, as summarized in the table at the top of this page.

Like the preferred policy approach, Options 2 and 3 were likely to have no effect in relation to the same 16 objectives.

Option 2 scored similarly to Option 1, with positive effects predicted against several objectives, specifically: 1.3; 4.3; 5.1; 5.2; 6.1; 8.1. There were uncertain effects anticipated in relation to 6.3 (minimise and avoid where possible impacts to biodiversity and geodiversity, both within and beyond designated sites of international, national or local significance, and on protected species), 6.4 (achieve net gains in biodiversity and create and enhance an ecological network that is resilient to the effects of climate change) and 7.1 (minimise water consumption and encourage re-use).

The only difference in scoring between Options 1 and 2 was in relation to objective 5.1 - *limit or reduce vulnerability to the effects of climate change*. Policy Option 1 was awarded a positive/ significant positive score, while option 2 was awarded a simple positive score. The reason for this difference was that Option 1 included a positive policy approach towards net gain in nature-based carbon sequestration, which may also reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide and assist in reducing the effects of climate change, thus resulting in greater positive impact in relation to this objective.

Option 3 scored less favourably than the preferred option and Option 2: this policy approach was deemed likely to have no impact upon 18 of the objectives. While there is potential for positive effects in relation to the remaining 7 objectives, the effects were uncertain, given that the policy approach would offer material weight in favour of proposals which demonstrated significant net gain in carbon sequestration, but the policy did not set specific policy requirements and thus the extent of impact, if any, is uncertain.

Option 4 scored least favourably, with no impact in relation to 19 of the objectives. Positive outcomes were predicted in relation to 6.4 (*achieve net gains in biodiversity and create and enhance an ecological network that is resilient to the effects of climate change*) given the protection and enhancement of the natural environment afforded by the NPPF. There was potential for positive impact in relation to 4.3 (*retain the distinctive character of Fenland's landscape*) and 6.1 (*minimise the irreversible loss of undeveloped land, particularly high-grade agricultural land*) given the provisions of NPPF paragraph 211. Negative impacts (potentially significant negative) were considered likely in relation to 5.1 (Limit or reduce vulnerability to the effects of climate change) given the lack of national policy which could result in unnecessary and unmanaged release of carbon. Similarly, policy Option 4 was awarded a negative and uncertain score in relation to objective 8.1 (*Reduce emissions of greenhouse gasses and other pollutants (including air, water, soil, noise, odour, vibration and light)*) given the lack of clear, defined national policy.

While not appraised in the policy options above, another policy option could be to set a specific requirement for net gain in carbon sequestration, rather than have a policy element that *supports* net gain and provides that there will be material weight against proposals where there it is demonstrated likely that harm is likely to arise. However, this option has not been appraised because of the complexities regarding carbon sequestration and the wide-ranging variety of circumstances that may exist between sites and different types of development. A more flexible approach was therefore favoured. Such a flexible approach will also ensure that the policy does not place undue burden on developers.

Justification

Policy Option 1 is taken forward in the Local Plan as it is likely to deliver more positive outcomes compared to the other three policy approaches considered.

Policy LP27: Trees and Planting

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have no policy on trees and planting |
| 2 | Have a policy which seeks to protect and provide additional trees and planting in most new developments where appropriate |
| 3 | Have a more prescriptive policy which seeks to protect all trees and provide additional trees and planting in all new developments |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is Option 2: ***Have a policy which seeks to protect and provide additional trees and planting in most new developments where appropriate***

Policy Option 2 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 7 of the SA Objectives. For 3 of the objectives the effect on the policy option is unclear.

This policy option produces one significant positive benefit on the SA Objectives (6.3), and additionally positive benefits are predicted in relation to 14 of the other SA Objectives: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 6.4, 7.2 and 8.1. These are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 - Healthy Communities

2.2 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.1 – Transport

4.1, 4.2, 4.3 – Place Making and Landscape

5.1, 5.2 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

6.4 - Land Use and Wildlife

7.2 - Water Resources

8.1 - Pollution and Waste

Other Options Considered

Two alternative policy approaches were considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon 7 of the SA Objectives whilst for another 11 objectives the impact of having no policy is unclear. For 7 of the objectives, namely 1.3, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 6.3 and 6.4 there is likely to be a negative impact.

