

## Appendix G: Appraisal of strategic spatial options

Score	Description	Symbol
<b>Significant Positive Effect</b>	The option contributes significantly to the achievement of the objective.	<b>++</b>
<b>Minor Positive Effect</b>	The option contributes to the achievement of the objective but not significantly.	<b>+</b>
<b>Neutral</b>	The option does not have any effect on the achievement of the objective	<b>0</b>
<b>Minor Negative Effect</b>	The option detracts from the achievement of the objective but not significantly.	<b>-</b>
<b>Significant Negative Effect</b>	The option detracts significantly from the achievement of the objective.	<b>--</b>
<b>No Relationship</b>	There is no clear relationship between the option and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible.	<b>~</b>
<b>Uncertain</b>	The option has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an appraisal to be made.	<b>?</b>

NB: where more than one symbol/colour is presented in a box it indicates that the appraisal has identified both positive and negative effects. Where a box is coloured but also contains a '?', this indicates uncertainty over whether the effect could be a minor or significant effect although a professional judgement is expressed in the colour used. A conclusion of uncertainty arises where there is insufficient evidence for expert judgement to conclude an effect.

### 3 Dispersed development

Dispersed development - No large sites (500+)		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
<p><b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Ashfield.</p>	++/?	<p>This strategic option will support housing delivery across the District with dispersed development of smaller sites below 500 dwellings. This option may help meet the housing needs of Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Sutton in Ashfield, Hucknall and the existing settlements in the rural areas subject to the location of development. This option may support delivery of the requirements set out in the Housing Need Study, which identifies the different housing needs of particular groups in the District.</p> <p>Housing delivery has declined in recent years with total net completions of Class C3, dwelling houses in 2017/18 (397), 2018/19 (300), 2019/20 (173), 2020/21 (265) well below those experienced in 2015/16 (558) and 2016/17 (544) although they rose again in 2021/22 (412) before falling in 2022/23 (351). The identification of a range of smaller sites below 500 dwellings would help to meet immediate housing needs as development would be less reliant on longer lead-in times and the provision of infrastructure. Subject to the location of the sites, this option may support the delivery of housing in existing sustainable settlements. However, there may be less opportunity to support a broad mix and type of housing to meet all needs.</p> <p>The areas of Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield are recognised as having lower viability for affordable housing than Hucknall and the rural areas. Smaller sites in existing settlements in these locations, and greater reliance on delivery in the rural areas, may support enhanced delivery of affordable housing. Average incomes in Ashfield suggest two thirds of households with a current need are estimated to be likely to have insufficient income to afford market housing, highlighting the importance of provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>Overall, this option is assessed as having significant positive effects with some uncertainty. This reflects that this option would meet housing need provision over the plan period but would not meet any additional housing allowance or changes in the future housing demand requirement. This option may not provide housing in the right locations to meet all housing needs by being dispersed throughout the district.</p>
<p><b>2. Health</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+/-/?	<p>The health of people in Ashfield is generally worse than the England average. Life expectancy is lower than the UK average, but has improved over the last ten years in line with the England average.</p> <p>There is potential for the construction and operation of new development to have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents near development sites and along transport routes within the</p>

Dispersed development - No large sites (500+)		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>District. Effects may include, for example, stress related to disturbance, noise and vibration and respiratory problems exacerbated by construction traffic emissions and dust.</p> <p>Dispersed development would support some opportunities for the integration of open space and green infrastructure and would provide some opportunities for improvements to health provision, provision of open space and improved green infrastructure routes and linkages (dependent on scale).</p> <p>Dispersed development would be unlikely to maximise the potential for increased investment in existing and new facilities. Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton-in-Ashfield have areas that are amongst the most health deprived areas nationally and dispersed development may not provide development proposals of sufficient individual scale to address health deprivation in these areas (either through the provision of facilities or through developer contributions). There is also a risk that increased demand from new residents may undermine the quality of existing facilities within these already health deprived areas, unless supported by additional investment in services.</p> <p>Dispersed development could result in development in less sustainable locations in the district which are not accessible by public transport and may not be located near to employment opportunities. This option could increase car use which would not help to promote healthy lifestyles and would have negative effects. However, there may still be some opportunities to promote walking and cycling and in turn the benefits of exercise.</p> <p>The option is considered to have mixed minor positive and minor negative effects on achievement of this objective with some uncertainty</p>
<p><b>3.Historic Environment</b> To conserve and enhance Ashfield's historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.</p>	<p>+/- /?</p>	<p>Development under this option has the potential to adversely affect the character of historic assets both in the short term during associated construction activities (e.g. as a result of vibrations) and in the longer term once development is complete (e.g. due to the built form of new development affecting the setting of the historic asset).</p> <p>Development may have a direct impact on cultural heritage features where it involves the loss of, or alteration to, assets or indirect adverse effects on their settings. In this context, there are a number of designated cultural heritage assets throughout the district including scheduled monuments, listed buildings and conservation areas.</p> <p>There are assets in close proximity to Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield and other existing settlements. Assets close to Kirkby-in-Ashfield include three scheduled monuments, a number of Grade</p>

- Local Plan policies should ensure that development is not located in close proximity to unsuitable neighbouring uses.
- Local Plan policies should consider if/how accessibility to the countryside can be promoted as part of new development.

**Assumptions**

- None.

**Uncertainties**

- The exact location of new development is unknown at present.
- The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.

**Mitigation**

- Policies contained within the Local Plan should seek to conserve and, where possible, enhance cultural heritage assets including by promoting heritage-led development.
- Policies within the Local Plan should promote high standards of architectural and urban design.
- The Local Plan should set out a strategic framework to preserve and enhance historic areas and promote high standards of new development.

**Assumptions**

Dispersed development - No large sites (500+)		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>II listed buildings and the Kirkby Cross Conservation Area. Sutton in Ashfield has a Scheduled Monument in the north east, several Grade II listed buildings and the Sutton in Ashfield Church &amp; Market Place Conservation Area. A number of the existing settlements also include conservation areas including and at Hucknall, and a range of listed buildings.</p> <p>There is the potential for these assets, or their settings, to be adversely affected by new development, although this will be dependent on the exact type, location and design of new development which is uncertain at this stage. The likelihood of adverse effects occurring may also be increased depending on the housing target option taken forward.</p> <p>Locating new development near these assets may increase the accessibility of prospective residents to them, generating a potentially positive effect on this objective. There may also be opportunities for heritage-led development, which could serve to protect and enhance areas or buildings of historical, archaeological and cultural value, and potentially to enhance the setting of assets (for example, through the sensitive redevelopment of brownfield sites).</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having a mixed positive and negative effect on this objective with some uncertainty. This reflects that dispersed development throughout the district has the potential to have both positive and negative effects on the historic environment, subject to location of sites which is uncertain.</p>
<p><b>4. Community Safety</b> To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.</p>	0	<p>The spatial strategic options are not considered to influence the ability to improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. The ability to do so depends on the inclusion of design features such as natural surveillance, appropriate lighting and shared spaces. These factors can only be determined through detailed design at the masterplanning/planning application stage and therefore the strategic options for the distribution of growth in the District are not considered to have an effect on this objective.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the option has a neutral effect on this objective.</p>
<p><b>5. Social Inclusion Deprivation</b> To improve social inclusion</p>	+/?	<p>Ashfield, ranked at 68th out of 326 local authority areas, performs poorly in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2019).</p> <p>There are significant pockets of deprivation within Ashfield. Dispersed development may not lead to the integration of facilities for example green infrastructure and open space or new schools. (associated with</p>

Dispersed development - No large sites (500+)		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
and to close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield.		<p>the critical mass of development). There would likely be strong reliance placed on existing facilities and this option may not support delivery of enhanced service provision (associated with a critical mass of development) and/or may not generate sufficient developer contributions to enable investment in new facilities.</p> <p>However, there may be some more limited opportunities to improve existing service provision through some developer contributions or provision of new facilities which would have a positive effect on this objective.</p> <p>Whether or not dispersed development would address the significant pockets of deprivation is uncertain.</p> <p>Overall, this option is assessed as having minor positive effects on this objective reflecting the potential for dispersed development to have some positive effects on service provision and in turn improving social inclusion but with some uncertainty as to the extent of any positive effects from dispersed development.</p>
<p><b>6. Biodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</b> To conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels and Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</p>	-/?	<p>There are no internationally designated conservation sites within the District although there is a possible potential SPA (ppSPA) for Sherwood Forest, which is recognised as being important for breeding woodlark and Nightjar, in the south and east of the District.</p> <p>There are nine SSSIs across Ashfield including Kirkby Grives SSSI to the south of Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Annesley Woodhouse Quarries SSSI and Bogs Farm SSSI west of Annesley Woodhouse. There are several tracts of ancient woodland. There are also a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) across the District and four Local Nature Reserves (LNR).</p> <p>In consequence, there is the potential for indirect adverse effects on these sites associated with new development (for example, disturbance arising from increased recreational activity and wild bird and mammal loss from cat predation).</p> <p>The option would see the loss of greenfield land and Green Belt release around Hucknall and the rural areas (which is also assumed to be overwhelmingly comprised of green field land) through dispersed development. However, this option may result in development of some smaller sites within existing settlements and in turn the re-use of brownfield sites which may minimise direct and indirect risks to designated sites, and potentially provide biodiversity gains.</p>

Dispersed development - No large sites (500+)			
SA Objective	Score	Commentary	
		Overall, this option is assessed as having a negative effect on this objective due to the potential for adverse effects on designated sites, and the loss of habitats from the use of greenfield land, although uncertainty remains with regard to the exact type, magnitude and duration of effects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The exact quantum of growth to be delivered.</li> </ul>
<b>7.Landscape</b> To protect enhance and manage the character and appearance of Ashfield's landscape /townscape, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place.	+/- /?	<p>The option would see dispersed development throughout the district including development on greenfield land and Green Belt release. The Green Belt covers approximately 41% of the District, covering the majority of the District's area extending from Kirkby-in-Ashfield southwards, reflecting the proximity to Nottingham.</p> <p>It is anticipated that there would be Green Belt release at Hucknall, the rural areas and at Kirkby, with sites brought forward in the countryside at Kirkby/Sutton. Dispersed development could therefore result in piecemeal development and there would be encroachment into the countryside all of which would have negative landscape effects, both individually and cumulatively.</p> <p>Dispersed development would also provide some scope for integrated and well-designed landscape mitigation measures to address impact. Such mitigation should include existing hedgerows and trees where possible. However, the scale of mitigation measures is likely to be reduced as this option would not see the development of any large sites.</p> <p>The option would be likely to support development within existing settlements. There is potential for new development to enhance the quality of the built environment and improve townscapes (subject to more detailed policies on design contained within the Local Plan).</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that this option would have minor positive and minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective. However, the extent to which negative effects are experienced is dependent on the location of dispersed development and the scale of growth proposed and so there are also uncertain effects.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed policies in the Local Plan should support high quality design in new development.</li> <li>Local Plan policies should seek to conserve and enhance the character and quality of the District's landscapes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The exact location of future development, the quality of the receiving landscapes and the proximity of sensitive receptors is unknown at this stage.</li> <li>The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>
<b>8.Natural Resources</b> To minimise the loss of natural resources including soils, greenfield land and the best	+/- R	<p>This option would require the development of greenfield land and release of Green Belt to facilitate dispersed development which would have negative effects on this objective.</p> <p>There are pockets of Grade 2 (very good) and Grade 3 (although it is not possible to determine where this is 3a or 3b) land throughout the district which could be impacted by dispersed development.</p> <p>It is expected that there would be new development in existing settlements through this option. Whilst such development would be dependent to some extent on the release of greenfield, there would be</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan policies should encourage the effective use of land by re-using previously developed land.</li> <li>Local Plan policies should prioritise the development of brownfield over greenfield land where possible.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p>

Dispersed development - No large sites (500+)			
SA Objective	Score	Commentary	
quality agricultural land.		<p>opportunities to redevelop brownfield land. The extent of such positive effects would be dependent on the sites identified and is uncertain at this stage.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the option would have a mix of significant negative and minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective, with some uncertainty over how dispersed development would affect natural resources in the district.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exact location of future development at each settlement is unknown at this stage.</li> <li>• The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>
<p><b>9. Air &amp; noise pollution</b> To reduce air pollution and the proportion of the local population subject to noise pollution.</p>	+/- /?	<p>There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within Ashfield.</p> <p>There is the potential for the construction and operation of new development to have negative effects on noise and air quality due to emissions generated from plant and HGV movements during construction and increased vehicle movements during operation.</p> <p>Dispersal of development throughout the district would reduce opportunities to ensure provision of walking/cycling infrastructure and reduce reliance on the car. Car use would be likely to increase, particularly in rural areas where public transport is limited. In consequence associated emissions would increase and have negative effects on air quality and noise pollution.</p> <p>Dispersed development that resulted in development within and adjacent settlements would support services/facilities in these locations. However, congestion is likely to increase and associated emissions. It may also provide more limited opportunities for new walking and cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>A mix of minor positive and minor negative effects on achievement of this objective are considered likely with some uncertainty as to how much dispersed development</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan policies should support the protection of amenity.</li> <li>• Local Plan policies should seek to reduce congestion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is assumed that proposals to ensure no sale of new diesel/petrol engine vehicles after 2035, which will lead to an increased proportion of e-vehicles over time, may benefit air quality over the long-term.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exact location of future development is uncertain at this stage.</li> <li>• The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>
<p><b>10. Water Quality</b> To conserve and improve water quality and quantity.</p>	-	<p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) indicated water resources in the East Midlands are significantly constrained with little opportunity to develop new water resource schemes.</p> <p>The shortfall identified in the Watercycle Study (of water supply) is also identified in the more recent Severn Trent Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP, 2019) within the Nottinghamshire Water Resource Zone but the WRMP19 proposes a range of demand and supply measures to ensure sufficient water resources can be maintained up to 2025 (and in outline up to 2030). The draft Water Resource Management Plan 2024 (2022) sets out what is planned between 2025 and 2085 to address water</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan policies should support water efficiency measures, the implementation of SuDs, and wastewater treatment capacity enhancements where necessary.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New development will increase water use</li> </ul>

Dispersed development - No large sites (500+)		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>pressures. Ashfield sits in an area under serious water stress as identified by the Environment Agency (Water stressed areas – final classification 2021).</p> <p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) notes that there are no capacity constraints at Ashfield's Wastewater Treatment Works.</p> <p>Ashfield sits on principal and secondary aquifers so the need to protect groundwaters is particularly important, but it is not considered that the strategic spatial options would have an effect, subject to effective measures being put in place during the development process.</p> <p>Overall, this option is considered to have minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective.</p>
<p><b>11. Waste</b> To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials.</p>	-	<p>New development will result in increased resource use and the generation of waste in both the short-term during construction and in the longer term once development is complete. However, the specific impacts will depend on arrangements made for recycling and composting.</p> <p>All strategic options will increase waste generation and have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective.</p>
<p><b>12. Climate Change and Flood Risk</b> To adapt to climate change by reducing and manage the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to people, property and the environment.</p>	0/?	<p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2023) identifies that the District has a relatively low risk of flooding from watercourses although some properties in Hucknall and Jacksdale are at risk. Flood risk is mainly away from the urban areas. However, it is recognised that additional water in the River Leen could cause flood issues for Nottingham to the south.</p> <p>Development in the existing settlements would be dependent on location.</p> <p>The loss of any greenfield land under this option could lead to an increased risk of flooding (as a result of the increase in impermeable surfaces). However, it can be reasonably assumed that new development proposals which may result in an increase in flood risk will be accompanied by a site-specific flood risk assessment (FRA) and incorporate suitable flood alleviation measures thereby minimising the risk of flooding. The scale of opportunities for flood alleviation would be reduced through dispersed development of no large sites.</p>



Dispersed development - No large sites (500+)			
SA Objective	Score	Commentary	
		<p>There may be opportunities as part of new development proposals to enhance existing, or incorporate new, green infrastructure which could potentially have a positive effect on this objective by providing space for flood waters to flow through and additional areas for future flood storage.</p> <p>Overall, this option is considered to have neutral effects. However, there is some uncertainty dependent on the location of development.</p>	<p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The exact location of development.</li> </ul>
<p><b>13.Climate Change and Energy Efficiency</b></p> <p>To adapt to climate change by minimise energy usage and to develop Ashfield's renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.</p>	-	<p>Dispersal of development and smaller sites would be less likely to support the integration of low carbon and renewable energies (for example the integration of combined heat and power networks). There would be more limited scope to orientate development to maximise solar gain. Such development would also reduce opportunities for new green infrastructure with walking and cycling links that reduces the need to travel by private car, thereby may increase car use and increase carbon emissions.</p> <p>Any development within and adjoining existing settlements as part of dispersal would support existing patterns of travel which can reinforce car emissions experienced. The links to services and facilities, and the potential for contributions to public transport, may not be able to be developed as successfully as through larger scale development. However, the development of sites within settlements would provide such benefits, should suitable public transport links be forthcoming.</p> <p>Overall, this option is assessed as having minor negative effects reflecting more limited opportunities for renewable energy provision and walking and cycling provision on smaller sites, and also that development may not be in sustainable locations and increase vehicle emissions.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan policies should support the integration of renewable energy in new development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is assumed that over the plan period there will be a decarbonisation of the electricity generation mix with renewable energy sources displacing fossil fuels.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The location of development.</li> </ul>
<p><b>14.Travel and Accessibility</b></p> <p>To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys.</p>	+ / --	<p>Dispersal and development of smaller sites would be less likely to support integration of walking and cycling routes and in turn sustainable transport methods. Dispersal may also result in development in unsustainable locations where there is no access to</p> <p>Any development in or in close proximity to Kirkby-in-Ashfield or Sutton in Ashfield may support greater connectivity through rail transport. This would support accessibility of Nottingham. Any development in or near Hucknall would be able to benefit from the Nottingham tram network and rail transport.</p> <p>The delivery of a range of smaller sites would have less ability for provision of sustainable travel measures. However, dependent on the specific location, development could take place in close proximity to existing community facilities, services and employment opportunities and be reasonably well connected to the existing public transport network. Development within these areas may also help to</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan policies should encourage the preparation of green travel plans.</li> <li>Local Plan policies should support walking and cycling within new developments.</li> <li>Local Plan policies should align with Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan 3.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p>

Dispersed development - No large sites (500+)		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>maintain existing, and (potentially) stimulate investment in, public transport provision. However, smaller developments are unlikely to generate substantial contributions to public transport provision and may not allow integration of walking/cycling route to services and facilities. A greater focus on rural areas may support local housing needs but exacerbate the need to travel to higher level settlements for services and facilities.</p> <p>Overall, this option is assessed as having mixed positive and significant negative effects on this objective reflecting that the development of smaller sites reduces opportunities for new public transport provision, walking and cycling. Dispersed development may also see an increase reliance on the car as the primary means of transport with no opportunities to develop a critical mass for public transport improvements.</p>
<p><b>15. Employment</b> To create high quality employment opportunities including opportunities for increased learn and skills to meet the needs of the District.</p>	+/?	<p>The development option would support investment within the District, through construction activities in the short term and through the provision of new jobs in the District and housing to support the workforce the long term.</p> <p>The majority of employment in the District is located in Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton in Ashfield and the Sherwood Business Park off Junction 27 of the M1. More limited employment opportunities are found to the west of the M1 (Selston, Jacksdale, Underwood and Bagthorpe). Dispersal of development may not support these employment centres.</p> <p>Several schools in with Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Sutton in Ashfield and Hucknall are at, or above, capacity. Smaller developments are unlikely to drive substantial developer contributions to the provision of school places. The District suffers from poor educational attainment and the option is unlikely to support greater attainment levels.</p> <p>Overall, this option is assessed as having mixed minor positive and negative effects on this objective.</p>
<p><b>16. Economy</b> To Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy.</p>	+/?	<p>The District's main employment centres are Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton in Ashfield. Dispersal of development may not support these employment centres.</p> <p>Dispersal of development and smaller sites would be less likely to support ongoing economic investment and enhancement of employment opportunities as it may not provide sufficient additional growth in existing settlements, or in the A38/M1 corridor employment areas. This option would be likely to impede greater self-containment in the District and may increase out commuting to other areas</p>