For Option 3, there is likely to be either a negligible or unknown impact on 10 of the SA Objectives. For 9 of the objectives (1.1, 1.4, 2.2, 3.1, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 7.2 and 8.1), there is likely to be a positive impact and for 6 of them there is likely to be significantly positive benefits: - 1.2, 1.3, 4.1, 4.2, 6.3 and 6.4.

Justification

In term of likely benefits Option 3 scores highest overall. Option 2 provides a similar number of overall benefits (15), but these are predominantly positive benefits compared with the significantly positive benefits which accrue with Option 3. There are no benefits for Option 1 and even some negative impacts.

The Council has a finite resource in terms of manpower and by having a very prescriptive policy (Option 3), runs the risk of the policy not being enforceable. In addition, the practicality of having such a policy could mean that it becomes unworkable in some circumstances and could have a negative impact on decision making and delivery.

Option 2 provides a high number of benefits and whilst these may not be as significant as Option 3, this option is considered to be the most practical and deliverable in the current financial climate in Fenland and is therefore included in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP28 - Landscape

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have no policy but instead rely on guidance in the NPPF |
| 2 | Have a policy which seeks to ensure that the various landscape types in Fenland are sensitively considered in development proposals |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 2: *Have a policy which seeks to ensure that the various landscape types in Fenland are sensitively considered in development proposals***

This policy option will have positive benefits on 12 of the SA objectives: 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 4.2, 5.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 7.2 and 8.1. In addition, there are likely to be significantly positive benefits for 2 of the objectives (4.1 and 4.3) which are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant symbol is shown below.



1.3, 1.4 - Healthy Communities

2.2, 2.3 - Jobs, Education and Housing

4.1, 4.2, 4.3 – Place Making and Landscape

5.1 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4 - Land Use and Wildlife

7.2 - Water Resources

8.1 - Pollution and Waste

Other Option Considered

One other policy approach was considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon 12 of the SA objectives. The impact of this policy option was unclear on 10 of the SA Objectives, namely 1.3, 1.4, 2.3, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4. There were no positive or significantly positive benefits for this policy option and negative impacts were identified for 3 of the objectives (4.3, 7.2 and 8.1).

Justification

Option 2 demonstrates a positive or significantly positive benefit to a number of the SA Objectives.

Option 1 on the other hand had no positive benefits for the objectives, many unknown impacts, and a number of negative impacts. Option 2 is therefore preferred and taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP29 – Green Infrastructure

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have no policy on Green Infrastructure |
| 2 | A policy which seeks to maintain and improve a comprehensive Green Infrastructure network in line with the NPPF |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 2: A policy which seeks to maintain and improve a comprehensive Green Infrastructure network in line with the NPPF**

Policy Option 2 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 10 of the SA objectives.

This policy option will have positive benefits on 11 of the SA objectives: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.2, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 6.1, 6.3, and 7.2. In addition, there are likely to be significantly positive benefits for 4 of the objectives (1.3, 5.1, 5.2 and 6.4) which are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant symbol is shown below.



1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 - Healthy Communities

2.2 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.1 – Transport

4.1, 4.2, 4.3 – Place Making and Landscape

5.1, 5.2 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

6.1, 6.3, 6.4 - Land Use and Wildlife

7.2 - Water Resources

Other Option Considered

One other policy approach was considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon 10 of the SA objectives. The impact of this policy option was unclear on 11 of the SA Objectives, namely 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 6.3, and 7.2. There were no positive or significantly positive benefits for this policy option and in fact there were negative impacts identified for 2 of the objectives (1.4 and 6.1) with significantly negative impacts for a further 2 (1.3 and 6.4).

Justification

Option 2 demonstrates a positive or significantly positive benefit to a number of the SA Objectives.

Option 1 on the other hand had no positive benefits for the objectives, many unknown impacts, and a number of negative or significantly negative impacts. Option 2 is therefore preferred and taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP30 – Local Green Space and Other Existing Open Spaces

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have a policy which identifies Local Green Spaces broadly in line with the NPPF |
| 2 | Have no Local Plan policy on Local Green Spaces |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 1: Have a policy which identifies Local Green Spaces broadly in line with the NPPF**

Policy Option 1 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 9 of the SA objectives.

This policy option will have positive benefits on 11 of the SA objectives: 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 3.1, 4.1, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, 7.2 and 8.1. In addition, there are likely to be significantly positive benefits for 5 of the objectives (1.3, 1.4, 4.2, 6.3 and 6.4) which are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 - Healthy Communities

2.2 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.1 – Transport

4.1, 4.2, 4.3 – Place Making and Landscape

5.1, 5.2 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

6.1, 6.3, 6.4 - Land Use and Wildlife

7.2 - Water Resources

8.1 - Pollution and Waste

Other Option Considered

One other policy approach was considered.

Option 2 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon 11 of the SA objectives. The impact of this policy option was unclear on 2 of the SA Objectives, namely 1.1 and 1.2. There were no positive or significantly positive benefits for this policy option and in fact there were negative impacts identified for 9 of the objectives (1.4, 2.2, 3.1, 4.1, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 6.1 and 6.4) with significantly negative impacts for 3 (1.3, 4.2 and 6.3).

Justification

Option 1 demonstrates a positive or significantly positive benefit to a number of the SA Objectives: Healthy Communities, Jobs, Education and Housing, Transport, Place Making and Landscape, Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk, Land Use and Wildlife, Water Resources, and Pollution and Waste.

Option 2 on the other hand had no positive benefits for the objectives and a number of negative or significantly negative impacts. Option 1 is therefore preferred and taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP31 – Open Space and Recreational Facilities

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|---|
| 1 | Have no policy for new open space provision and recreational facilities |
| 2 | Have a policy in line with the current open space policy and standards in the adopted Local Plan |
| 3 | Have a policy which exceeds the current open space standards in line with the recommendations of the Open Space Study 2022 |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 3: *Have a policy which exceeds the current open space standards in line with the recommendations of the Open Space Study 2022***

Policy Option 3 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 10 of the SA objectives.

This policy option will have positive benefits on 10 of the SA objectives: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.2, 3.1, 4.1, 4.3, 5.2, 6.1 and 7.2. In addition, there are likely to be significantly positive benefits for 5 of the objectives (1.3, 4.2, 5.1, 6.3 and 6.4) which are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant Environment Capital symbol is shown below.



1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 - Healthy Communities

2.2 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.1 – Transport

4.1, 4.2, 4.3 – Place Making and Landscape

5.1, 5.2 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

6.1, 6.3, 6.4 - Land Use and Wildlife

7.2 - Water Resources

Other Options Considered

Two alternative policy approaches were considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon 10 of the SA Objectives whilst for another 7 objectives the impact of having no policy is unclear. For 8 of the objectives, namely 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 3.1, 4.2, 6.3 and 7.2 there is likely to be a negative impact.

For Option 2, there is likely to be either a negligible or unknown impact on 11 of the SA Objectives and for 7 objectives the impact of this policy option is unclear. For a further 7 objectives (4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 6.1, 6.3, 6.4 and 7.2) there are likely to be positive benefits but no significantly positive benefits.

Justification

In term of likely benefits Option 3 scores highest overall. Option 2 provides some positive benefits (7) but no significantly positive benefits which accrue with Option 3. There are no benefits for Option 1.

Option 3 provides the highest number of positive and significantly positive benefits and is therefore included in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP32 – Flood Risk and Water Management

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have no policy, instead rely on national policy and the Cambridgeshire Flood and Water SPD |
| 2 | A similar policy to policy LP14 Part (B) in the current adopted Local Plan |
| 3 | A policy that includes more detailed requirements about water management as currently set out in the SPD |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 2: A similar policy to policy LP14 Part (B) in the current adopted Local Plan**

Policy Option 2 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 18 of the SA Objectives.