Dispersed development - No large sites (500+)			
SA Objective	Score	Commentary	
		Dispersed development would still have some positive economic effects, but the extent of any effects is uncertain and subject to location. Overall, the effects of this option on this objective are assessed as minor positive although there is some uncertainty.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market) and the recruitment policies of prospective employers.</li> <li>The exact location of future development at each settlement is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>
<b>17. Town Centres</b> Increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield's town centres.	+/?	Ashfield's main town centres are Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in- Ashfield and Hucknall. The Retail & Leisure Study (2016) identified that Sutton town centre is relatively healthy and performing moderately well in terms of vacancies and that Kirkby performs an important role and has seen a decline in the number of vacant retail units in recent years. The Council is currently in the process of updating the retail study.  This option would see dispersed development throughout the district and no large sites. This pattern of growth may not help overall to increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield's town centres as dispersal may see development in other locations, and not concentrate development within or adjacent to these centres. This would reduce opportunities to support existing services in Ashfield's town centres or contribute to the provision of new facilities.  Overall, this option is assessed as having minor positive effects but there is some uncertainty dependent on location.	<b>Mitigation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified.</li> </ul> <b>Assumptions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified.</li> </ul> <b>Uncertainties</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The exact location of development and links to town centres.</li> </ul>

#### 4 One large SUE

One large SUE adjacent Sutton/Kirkby (1000+ dwellings) with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) within and adjacent to existing settlements, with significant Green Belt release			
3. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE			
ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Ashfield.	++	++	This strategic option will support housing delivery across the District with a sustainable urban extension (SUE) adjacent to Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in- Ashfield and smaller sites within and adjacent to existing settlements. This option would help meet the housing needs of Kirkby-Ashfield, Sutton in Ashfield, and the existing settlements. Both options
			<b>Mitigation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified.</li> </ul> <b>Assumptions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified.</li> </ul>

<b>One large SUE adjacent Sutton/Kirkby (1000+ dwellings) with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) within and adjacent to existing settlements, with significant Green Belt release</b> <b>3. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE</b> <b>ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.</b>			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
			<p>would support delivery of the requirements set out in the Housing Need Study, which identifies the different housing needs of particular groups in the District.</p> <p>Housing delivery has declined in recent years with total net completions of Class C3, dwelling houses in 2017/18 (397), 2018/19 (300), 2019/20 (173), 2020/21 (265) 2021/22 (412) and 2022/23 (351) well below those experienced in 2015/16 (558) and 2016/17 (544). Reliance on a SUE could lead to a longer lead-in time between adoption of the Local Plan and delivery on the ground, due to the infrastructure required for delivery. However, the identification of a range of smaller sites within and adjacent to existing settlements would help to meet immediate housing needs as development would be less reliant on longer lead-in times and the provision of infrastructure. Additionally, development in these locations would support the delivery of housing in existing sustainable settlements.</p> <p>The development could provide greater ability to deliver affordable housing. However, the areas of Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield are recognised as having lower viability for affordable housing than Hucknall and the rural areas. Smaller sites in existing settlements in these locations, with associated Green Belt release, may therefore support enhanced delivery of affordable housing. Average incomes in Ashfield suggest two thirds of households with a current need are estimated to be likely to have insufficient income to afford market housing, highlighting the importance of provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>Both sub-options are considered to perform similarly in respect of this objective and are considered to have significant positive effects on achievement of this objective.</p>
<b>2. Health</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	+/-	+/-	<p>The health of people in Ashfield is generally worse than the England average. Life expectancy is lower than the UK average, but has improved over the last ten years in line with the England average.</p> <p>There is potential for the construction and operation of new development to have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents near development sites and along transport routes within the District. Effects may include, for example, stress related to disturbance, noise and vibration and respiratory problems exacerbated by construction traffic emissions and dust.</p>

**Uncertainties**

- The extent to which new housing development meets local needs will be dependent on the mix of housing delivered (in terms of size, type and tenure) which is currently unknown.
- The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.

**Mitigation**

- Local Plan policies should ensure that open space and/or health facilities are provided on site/contributions are sought to provision off site.
- Local Plan policies should ensure that development is not located in close proximity to unsuitable neighbouring uses.
- Local Plan policies should consider if/how accessibility to the countryside can be promoted as part of new development.

One large SUE adjacent Sutton/Kirkby (1000+ dwellings) with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) within and adjacent to existing settlements, with significant Green Belt release			
3. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE			
ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
			<p>The development of a SUE would support opportunities for the integration of open space and green infrastructure. A SUE at Sutton Parkway or Mowlands would provide opportunities for improvements to health provision, large areas of open space and improved green infrastructure routes. Smaller sites within and adjacent to existing settlements will provide some open space and improved linkages to green infrastructure (dependent on scale).</p> <p>Development within the District's existing settlements is likely to reduce the need to travel by car and encourage walking/cycling as services and employment opportunities would be more physically accessible. This is expected to generate a positive effect in relation to the promotion of healthy lifestyles.</p> <p>This option may also maximise the potential for increased investment in existing and new facilities, particularly in Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton in Ashfield which have areas that are amongst the most health deprived areas nationally. However, there is a risk that increased demand from new residents may undermine the quality of existing facilities within these already health deprived areas, unless supported by additional investment in services.</p> <p>The option is considered to have mixed minor positive and minor negative effects on achievement of this objective. Both sub-options are considered to perform similarly.</p>
<p><b>3.Historic Environment</b> To conserve and enhance Ashfield's historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.</p>	+/- /?	+/- /?	<p>Development under this option has the potential to adversely affect the character of historic assets both in the short term during associated construction activities (e.g. as a result of vibrations) and in the longer term once development is complete (e.g. due to the built form of new development affecting the setting of the historic assets).</p> <p>Development may have a direct impact on cultural heritage features where it involves the loss of, or alteration to, assets or indirect adverse effects on their settings. In this context, there are a number of designated cultural heritage assets within and in close proximity to Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield and other existing settlements.</p> <p>Assets close to Mowlands include three scheduled monuments, a number of Grade II listed buildings and the Kirkby Cross Conservation Area. The area of Sub-option 1 (Sutton Parkway) is less sensitive with regards to historic assets.</p>

One large SUE adjacent Sutton/Kirkby (1000+ dwellings) with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) within and adjacent to existing settlements, with significant Green Belt release			
3. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE			
ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
			<p>A number of the existing settlements also include conservation areas including Sutton in Ashfield Church &amp; Market Place and at Hucknall. Additionally, there are a range of listed buildings.</p> <p>There is the potential for these assets, or their settings, to be adversely affected by new development, although this will be dependent on the exact type, location and design of new development which is uncertain at this stage. The likelihood of adverse effects occurring may also be increased depending on the housing target option taken forward.</p> <p>Locating new development near these assets may increase the accessibility of prospective residents to them, generating a potentially positive effect on this objective. There may also be opportunities for heritage-led development, which could serve to protect and enhance areas or buildings of historical, archaeological and cultural value, and potentially to enhance the setting of assets (for example, through the sensitive redevelopment of brownfield sites).</p> <p>Overall, the sub-options have been assessed as having a mixed positive and negative effect on this objective. As noted above, the proximity of Mowlands to heritage assets has the potential for greater negative effects. However, the magnitude is uncertain.</p>
<p><b>4. Community Safety</b> To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.</p>	0	0	<p>The spatial strategic options are not considered to influence the ability to improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. The ability to do so depends on the inclusion of design features such as natural surveillance, appropriate lighting and shared spaces. These factors can only be determined through detailed design at the masterplanning/planning application stage and therefore the strategic options for the distribution of growth in the District are not considered to have an effect on this objective.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the option has a neutral effect on this objective.</p>
<p><b>5. Social Inclusion Deprivation</b> To improve social inclusion and to</p>	+	+	<p>Ashfield, ranked at 68<sup>th</sup> out of 326 local authority areas, performs poorly in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2019).</p>

<b>One large SUE adjacent Sutton/Kirkby (1000+ dwellings) with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) within and adjacent to existing settlements, with significant Green Belt release</b> <b>3. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE</b> <b>ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.</b>				
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary	
close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield.			<p>There are significant pockets of deprivation within Ashfield. The development of a SUE would lead to the integration of some facilities and services within new development, including green infrastructure and open space, with potential for a primary school dependent on size. Both sub-options therefore have the potential to deliver services and facilities. However, some reliance would be placed on existing provision. The scale of a SUE site would ensure developer contributions to support new delivery/enhanced provision elsewhere within Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton in Ashfield. Additionally, the scale of a SUE may support greater potential for affordable housing in an area with poor viability.</p> <p>More broadly, the development of smaller sites within/adjacent to existing settlements has the potential to support services and facilities in existing locations but may not support delivery of enhanced service provision (associated with a critical mass of development) and may not generate sufficient developer contributions.</p> <p>Overall, both sub-options are considered to have similar minor positive effects on this objective.</p>	<p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The type and mix of housing, including affordable housing is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6. Biodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</b></p> <p>To conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels and Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</p>	-/?	-/?	<p>There are no internationally designated conservation sites within the District although there is a possible potential SPA (ppSPA) for Sherwood Forest, which is recognised as being important for breeding woodlark and Nightjar, in the south and east of the District.</p> <p>There are nine SSSIs across Ashfield including Kirkby Grives SSSI to the south of Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Annesley Woodhouse Quarries SSSI and Bogs Farm SSSI west of Annesley Woodhouse. These are south of the location of the Mowlands SUE. Sutton Parkway is not close to any SSSIs.</p> <p>There are several tracts of ancient woodland, including to the west of the potential Mowlands SUE location. There are also a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) across the District and four Local Nature Reserves (LNR). A number of LWS are located adjacent to existing settlements, including within the vicinity of Mowlands SUE, and adjacent to Hucknall, Selston and Underwood.</p> <p>In consequence, there is the potential for indirect adverse effects on these sites associated with new development (for example, disturbance arising from increased recreational activity and wild bird and mammal loss from cat predation).</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan policies should seek to avoid negative effects on biodiversity and support enhancement where possible.</li> <li>• Careful consideration should be given to the selection of site allocations to avoid adverse effects on nationally and locally designated sites with mitigation identified.</li> <li>• Local Plan policies should support a network of green infrastructure assets linked to existing and new development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is assumed new development would not be located on designated conservation sites.</li> <li>• It is assumed that the value of previously developed land is less than greenfield land.</li> </ul>

One large SUE adjacent Sutton/Kirkby (1000+ dwellings) with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) within and adjacent to existing settlements, with significant Green Belt release			
3. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE			
ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
			<p>The option would see the loss of greenfield land through the development of the SUE and through significant Green Belt release (which is assumed to be overwhelmingly comprised of green field land) with development within and adjacent to existing settlements, which is also expected to largely comprise greenfield land. However, the development of smaller sites within existing settlements may also support the re-use of brownfield sites which may minimise direct and indirect risks to designated sites, and potentially provide biodiversity gains.</p> <p>Overall, both sub options have been assessed as having a negative effect on this objective due to the potential for adverse effects on adjacent designated sites, and the loss of habitats from the use of greenfield land, although uncertainty remains with regard to the exact type, magnitude and duration of effects.</p>
<p><b>7.Landscape</b> To protect enhance and manage the character and appearance of Ashfield's landscape /townscape, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place.</p>	+ / --	+ / --	<p>The option would see one SUE and additional significant Green Belt release at existing settlements. The Green Belt covers approximately 41% of the District, covering the majority of the District's area extending from Kirkby-in-Ashfield southwards, reflecting the proximity to Nottingham. The SUEs would not include Green Belt land, however, significant release would be expected elsewhere in the District, including with the settlements in the Rural Area and around Hucknall.</p> <p>The Mowlands sub-option and Southern Parkway sub-option are considered to perform similarly against this objective. The development of a SUE would see the take up of land that currently contributes to the landscape around Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton in Ashfield. Development in sub-option 1 would affect how the town is viewed from the east where the land raises towards neighbouring Mansfield. Sub-option 2 would affect the urban fringe on the western side of Kirkby-in-Ashfield, and views/from Boar Hill.</p> <p>The development of SUE would provide a substantial encroachment into the countryside and surrounding landscape. However, a SUE would also provide scope for integrated and well-designed landscape mitigation measures to address impact. Such mitigation should include existing hedgerows and trees where possible.</p>

**Uncertainties**

- The exact location of future growth.
- The exact quantum of growth to be delivered.

**Mitigation**

- Detailed policies in the Local Plan should support high quality design in new development.
- Local Plan policies should seek to conserve and enhance the character and quality of the District's landscapes.

**Assumptions**

- None identified.

**Uncertainties**

- The exact location of future development, the quality of the receiving landscapes and the proximity of sensitive receptors is unknown at this stage.
- The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.



One large SUE adjacent Sutton/Kirkby (1000+ dwellings) with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) within and adjacent to existing settlements, with significant Green Belt release				
3. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE				
ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.				
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary	
			<p>The option would support development within existing settlements. There is potential for new development to enhance the quality of the built environment and improve townscapes (subject to more detailed policies on design contained within the Local Plan).</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that both sub-options would have minor positive and significant negative effects on the achievement of this objective. However, the extent to which negative effects are experienced is dependent on the location of development and the scale of growth proposed.</p>	
<p><b>8.Natural Resources</b></p> <p>To minimise the loss of natural resources including soils, greenfield land and the best quality agricultural land.</p>	+/-	+/-	<p>Both sub-options would require the development of greenfield land to enable the SUE.</p> <p>Within the location of Mowlands the agricultural land is primarily Grade 2 (very good) and for Sutton Parkway the land is primarily Grade 3 (although it is not possible to determine where this is 3a or 3b).</p> <p>Although it would be expected that new development in existing settlements would be dependent to some extent on the release of greenfield, there would be opportunities to redevelop brownfield land. The extent of such positive effects would be dependent on the sites identified and is uncertain at this stage.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the option would have a mix of significant negative and minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan policies should encourage the effective use of land by re-using previously developed land.</li> <li>Local Plan policies should prioritise the development of brownfield over greenfield land where possible.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The exact location of future development at each settlement is unknown at this stage.</li> <li>The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>
<p><b>9.Air &amp; noise pollution</b></p> <p>To reduce air pollution and the proportion of the local population subject to noise pollution.</p>	+/-	+/-	<p>There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within Ashfield.</p> <p>There is the potential for the construction and operation of new development to have negative effects on noise and air quality due to emissions generated from plant and HGV movements during construction and increased vehicle movements during operation. Focusing development in a SUE would help to localise such effects in contrast to dispersed development. The Sutton Parkway sub-option may support greater connectivity through rail transport, given the proximity to the station on the Robin Hood Line, dependent on how the SUE is integrated and connected with the station. This would support accessibility</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan policies should support the protection of amenity.</li> <li>Local Plan policies should seek to reduce congestion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is assumed that proposals to ensure no sale of new diesel/petrol engine vehicles after 2035, which will lead to an increased proportion of e-vehicles over time, may benefit air quality over the long-term.</li> </ul>

One large SUE adjacent Sutton/Kirkby (1000+ dwellings) with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) within and adjacent to existing settlements, with significant Green Belt release			
3. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE			
ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
			<p>of Nottingham by a sustainable transport option and could help reduce any future increase in commuter traffic emissions.</p> <p>To be sustainable, the SUE would be expected to provide a degree of self-sufficiency (in terms of the provision of new facilities), opportunities for walking/cycling infrastructure, and would also be well-connected to the existing settlement, to minimise the generation of localised road trips.</p> <p>However, despite the above measures, it is likely, due to continuation of existing travel to work patterns, that localised congestion is likely to increase and will be associated with emissions.</p> <p>A mix of minor positive and minor negative effects on achievement of this objective are considered likely.</p>
<p><b>10. Water Quality</b> To conserve and improve water quality and quantity.</p>	-	-	<p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) indicated water resources in the East Midlands are significantly constrained with little opportunity to develop new water resource schemes.</p> <p>The shortfall identified in the Watercycle Study (of water supply) is also identified in the more recent Severn Trent Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP, 2019) within the Nottinghamshire Water Resource Zone but the WRMP19 proposes a range of demand and supply measures to ensure sufficient water resources can be maintained up to 2025 (and in outline up to 2030). The draft Water Resource Management Plan 2024 (2022) sets out what is planned between 2025 and 2085 to address water pressures. Ashfield sits in an area under serious water stress as identified by the Environment Agency (Water stressed areas – final classification 2021).</p> <p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) notes that there are no capacity constraints at Ashfield's Wastewater Treatment Works.</p> <p>Ashfield sits on principal and secondary aquifers so the need to protect groundwaters is particularly important, but it is not considered that the strategic spatial options would have an effect, subject to effective measures being put in place during the development process.</p>

**Uncertainties**

- The exact location of future development is uncertain at this stage.
- The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.

**Mitigation**

- Local Plan policies should support water efficiency measures, the implementation of SuDs, and wastewater treatment capacity enhancements where necessary.

**Assumptions**

- New development will increase water use.
- The Council will continue to liaise with Severn Trent Water regarding infrastructure requirements.

**Uncertainties**

- The exact location of developments and the potential impact on waterbodies is uncertain at this stage.
- The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.

One large SUE adjacent Sutton/Kirkby (1000+ dwellings) with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) within and adjacent to existing settlements, with significant Green Belt release			
3. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE			
ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
			Overall, this option is considered to have minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective.
<b>11. Waste</b> To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials.	-	-	<p>New development will result in increased resource use and the generation of waste in both the short-term during construction and in the longer term once development is complete. However, the specific impacts will depend on arrangements made for recycling and composting.</p> <p>All strategic options will increase waste generation and have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective.</p>
<b>12. Climate Change and Flood Risk</b> To adapt to climate change by reducing and manage the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to people, property and the environment.	0/?	0/?	<p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2023) identifies that the District has a relatively low risk of flooding from watercourses although some properties in Hucknall and Jacksdale are at risk. Flood risk is mainly away from the urban areas. However, it is recognised that additional water in the River Leen could cause flood issues for Nottingham to the south.</p> <p>Both Mowlands and Sutton Parkway SUE locations are located in Flood Zone 1. Any flood risk associated with development in the existing settlements would be dependent on location.</p> <p>The loss of any greenfield land under this option could lead to an increased risk of flooding (as a result of the increase in impermeable surfaces). However, it can be reasonably assumed that new development proposals which may result in an increase in flood risk will be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment and incorporate suitable flood alleviation measures thereby minimising the risk of flooding.</p> <p>There may be opportunities as part of new development proposals to enhance existing, or incorporate new, green infrastructure which could potentially have a positive effect on this objective by providing space for flood waters to flow through and additional areas for future flood storage.</p>

One large SUE adjacent Sutton/Kirkby (1000+ dwellings) with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) within and adjacent to existing settlements, with significant Green Belt release			
3. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE			
ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
			Both sub-options are considered to have neutral effects. However, there is some uncertainty dependent on the location of development.
<b>13.Climate Change and Energy Efficiency</b> To adapt to climate change by minimise energy usage and to develop Ashfield's renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	+/-	+/-	<p>Development of a SUE could support the integration of low carbon and renewable energies through, for example, the integration of combined heat and power networks. There is also greater scope to orientate development to maximise solar gain due to scale, siting options and design opportunities. The Sutton Parkway sub-option may support greater connectivity through rail transport, given the proximity to the station on the Robin Hood Line, dependent on how the SUE is integrated and connected with the station. This would support accessibility of Nottingham. The development could also support green infrastructure with walking and cycling links that reduces the need to travel by private car, thereby supporting a smaller increase in carbon emissions.</p> <p>Development within and adjoining existing settlements can reinforce existing patterns of travel which can continue current vehicle emission trends.</p> <p>Small site development may reduce the potential for developer contributions to provide public transport links, in contrast to the SUE. However, the promotion of sites within settlements would provide access to existing suitable public transport routes (where available).</p> <p>Overall, both sub-options have been assessed as having a mix of positive and negative effects.</p>
<b>14.Travel and Accessibility</b> To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and	+/-	+/-	<p>The development of a SUE could support the planned integration of walking and cycling routes which would support sustainable transport methods. The Sutton Parkway sub-option may support greater connectivity through rail transport, given the proximity to the station on the Robin Hood Line, dependent on how the SUE is integrated and connected with the station. This would support accessibility of Nottingham. The Mowlands sub-option is located in proximity to industrial areas north of the A38.</p> <p>The delivery of a range of smaller sites within existing settlements would have less ability for provision of sustainable travel measures. However, dependent on the specific location, development could take place in close proximity to existing community facilities, services</p>