This policy option produces 2 positive benefits for the SA Objectives (1.2 and 6.4) and additionally significantly positive benefits are predicted in relation to 5 the objectives: 1.3, 5.1, 5.2, 7.1, and 7.2. These are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant symbol is shown below.



1.2, 1.3 - Healthy Communities

5.1, 5.2 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

6.4 - Land Use and Wildlife

7.1, 7.2 - Water Resources

Other Option Considered

Two alternative policy approaches were considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon 18 of the SA Objectives. For 7 of the objectives, namely 1.2, 1.3, 5.1, 5.2, 6.4, 7.1 and 7.2 there is likely to be a positive impact.

For Option 3, there is likely to be no or negligible impact on 18 of the SA Objectives. For 2 of the objectives there is likely to be a positive impact (1.2 and 6.4) and there are 5 identified significant positive benefits for this option (1.3, 5.1, 5.2, 7.1, and 7.2).

Justification

In term of likely benefits Options 2 and 3 score highest overall. Option 2 provides the same number of positive benefits (2) and significant benefits (5) as Option 3. There are also 7 positive benefits for Option 1 but no significant benefits which accrue with the other two options.

There is no difference in the positive benefits for Options 2 and 3 in terms of the SA Objectives. However, having a more detailed policy (Option 3) will have negligible impact on the SA Objectives whilst having a

more general policy will be more practical and workable. As a result, Option 2 is therefore included in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP33 - Development on Land Affected by Contamination

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have no policy for the impacts of development and on land affected by contamination |
| 2 | Have a policy which requires only some developments to address the impacts of development and on land affected by contamination |
| 3 | Have a policy which requires all developments to address the impacts of development and on land affected by contamination |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 3: *Have a policy which requires all developments to address the impacts of development and on land affected by contamination***

Policy Option 3 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 12 of the SA Objectives.

This policy option produces 4 positive benefits on the SA Objectives (6.1, 7.2, 8.1 and 9.2), and additionally significantly positive benefits are predicted in relation to 9 the objectives: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.3, 4.2, 6.2, 6.3, 8.2 and 8.3. These are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant symbol is shown below.



1.1, 1.2, 1.3 - Healthy Communities

2.3 - Jobs, Education and Housing

4.2 – Place Making and Landscape

6.1, 6.2, 6.3 - Land Use and Wildlife

7.2 - Water Resources

8.1, 8.2, 8.3 - Pollution and Waste

9.2 - Sustainable Resources

Other Options Considered

Two alternative policy approaches were considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon 13 of the SA Objectives and for another 2 objectives the impact of having no policy is unclear. For 8 of the objectives, namely 1.1, 1.2, 2.3, 4.2, 6.2, 6.3, 8.1 and 8.3 there is likely to be a negative impact and for 2 of them a significant negative impact (7.2 and 8.2).

For Option 2, there is likely to be no or negligible impact on 12 of the SA Objectives. For 13 of the objectives there is likely to be a positive impact (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.3, 4.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 7.2, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 9.2) but there are no significant benefits for any of the objectives with this option.

Justification

In term of likely benefits Option 3 scores highest overall. Option 2 provides a similar number of overall benefits (13), albeit these are positive benefits rather than the significantly positive benefits which accrue with Option 3. There are no benefits and in fact a number of negative and significantly negative impacts for Option 1.

It is clear the that requiring all developments to address their impacts and on land affected by contamination will have the greatest number of benefits in terms of the SA Objectives and Option 3 is therefore included in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP34 – Air Quality

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have no policy on Air Quality |
| 2 | Have a policy on Air Quality for specific types of development only |
| 3 | Have a policy on Air Quality for all development types |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 2: Have a policy on Air Quality for specific types of development only**

Policy Option 2 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 8 of the SA Objectives.

This policy option produces 17 positive benefits on the SA Objectives (1.1, 1.2,1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 8.1, 8.3, 9.1 and 9.2). These are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant symbol is shown below.