<b>One large SUE adjacent Sutton/Kirkby (1000+ dwellings) with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) within and adjacent to existing settlements, with significant Green Belt release</b> <b>3. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE</b> <b>ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.</b>			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
duration of journeys.			<p>and employment opportunities and be reasonably well connected to the existing public transport network. Development within these areas may also help to maintain existing, and (potentially) stimulate investment in, public transport provision. However, smaller developments are unlikely to generate substantial contributions to public transport provision and may not allow integration of walking/cycling route to services and facilities.</p> <p>Both sub-options are considered to perform similarly, although the potential for greater connectivity with the Sutton Parkway station may increase the positive effects expected against this objective.</p> <p>Overall, both sub-options are expected to have a mix of minor positive and minor negative effects on this objective.</p>
<b>15. Employment</b> To create high quality employment opportunities including opportunities for increased learn and skills to meet the needs of the District.	+	+	<p>The development option would support investment within the District, through construction activities in the short term and through the provision of new jobs in the District and supporting housing in the long term. Both sub-options are expected to perform similarly in respect of this objective.</p> <p>The majority of employment in the District is located in Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton-in-Ashfield and Sherwood Business Park off Junction 27 of the M1. More limited employment opportunities are found to the area west of the M1 (Selston, Jacksdale, Underwood and Bagthorpe). Development under either sub-option would support employment centres of Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton in Ashfield through SUE development. Potentially, development at Mowlands would support greater access to the M1 corridor. Additionally, development within/adjacent to existing settlements would support those centres.</p> <p>Several schools in with Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Sutton in Ashfield and Hucknall are at, or above, capacity. Smaller developments are unlikely to drive substantial developer contributions to the provision of school places. The District suffers from poor educational attainment and the option is unlikely to support greater attainment levels.</p> <p>Development under each sub-option would help support access to employment opportunities and is considered to have minor positive effects on achievement of this objective.</p>

One large SUE adjacent Sutton/Kirkby (1000+ dwellings) with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) within and adjacent to existing settlements, with significant Green Belt release			
3. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE			
ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
<p><b>16. Economy</b> To Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy.</p>	+	+	<p>The option would support economic investment in the District's main employment centres of Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton in Ashfield. Focussing development within one SUE and providing additional growth in existing settlements would support ongoing economic investment.</p> <p>Development within the A38/M1 corridor may support out commuting to Nottingham however it is also likely to support existing economic investment in these employment areas, aiding greater self-containment in the District. The Sutton Parkway SUE site is located close to Lowmoor Business Park and sub-option 1 may present opportunities for enhancement of employment opportunities in this location.</p> <p>Both sub-options have been assessed as having minor positive effects on achievement of this objective.</p>
<p><b>17. Town Centres</b> Increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield's town centres.</p>	+	+	<p>This option would focus growth in Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield through a SUE with other existing settlements accommodating smaller sites within and adjacent to settlements. This provision of growth is likely to support the vitality and vibrancy of Sutton/Kirkby town centre. The Retail &amp; Leisure Study (2016) identified that Sutton town centre is relatively healthy and performing moderately well in terms of vacancies and that Kirkby performs an important role and has seen a decline in the number of vacant retail units in recent years. The Council is currently in the process of updating the retail study. Each sub-option would support these centres through the development of a SUE. However, the links to these centres would be important. The potential for smaller sites within or adjacent to Hucknall would also support this centre but to a lesser degree.</p> <p>Each sub-option is considered to perform similarly against this objective with minor positive effects considered likely.</p>

## 5 One new settlement, one large SUE

<b>One new settlement (outside Green Belt), one large SUE adjacent Kirkby/Sutton and smaller sites in/adjacent existing settlements, including moderate Green Belt release in Hucknall and Rurals</b>			
<b>i. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE</b> <b>ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.</b>			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Ashfield.	++/?	++/?	<p>This strategic option will support housing delivery across the District with a new settlement, a sustainable urban extension (SUE) adjacent to Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield and smaller sites within and adjacent to existing settlements including Hucknall and Rurals. This option would help meet the housing needs of Kirkby-Ashfield, Sutton in Ashfield, Hucknall, and the existing settlements and subject to the location of any new settlement, may meet local needs elsewhere in the District. Both options would support delivery of the requirements set out in the Housing Need Study, which identifies the different housing needs of particular groups in the District.</p> <p>Housing delivery has declined in recent years with total net completions of Class C3, dwelling houses in 2017/18 (397), 2018/19 (300), 2019/20 (173), 2020/21 (265) 2021/22 (412) and 2022/23 (351) well below those experienced in 2015/16 (558) and 2016/17 (544). Reliance on a new settlement and a SUE could lead to a longer lead-in time between adoption of the Local Plan and delivery on the ground, due to the infrastructure required for delivery. The identification of a range of smaller sites within and adjacent to existing settlements would help to meet immediate housing needs as development would be less reliant on longer lead-in times and the provision of infrastructure. Additionally, development in these locations would support the delivery of housing in existing sustainable settlements.</p> <p>The development could provide greater ability to deliver affordable housing, particularly so for one new settlement and/or the large SUE. However, the areas of Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield are recognised as having lower viability for affordable housing than Hucknall and the rural areas. Smaller sites in existing settlements in these locations, with associated Green Belt release, may therefore support enhanced delivery of affordable housing. Average incomes in Ashfield suggest two thirds of households with a current need are estimated to be likely to have insufficient income to afford market housing, highlighting the importance of provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>Both sub-options are considered to perform similarly in respect of this objective and are considered to have significant positive effects on achievement of this objective. However, there is some uncertainty over the lead in time for a new settlement/large SUE and how this may impact on housing delivery in the early years of the plan period.</p>
			<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extent to which new housing development meets local needs will be dependent on the mix of housing delivered (in terms of size, type and tenure) which is currently unknown.</li> <li>• The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>

One new settlement (outside Green Belt), one large SUE adjacent Kirkby/Sutton and smaller sites in/adjacent existing settlements, including moderate Green Belt release in Hucknall and Rurals			
i. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE			
ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
<b>2. Health</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.	+/- /?	+/- /?	<p>The health of people in Ashfield is generally worse than the England average. Life expectancy is lower than the UK average, but has improved over the last ten years in line with the England average.</p> <p>There is potential for the construction and operation of new development to have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents near development sites and along transport routes within the District. Effects may include, for example, stress related to disturbance, noise and vibration and respiratory problems exacerbated by construction traffic emissions and dust.</p> <p>The development of one new settlement could provide opportunities for new health provision, new areas of open space and green infrastructure and to link in with the existing green infrastructure network. The potential scale of development associated with a new settlement could result in significant positive effects. However, there is some uncertainty around the magnitude of such effects.</p> <p>The development of a SUE would support opportunities for the integration of open space and green infrastructure. A SUE at Sutton Parkway or Mowlands would provide opportunities for improvements to health provision, large areas of open space and improved green infrastructure routes. Smaller sites within and adjacent to existing settlements will provide some open space and improved linkages to green infrastructure (dependent on scale).</p> <p>Development within the District's existing settlements is likely to reduce the need to travel by car and encourage walking/cycling as services and employment opportunities would be more physically accessible. This is expected to generate a positive effect in relation to the promotion of healthy lifestyles.</p> <p>This option may also maximise the potential for increased investment in existing and new facilities, particularly in Kirkby and Sutton in Ashfield which have areas that are amongst the most health deprived areas nationally. However, there is a risk that increased demand from new residents may undermine the quality of existing facilities within these already health deprived areas, unless supported by additional investment in services.</p>

**Mitigation**

- Local Plan policies should ensure that open space and/or health facilities are provided on site/contributions are sought to provision off site.
- Local Plan policies should ensure that development is not located in close proximity to unsuitable neighbouring uses.
- Local Plan policies should consider if/how accessibility to the countryside can be promoted as part of new development.

**Assumptions**

- It is assumed that any development of a new settlement would seek to maximise use of public transport, through provision of new public transport or connections to existing services.

**Uncertainties**

- None identified.



One new settlement (outside Green Belt), one large SUE adjacent Kirkby/Sutton and smaller sites in/adjacent existing settlements, including moderate Green Belt release in Hucknall and Rurals			
i. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE			
ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
<b>3.Historic Environment</b> To conserve and enhance Ashfield's historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.	+/- /?	+/- /?	<p>Development under this option has the potential to adversely affect the character of historic assets both in the short term during associated construction activities (e.g. as a result of vibrations) and in the longer term once development is complete (e.g. due to the built form of new development affecting the setting of the historic assets).</p> <p>Development may have a direct impact on cultural heritage features where it involves the loss of, or alteration to, assets or indirect adverse effects on their settings. In this context, there are a number of cultural heritage assets within and in close proximity to some of the areas identified as possible areas for new settlements. Possible new settlement locations at North and South of Wild Hill are within the setting of Hardwick Hall and a new settlement at South of Mansfield Road in Felley could potentially impact on the setting of Felley Priory, a listed building. Cauldwell Road, West of Stonehills plantation has Hamilton Hill scheduled monument located to the north west (which could be impacted) but the Kirkby Lane/Pinxton Lane location is less sensitive with regards to heritage assets.</p> <p>Assets close to Mowlands include three scheduled monuments, a number of Grade II listed buildings and the Kirkby Cross Conservation Area. The area of Sub-option 1 (Sutton Parkway) is less sensitive with no historic assets in its vicinity.</p> <p>A number of the existing settlements also include conservation areas including Sutton in Ashfield Church &amp; Market Place and at Hucknall. Additionally, there are a range of listed buildings. There is the potential for these assets, or their settings, to be adversely affected by new development, although this will be dependent on the exact type, location and design of new development which is uncertain at this stage. The likelihood of adverse effects occurring may also be increased with the scale of development associated with a new settlement, subject to</p> <p>Locating new development near these assets may increase the accessibility of prospective residents to them, generating a potentially positive effect on this objective. There may also be opportunities for heritage-led development, which could serve to protect and enhance areas or buildings of historical, archaeological and cultural value, and potentially to enhance the setting of assets (for example, through the sensitive redevelopment of brownfield sites). The potential scale of development associated with a new settlement could result in significant positive effects, for example with good design enhancing the setting of existing heritage assets.</p>

**Mitigation**

- Policies contained within the Local Plan should seek to conserve and, where possible, enhance cultural heritage assets including by promoting heritage-led development.
- Policies within the Local Plan should promote high standards of architectural and urban design.
- The Local Plan should set out a strategic framework to preserve and enhance historic areas and promote high standards of new development.

**Assumptions**

- None identified.

**Uncertainties**

- The exact location of new development is uncertain at this stage.
- The form and function of any development will have the potential to enhance or detract from designated heritage and cultural assets and/or their settings.
- The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.

<b>One new settlement (outside Green Belt), one large SUE adjacent Kirkby/Sutton and smaller sites in/adjacent existing settlements, including moderate Green Belt release in Hucknall and Rurals</b> <b>i. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE</b> <b>ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.</b>				
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary	
			Overall, the sub-options have been assessed as having a mixed positive and negative effect on this objective. As noted above, the proximity of Mowlands to heritage assets has the potential for greater negative effects. However, the magnitude is uncertain.	
<b>4.Community Safety</b> To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.	0	0	<p>The spatial strategic options are not considered to influence the ability to improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. The ability to do so depends on the inclusion of design features such as natural surveillance, appropriate lighting and shared spaces. These factors can only be determined through detailed design at the masterplanning/planning application stage and therefore the strategic options for the distribution of growth in the District are not considered to have an effect on this objective.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the option has a neutral effect on this objective.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan polices should support measures to design out crime.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>None.</p>
<b>5.Social Inclusion Deprivation</b> To improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield.	+	+	<p>Ashfield, ranked at 68th out of 326 local authority areas, performs poorly in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2019).</p> <p>There are significant pockets of deprivation within Ashfield. The development of a new settlement would be likely to provide some new facilities and services, including green infrastructure and open space and may also support the development of new school(s).</p> <p>The development of a SUE would lead to the integration of some facilities and services within new development, including green infrastructure and open space, with potential for a primary school dependent on size. Both sub-options therefore have the potential to deliver services and facilities. However, some reliance would be placed on existing provision. The scale of a SUE site would ensure developer contributions to support new delivery/enhanced provision elsewhere within Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton-in-Ashfield.</p> <p>More broadly, the development of smaller sites within/adjacent to existing settlements has the potential to support services and facilities in existing locations but may not support delivery of enhanced service provision (associated with a critical mass of development) and may not generate sufficient developer contributions.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan policies should support the integrated provision of services and facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The type and mix of housing, including is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>

One new settlement (outside Green Belt), one large SUE adjacent Kirkby/Sutton and smaller sites in/adjacent existing settlements, including moderate Green Belt release in Hucknall and Rurals			
i. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE			
ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
			Overall, both sub-options are considered to have similar minor positive effects on this objective.
<b>6. Biodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</b> To conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels and Green & Blue Infrastructure	-/?	-/?	<p>There are no internationally designated conservation sites within the District although there is a possible potential SPA (ppSPA) for Sherwood Forest, which is recognised as being important for breeding woodlark and Nightjar, in the south and east of the District.</p> <p>There are nine SSSIs across Ashfield including Kirkby Grives SSSI to the south of Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Annesley Woodhouse Quarries SSSI and Bogs Farm SSSI west of Annesley Woodhouse. These are south of the location of the Mowlands SUE. Sutton Parkway is not close to any SSSIs.</p> <p>Some of the areas identified as possible areas for new settlements include or are close to wildlife sites. Part of new settlement area 5 (West of Stonehills Plantation, Cauldwell Road, Mansfield) falls within 400 metres of woodland under ppSPA. There are several tracts of ancient woodland, including to the west of the potential Mowlands SUE location. There are also a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) across the District and four Local Nature Reserves (LNR). A number of LWS are located adjacent to existing settlements, including within the vicinity of Mowlands SUE, and adjacent to Hucknall, Selston and Underwood. and near to some of the areas identified as possible areas for new settlements. Part of one of these areas (Cauldwell Road) falls within 400 metres of woodland of the ppSPA.</p> <p>In consequence, there is the potential for indirect adverse effects on these sites associated with new development (for example, disturbance arising from increased recreational activity and wild bird and mammal loss from cat predation). The precise location of any new settlement would determine effects on biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>The option would see the loss of greenfield land through the development of a new settlement (albeit outside of the Green Belt) and the SUE, and through moderate Green Belt release (which is assumed to be overwhelmingly comprised of green field land) with development within and adjacent to existing settlements, which is also expected to largely comprise greenfield land. However, the development of smaller sites within existing settlements may also support the re-use of brownfield sites which may minimise direct and indirect risks to designated sites, and potentially provide biodiversity gains.</p>

**Mitigation**

- Local Plan policies should seek to avoid negative effects on biodiversity and support enhancement where possible.
- Careful consideration should be given to the selection of site allocations to avoid adverse effects on nationally and locally designated sites with mitigation identified.
- ppSPA - Apply any mitigation measured agreed with Natural England.
- Local Plan policies should support a network of green infrastructure assets linked to existing and new development.

**Assumptions**

- It is assumed new development would not be located on designated conservation sites.
- It is assumed that the value of previously developed land is less than greenfield land.

**Uncertainties**

- The exact location of future growth.
- The exact quantum of growth to be delivered.

<b>One new settlement (outside Green Belt), one large SUE adjacent Kirkby/Sutton and smaller sites in/adjacent existing settlements, including moderate Green Belt release in Hucknall and Rurals</b> i. <b>Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE</b> ii. <b>Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.</b>			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
			Overall, both sub options have been assessed as having a negative effect on this objective due to the potential for adverse effects on adjacent designated sites, and the loss of habitats from the use of greenfield land (including moderate green belt releases), although uncertainty remains with regard to the exact type, magnitude and duration of effects.
<b>7.Landscape</b> To protect enhance and manage the character and appearance of Ashfield’s landscape /townscape, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place.	+/--	+/--	<p>The option would see one new settlement (outside of the Green Belt) one SUE and additional moderate Green Belt release at existing settlements. The Green Belt covers approximately 41% of the District, covering the majority of the District’s area extending from Kirkby-in-Ashfield southwards, reflecting the proximity to Nottingham. The new settlement and the SUEs would not include Green Belt land, however, there could be moderate release elsewhere in the District, including with the settlements in the Rural Area and around Hucknall. Some of the areas identified as possible areas for New Settlements are located in the countryside. One of the areas identified as a possible area for new settlements (area 4 South Mansfield Road) is noted as being a strong, attractive rural landscape.</p> <p>The Mowlands sub-option and Sutton Parkway sub-option are considered to perform similarly against this objective. The development of a SUE would see the take up of land that currently contributes to the landscape around Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton in Ashfield. Development in sub-option 1 would affect how the town is viewed from the east where the land raises towards neighbouring Mansfield. Sub-option 2 would affect views to the western side of Kirkby-in-Ashfield, towards Boar Hill.</p> <p>The development of a new settlement and/or a SUE would provide a substantial encroachment into the countryside and surrounding landscape. However, a new settlement and/or SUE would also provide scope for integrated and well-designed landscape mitigation measures to address impact and could be significant, subject to the scale of development. Such mitigation should include existing hedgerows and trees where possible.</p> <p>The option would support development within existing settlements. There is potential for new development to enhance the quality of the built environment and improve townscapes (subject to more detailed policies on design contained within the Local Plan).</p>

<b>One new settlement (outside Green Belt), one large SUE adjacent Kirkby/Sutton and smaller sites in/adjacent existing settlements, including moderate Green Belt release in Hucknall and Rurals</b> <b>i. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE</b> <b>ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.</b>				
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary	
			Overall, it is considered that both sub-options would have minor positive and significant negative effects on the achievement of this objective. However, the extent to which negative effects are experienced is dependent on the location of development and the scale of growth proposed.	
<b>8.Natural Resources</b> To minimise the loss of natural resources including soils, greenfield land and the best quality agricultural land.	+/--	+/--	<p>One new settlement would be likely to require the development of significant greenfield land. Both sub-options would require the development of greenfield land to enable the SUE and there would be moderate Green Belt releases.</p> <p>Within the location of Mowlands the agricultural land is primarily Grade 2 (very good) and for Sutton Parkway the land is primarily Grade 3 (although it is not possible to determine where this is 3a or 3b). There is also Grade 2 and Grade 3 (although it is not possible to determine where this is 3a or 3b) land elsewhere in the district which could be affected by the development of one new settlement, subject to the precise location of development. There are also areas of grade 2 and 3 land around Hucknall.</p> <p>Although it would be expected that new development in existing settlements would be dependent to some extent on the release of greenfield, there would be opportunities to redevelop brownfield land. The extent of such positive effects would be dependent on the sites identified and is uncertain at this stage.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the option would have a mix of significant negative and minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan policies should encourage the effective use of land by re-using previously developed land.</li> <li>Local Plan policies should prioritise the development of brownfield over greenfield land where possible.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The exact location of future development at each settlement is unknown at this stage.</li> <li>The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>
<b>9.Air &amp; noise pollution</b> To reduce air pollution and the proportion of the local population subject to noise pollution.	+/-	+/-	<p>There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAS) within Ashfield.</p> <p>There is the potential for the construction and operation of new development to have negative effects on noise and air quality due to emissions generated from plant and HGV movements during construction and increased vehicle movements during operation. Focusing development in a new settlement and one SUE would help to localise such effects in contrast to dispersed development.</p> <p>The Sutton Parkway sub-option may support greater connectivity through rail transport, given the proximity to the station on the Robin Hood Line, dependent on how the SUE is integrated and</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan policies should support the protection of amenity.</li> <li>Local Plan policies should seek to reduce congestion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is assumed that proposals to ensure no sale of new diesel/petrol engine vehicles after 2035, which will lead to an increased</li> </ul>

<b>One new settlement (outside Green Belt), one large SUE adjacent Kirkby/Sutton and smaller sites in/adjacent existing settlements, including moderate Green Belt release in Hucknall and Rurals</b> <b>i. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE</b> <b>ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.</b>			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
			<p>connected with the station. This would support accessibility of Nottingham by a sustainable transport option and could help reduce any future increase in commuter traffic emissions.</p> <p>To be sustainable, the new settlement and SUE would be expected to provide a degree of self-sufficiency (in terms of the provision of new facilities), opportunities for walking/cycling infrastructure, and would for the SUE also be well-connected to the existing settlement, to minimise the generation of localised road trips.</p> <p>However, despite the above measures, it is likely, due to continuation of existing travel to work patterns, that localised congestion is likely to increase and will be associated with emissions.</p> <p>A mix of minor positive and minor negative effects on achievement of this objective are considered likely.</p>
<b>10. Water Quality</b> To conserve and improve water quality and quantity.	-	-	<p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) indicated water resources in the East Midlands are significantly constrained with little opportunity to develop new water resource schemes.</p> <p>The shortfall identified in the Watercycle Study (of water supply) is also identified in the more recent Severn Trent Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP, 2019) within the Nottinghamshire Water Resource Zone but the WRMP19 proposes a range of demand and supply measures to ensure sufficient water resources can be maintained up to 2025 (and in outline up to 2030). The draft Water Resource Management Plan 2024 (2022) sets out what is planned between 2025 and 2085 to address water pressures. Ashfield sits in an area under serious water stress as identified by the Environment Agency (Water stressed areas – final classification 2021).</p> <p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) notes that there are no capacity constraints at Ashfield’s Wastewater Treatment Works.</p> <p>Ashfield sits on principal and secondary aquifers so the need to protect groundwaters is particularly important, but it is not considered that the strategic spatial options would have an effect, subject to effective measures being put in place during the development process.</p>

proportion of e-vehicles over time, may benefit air quality over the long-term.