1.1, 1.2, 1.4 - Healthy Communities

2.2, 2.3 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.1, 3.2 – Transport

4.1, 4.2 – Place Making and Landscape

5.1 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

6.2, 6.3, 6.4 - Land Use and Wildlife

8.1, 8.3 - Pollution and Waste

9.1, 9.2 - Sustainable Resources

Other Options Considered

Two alternative policy approaches were considered.

Option 1 is likely to have no or negligible impact upon 8 of the SA Objectives and for another 2 objectives the impact of having no policy is unclear. For 15 of the objectives, namely 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 6.3, 6.4, 8.1, 8.3, 9.1 and 9.2 there is likely to be a negative impact.

For Option 3, there is likely to be no or negligible impact on 8 of the SA Objectives. For 17 of the objectives there is likely to be a positive impact (1.1, 1.2,1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 8.1, 8.3, 9.1 and 9.2) although there are no significant benefits for any of the objectives with this option.

Justification

In term of likely benefits Options 2 and 3 score highest overall. Option 2 provides the same number of positive benefits (17) as Option 3. There are no benefits and in fact a number of negative impacts for Option 1.

There is no difference in the positive benefits for Options 2 and 3 in terms of the SA Objectives. Having a more prescriptive policy will have negligible impact on the SA Objectives and given the limited resources of the Council a more targeted policy approach is both more practical and achievable. As a result, Option 2 is therefore included in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP41 - Land north of Knight's End Road and East of the A141

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have a policy outlining the specific considerations for Land north of Knight's End Road and East of the A141 (site LP39.01) |
| 2 | Have no policy outlining the specific considerations for Land north of Knight's End Road and East of the A141 (site LP39.01) |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 1: Have a policy outlining the specific considerations for Land north of Knight's End Road and East of the A141 (site LP39.01)**

Policy Option 1 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 10 of the SA Objectives whilst there is 1 objective where the impacts are unclear. There was 1 option having negative effects (6.1).

This policy option will have positive effects on 13 of the SA objectives: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.3, 5.2, 6.4 and 8.1. These are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



1.1, 1.2, 1.3 - Healthy Communities

2.1, 2.2, 2.3 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.1, 3.2 – Transport

4.1, 4.3 – Heritage, Place Making and Landscape

5.2 - Resilience to Climate Change and Flood Risk

6.4 - Land Use and Wildlife

8.1 - Pollution and Waste

Other Option Considered

One other policy approach was considered.

Option 2 is likely to have no or negligible impact on 10 of the SA objectives whilst there were 11 objectives where the effects were unclear. There were positive effects for this policy option on 3 of the SA Objectives, namely 1.1, 2.3, and 6.4 and 1 negative effect (6.1).

Justification

Option 1 demonstrates considerably more positive effects and is therefore preferred and taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.

Policy LP42 - Whittlesey – A Market Town fit for the Future

The alternative options considered for this policy were:

| Options Considered | |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Have a policy to address the specific issues outlined |
| 2 | Have no policy to address the specific issues outlined |

Preferred Policy

The preferred policy approach is **Option 1: *Have a policy to address the specific issues outlined***

Policy Option 1 is likely to have neutral or negligible impacts in relation to 18 of the SA Objectives whilst there are 3 objectives where the impacts are unclear.

This policy option will have positive effects on 4 of the SA objectives: 1.2, 2.2, 3.1 and 4.1. These are summarized below.

Where the preferred policy scores either a positive effect (+) or a significant positive effect (++) against an SA objective, the relevant SA symbol is shown below.



1.2 - Healthy Communities

2.2 - Jobs, Education and Housing

3.1 – Transport

4.1 – Heritage, Place Making and Landscape

Other Option Considered

One other policy approach was considered.

Option 2 is likely to have no or negligible impact on 18 of the SA objectives whilst there were 7 objectives where the effects were unclear. There were no positive effects for this policy option.

Justification

Option 1 demonstrates some positive effects and is therefore preferred and taken forward in the Draft Local Plan.