**Uncertainties**

- The exact location of future development is uncertain at this stage.
- The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.

**Mitigation**

- Local Plan policies should support water efficiency measures, the implementation of SuDs, and wastewater treatment capacity enhancements where necessary.

**Assumptions**

- New development will increase water use
- The Council will continue to liaise with Severn Trent Water regarding infrastructure.

**Uncertainties**

- The exact location of developments and the potential impact on waterbodies is uncertain.
- The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.

<b>One new settlement (outside Green Belt), one large SUE adjacent Kirkby/Sutton and smaller sites in/adjacent existing settlements, including moderate Green Belt release in Hucknall and Rurals</b> <b>i. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE</b> <b>ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.</b>			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
			Overall, this option is considered to have minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective.
<b>11. Waste</b> To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials.	-	-	<p>New development will result in increased resource use and the generation of waste in both the short-term during construction and in the longer term once development is complete. However, the specific impacts will depend on arrangements made for recycling and composting and there may also be opportunities for re-use of construction waste, for example with the potential scale of development associated with a new settlement and a large SUE.</p> <p>All strategic options will increase waste generation and have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective.</p>
<b>12. Climate Change and Flood Risk</b> To adapt to climate change by reducing and manage the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to people, property and the environment.	0/?	0/?	<p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2023) identifies that the District has a relatively low risk of flooding from watercourses although some properties in Hucknall and Jacksdale are at risk. Flood risk is mainly away from the urban areas. However, it is recognised that additional water in the River Leen could cause flood issues for Nottingham to the south.</p> <p>Both Mowlands and Sutton Parkway are located in Flood Zone 1. Development of a new settlement and in the existing settlements would be dependent on location as to the extent of any effects on flood risk.</p> <p>The loss of any greenfield land under this option could lead to an increased risk of flooding (as a result of the increase in impermeable surfaces). However, it can be reasonably assumed that new development proposals which may result in an increase in flood risk will be accompanied by an FRA and incorporate suitable flood alleviation measures (e.g. SuDS) thereby minimising the risk of flooding.</p> <p>There may be opportunities as part of new development proposals to enhance existing, or incorporate new, green infrastructure which could potentially have a positive effect on this objective by providing space for flood waters to flow through and additional areas for future flood storage.</p>

<b>One new settlement (outside Green Belt), one large SUE adjacent Kirkby/Sutton and smaller sites in/adjacent existing settlements, including moderate Green Belt release in Hucknall and Rurals</b> <b>i. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE</b> <b>ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.</b>				
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary	
			Both sub-options are considered to have neutral effects. However, there is some uncertainty dependent on the location of development.	
<b>13.Climate Change and Energy Efficiency</b> To adapt to climate change by minimise energy usage and to develop Ashfield's renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.	+/-	+/-	<p>Development of a new settlement and/or a SUE could support the integration of low carbon and renewable energies through, for example, the integration of combined heat and power networks. There is also greater scope to orientate development to maximise solar gain due to scale, siting options and design opportunities. The development could also support green infrastructure with walking and cycling links that reduces the need to travel by private car, thereby supporting a smaller increase in carbon emissions.</p> <p>Development within and adjoining existing settlements can reinforce existing patterns of travel which could continue current vehicle emission trends. The Sutton Parkway sub-option may support greater connectivity through rail transport, given the proximity to the station on the Robin Hood Line, dependent on how the SUE is integrated and connected with the station. This would support accessibility of Nottingham.</p> <p>Small site development may reduce the potential for developer contributions to provide, public transport links, in contrast to the new settlement or SUE. However, the promotion of sites within settlements would provide access to existing suitable public transport routes (where available).</p> <p>Overall, both sub-options have been assessed as having a mix of positive and negative effects.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan policies should support the integration of renewable energy in new development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is assumed that over the plan period there will be a decarbonisation of the electricity generation mix with renewable energy sources displacing fossil fuels.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The exact location of development.</li> </ul>
<b>14.Travel and Accessibility</b> To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys.	+/-	+/-	<p>The development of a new settlement and/or a SUE could support the planned integration of walking and cycling routes which would support sustainable transport methods. The Sutton Parkway sub-option may support greater connectivity through rail transport, given the proximity to the station on the Robin Hood Line, dependent on how the SUE is integrated and connected with the station. This would support accessibility of Nottingham. The Mowlands sub-option is located in proximity to industrial areas north of the A38.</p> <p>A new settlement may provide the critical mass to support the development of new public transport infrastructure and links, for example new railways stations and bus stops, subject to the location. Development at Cauldwell Road could support out commuting to neighbouring</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan policies should encourage the preparation of green travel plans.</li> <li>Local Plan policies should support walking and cycling within new developments.</li> <li>Local Plan policies should align with Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan 3.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified.</li> </ul>



One new settlement (outside Green Belt), one large SUE adjacent Kirkby/Sutton and smaller sites in/adjacent existing settlements, including moderate Green Belt release in Hucknall and Rurals			
i. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE			
ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
			<p>Mansfield but is located close to existing employment areas at Summit Park and Coxmoor Road. Kirkby Lane/Pinxton may support out community due to proximity to Junction 28 of the M1.</p> <p>The delivery of a range of smaller sites within existing settlements would have less ability for provision of sustainable travel measures. However, dependent on the specific location, development could take place in close proximity to existing community facilities, services and employment opportunities and be reasonably well connected to the existing public transport network. Development within these areas may also help to maintain existing, and (potentially) stimulate investment in, public transport provision. However, smaller developments are unlikely to generate substantial contributions to public transport provision and may not allow integration of walking/cycling route to services and facilities. The reality of rural growth is an increase in car use.</p> <p>Both sub-options are considered to perform similarly, although the potential for greater connectivity with the parkway station may increase the positive effects expected against this objective.</p> <p>Overall, both sub-options are expected to have a mix of minor positive and minor negative effects on this objective.</p>
<p><b>15. Employment</b> To create high quality employment opportunities including opportunities for increased learn and skills to meet the needs of the District.</p>	+	+	<p>The development option would support investment within the District, through construction activities in the short term and through the provision of new jobs in the District and supporting housing in the long term. Both sub-options are expected to perform similarly in respect of this objective.</p> <p>The majority of employment in the District is located in Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton in Ashfield and Sherwood Business Park off Junction 27 of the M1. More limited employment opportunities are found to the area west of the M1 (Selston, Jacksdale, Underwood and Bagthorpe). Development under either sub-option would support employment centres of Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton in Ashfield through SUE development. Potentially, development at Mowlands would support greater access to the M1 corridor. Additionally, development within/adjacent to existing settlements would support those centres.</p> <p>A new settlement may provide the critical mass to support the development of new employment opportunities and the provision of new schools, subject to the location of development.</p>

**Uncertainties**

- The exact location is not known at this stage.
- The exact quantum of growth is not known at this stage.

**Mitigation**

- None identified.

**Assumptions**

- None identified.

**Uncertainties**

- The type and scale of employment land to be delivered is unknown at this stage.
- The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market) and the recruitment policies of prospective employers.

<b>One new settlement (outside Green Belt), one large SUE adjacent Kirkby/Sutton and smaller sites in/adjacent existing settlements, including moderate Green Belt release in Hucknall and Rurals</b> <b>i. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE</b> <b>ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.</b>			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
			<p>Several schools in with Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Sutton in Ashfield and Hucknall are at, or above, capacity. Smaller developments are unlikely to drive substantial developer contributions to the provision of school places. The District suffers from poor educational attainment but the option may support greater attainment levels as a new settlement may generate demand for a new school or improve capacity at existing schools.</p> <p>Development under each sub-option would help support access to employment opportunities and is considered to have minor positive effects on achievement of this objective.</p>
<b>16. Economy</b> To Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy.	+	+	<p>The option would support economic investment in the District's main employment centres of Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton in Ashfield. Focussing development within one new settlement and one SUE and providing additional growth in existing settlements would support ongoing economic investment.</p> <p>For the areas identified as possible areas for new settlements, Cauldwell Road (West of Stonehills Plantation) is in relatively close proximity to employment areas at Summit Park and Coxmoor Road. A new settlement here would provide access to these existing employment areas.</p> <p>Development within the A38/M1 corridor may support out commuting to Nottingham however it is also likely to support existing economic investment in these employment areas, aiding greater self-containment in the District. The Sutton Parkway SUE site is located close to Lowmoor Business Park and sub-option 1 may present opportunities for enhancement of employment opportunities in this location.</p> <p>Both sub-options have been assessed as having minor positive effects on achievement of this objective. However, the magnitude of these positive effects is uncertain.</p>
<b>17. Town Centres</b> Increase the vitality and viability of	+	+	<p>This provision of growth is likely to support the vitality and vibrancy of Sutton/Kirkby town centres. The Retail &amp; Leisure Study (2016) identified that Sutton town centre is relatively healthy and performing moderately well in terms of vacancies and that Kirkby performs an important role and has seen a decline in the number of vacant retail units in recent years. The Council is currently in the process of updating the retail study. Each sub-option would support these centres through</p>

<b>One new settlement (outside Green Belt), one large SUE adjacent Kirkby/Sutton and smaller sites in/adjacent existing settlements, including moderate Green Belt release in Hucknall and Rurals</b>			
<b>i. Sub-option 1 considers Sutton Parkway as SUE</b> <b>ii. Sub-option 2 considers Mowlands as SUE.</b>			
SA Objective	Score (i)	Score (ii)	Commentary
Ashfield's town centres.			<p>the development of a SUE. However, the links to these centres would be important. The potential for smaller sites within or adjacent to Hucknall would also support this centre but to a lesser degree.</p> <p>A new settlement may provide the critical mass to support the development of a new centre or could be likely to support the vitality and viability of other town centres, subject to the location of development. A new centre would be largely self-contained.</p> <p>Each sub-option is considered to perform similarly against this objective with minor positive effects considered likely.</p>
			<p><b>Uncertainties</b> The exact location of development and links to town centres.</p>

## 6 Two large SUEs

Two SUEs adjacent Kirkby/Sutton with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent existing settlements, with moderate Green Belt release.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
<p><b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Ashfield.</p>	<p>++/- ?</p>	<p>This strategic option will support housing delivery across the District with two sustainable urban extensions (SUE) adjacent to Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield and smaller sites within and adjacent to existing settlements. This option would help meet the housing needs of Kirkby-Ashfield, Sutton in Ashfield, and the existing settlements. This option would support delivery of the requirements set out in the Housing Need Study, which identifies the different housing needs of particular groups in the District.</p> <p>Housing delivery has declined in recent years with total net completions of Class C3, dwelling houses in 2017/18 (397), 2018/19 (300), 2019/20 (173), 2020/21 (265), 2021/22 (412) and 2022/23 (351) well below those experienced in 2015/16 (558) and 2016/17 (544). Potentially, this option could lead to an over reliance on delivery of housing within the two SUE's adjacent to Kirkby/Sutton given development lead in times, which may be particularly apparent in the short term. This would potentially impact on the ability to meet the specific needs of these communities in the short term. However, the identification of a range of smaller sites within and adjacent to existing settlements would help to meet immediate housing needs as development would be less reliant on longer lead-in times and the provision of infrastructure. Additionally, development in these locations would support the delivery of housing in existing sustainable settlements.</p> <p>The development could provide greater ability to deliver affordable housing, particularly so for the two SUE's. However, the areas of Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield are recognised as having lower viability for affordable housing than Hucknall and settlements in the rural areas. Smaller sites in existing settlements in these locations, with associated Green Belt release, may therefore support enhanced delivery of affordable housing. Average incomes in Ashfield suggest two thirds of households with a current need are estimated to be likely to have insufficient income to afford market housing, highlighting the importance of provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>This option is considered to have mixed significant positive and minor negative effects on achievement of this objective, although some uncertainty remains.</p>
<p><b>2. Health</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.</p>	<p>+/-</p>	<p>The health of people in Ashfield is generally worse than the England average. Life expectancy is lower than the UK average, but has improved over the last ten years in line with the England average.</p> <p>There is potential for the construction and operation of new development to have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents near development sites and along transport routes within the District. Effects may include, for example, stress related to disturbance, noise and vibration and respiratory problems exacerbated by construction traffic emissions and dust.</p>

Two SUEs adjacent Kirkby/Sutton with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent existing settlements, with moderate Green Belt release.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>The development of two SUEs would support opportunities for the integration of open space and green infrastructure. SUEs at Sutton Parkway and Mowlands would provide opportunities for improvements to health provision, large areas of open space and improved green infrastructure routes. Smaller sites within and adjacent to existing settlements will provide some open space and improved linkages to green infrastructure (dependent on scale).</p> <p>Development within the District's existing settlements is likely to reduce the need to travel by car and encourage walking/cycling as services and employment opportunities would be more physically accessible. This is expected to generate a positive effect in relation to the promotion of healthy lifestyles.</p> <p>This option may also maximise the potential for increased investment in existing and new facilities, particularly in Kirkby and Sutton in Ashfield which have areas that are amongst the most health deprived areas nationally. However, there is a risk that increased demand from new residents may undermine the quality of existing facilities within these already health deprived areas, unless supported by additional investment in services.</p> <p>The option is considered to have mixed minor positive and minor negative effects on achievement of this objective.</p>
<p><b>3.Historic Environment</b> To conserve and enhance Ashfield's historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.</p>	+/- /?	<p>Development under this option has the potential to adversely affect the character of historic assets both in the short term during associated construction activities (e.g. as a result of vibrations) and in the longer term once development is complete (e.g. due to the built form of new development affecting the setting of the historic assets).</p> <p>Development may have a direct impact on cultural heritage features where it involves the loss of, or alteration to, assets or indirect adverse effects on their settings. In this context, there are a number of designated cultural heritage assets within and in close proximity to Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield and other existing settlements.</p> <p>Assets close to Mowlands include three scheduled monuments, a number of Grade II listed buildings and the Kirkby Cross Conservation Area. Sutton Parkway is less sensitive with no historic assets in its vicinity.</p> <p>A number of the existing settlements also include conservation areas including Sutton in Ashfield Church &amp; Market Place and at Hucknall. Additionally, there are a range of listed buildings. There is the potential for these assets, or their settings, to be adversely affected by new development, although this will be dependent on the exact type, location and design of new development which is uncertain at this stage. Delivering a large number of houses in SUEs may lessen effects on other settlements in the District.</p>

Two SUEs adjacent Kirkby/Sutton with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent existing settlements, with moderate Green Belt release.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>Locating new development near these assets may increase the accessibility of prospective residents to them, generating a potentially positive effect on this objective. There may also be opportunities for heritage-led development, which could serve to protect and enhance areas or buildings of historical, archaeological and cultural value, and potentially to enhance the setting of assets (for example, through the sensitive redevelopment of brownfield sites). The potential scale of development associated with a new settlement could result in significant positive effects, for example with good design enhancing the setting of existing heritage assets.</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having a mixed positive and negative effect on this objective. As noted above, the proximity of Mowlands to heritage assets has the potential for greater negative effects. However, the magnitude is uncertain.</p>
<p><b>4.Community Safety</b> To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.</p>	0	<p>The spatial strategic options are not considered to influence the ability to improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. The ability to do so depends on the inclusion of design features such as natural surveillance, appropriate lighting and shared spaces. These factors can only be determined through detailed design at the masterplanning/planning application stage and therefore the strategic options for the distribution of growth in the District are not considered to have an effect on this objective.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the option has a neutral effect on this objective.</p>
<p><b>5.Social Inclusion Deprivation</b> To improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield.</p>	+	<p>Ashfield, ranked at 68th out of 326 local authority areas, performs poorly in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2019).</p> <p>There are significant pockets of deprivation within Ashfield. The development of two SUEs would lead to the integration of some facilities and services within new development, including green infrastructure and open space, with potential for a primary school dependent on size. However, some reliance would be placed on existing provision. The scale of a SUE site would ensure developer contributions to support new delivery/enhanced provision elsewhere within Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton-in-Ashfield.</p> <p>More broadly, the development of smaller sites within/adjacent to existing settlements has the potential to support services and facilities in existing locations but may not support delivery of enhanced service provision (associated with a critical mass of development) and may not generate sufficient developer contributions.</p>

Two SUEs adjacent Kirkby/Sutton with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent existing settlements, with moderate Green Belt release.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		Overall, this option is considered to have similar minor positive effects on this objective.
<p><b>6. Biodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</b> To conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels and Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</p>	-/?	<p>There are no internationally designated conservation sites within the District although there is a possible potential SPA (ppSPA) for Sherwood Forest, which is recognised as being important for breeding woodlark and Nightjar, in the south and east of the District.</p> <p>There are nine SSSIs across Ashfield including Kirkby Grives SSSI to the south of Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Annesley Woodhouse Quarries SSSI and Bogs Farm SSSI west of Annesley Woodhouse. These are south of the location of the Mowlands SUE. Sutton Parkway is not close to any SSSIs. There are several tracts of ancient woodland, including to the west of the potential Mowlands SUE location. There are also a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) across the District and four Local Nature Reserves (LNR). A number of LWS are located adjacent to existing settlements, including within the vicinity of Mowlands SUE, and adjacent to Hucknall, Selston and Underwood.</p> <p>In consequence, there is the potential for indirect adverse effects on these sites associated with new development (for example, disturbance arising from increased recreational activity and wild bird and mammal loss from cat predation). The precise location of any new settlement would determine effects on biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>The option would see the loss of greenfield land through the development of two SUEs, and through moderate Green Belt release (which is assumed to be overwhelmingly comprised of green field land) with development within and adjacent to existing settlements, which is also expected to largely comprise greenfield land. However, the development of smaller sites within existing settlements may also support the re-use of brownfield sites which may minimise direct and indirect risks to designated sites, and potentially provide biodiversity gains.</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having a negative effect on this objective due to the potential for adverse effects on adjacent designated sites, and the loss of habitats from the use of greenfield land (including moderate green belt releases), although uncertainty remains with regard to the exact type, magnitude and duration of effects.</p>
<p><b>7.Landscape</b> To protect enhance and manage the</p>	+/--	<p>The option would see two SUEs and additional moderate Green Belt release at existing settlements. The Green Belt covers approximately 41% of the District, covering the majority of the District's area extending from Kirkby-in-Ashfield southwards, reflecting the proximity to Nottingham. The SUEs would not include</p>

Two SUEs adjacent Kirkby/Sutton with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent existing settlements, with moderate Green Belt release.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
<p>character and appearance of Ashfield's landscape /townscape, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place.</p>		<p>Green Belt land, however, there could be moderate release elsewhere in the District, including with the settlements in the Rural Area and around Hucknall.</p> <p>The development of a SUE would see the take up of land that currently contributes to the landscape around Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton in Ashfield.</p> <p>The development of SUEs would provide a substantial encroachment into the countryside and surrounding landscape. However, a new settlement and/or SUE would also provide scope for integrated and well-designed landscape mitigation measures to address impact and could be significant, subject to the scale of development. Such mitigation should include existing hedgerows and trees where possible.</p> <p>The option would support development within existing settlements. There is potential for new development to enhance the quality of the built environment and improve townscapes (subject to more detailed policies on design contained within the Local Plan).</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that this option would have minor positive and significant negative effects on the achievement of this objective. However, the extent to which negative effects are experienced is dependent on the location of development and the scale of growth proposed.</p>
<p><b>8.Natural Resources</b> To minimise the loss of natural resources including soils, greenfield land and the best quality agricultural land.</p>	+ / --	<p>This option would require the development of greenfield land to enable the SUEs and some moderate Green Belt release.</p> <p>Within the location of Mowlands the agricultural land is primarily Grade 2 (very good) and for Sutton Parkway the land is primarily Grade 3 (although it is not possible to determine where this is 3a or 3b). There are pockets of Grade 2 and Grade 3 land in other locations in the district.</p> <p>Although it would be expected that new development in existing settlements would be dependent to some extent on the release of greenfield, there would be opportunities to redevelop brownfield land. The extent of such positive effects would be dependent on the sites identified and is uncertain at this stage.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that the option would have a mix of minor positive and significant negative effects on the achievement of this objective.</p>



Two SUEs adjacent Kirkby/Sutton with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent existing settlements, with moderate Green Belt release.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
<p><b>9. Air &amp; noise pollution</b> To reduce air pollution and the proportion of the local population subject to noise pollution.</p>	+/-	<p>There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within Ashfield.</p> <p>There is the potential for the construction and operation of new development to have negative effects on noise and air quality due to emissions generated from plant and HGV movements during construction and increased vehicle movements during operation. Focusing development in SUEs would help to localise such effects in contrast to dispersed development.</p> <p>To be sustainable, the SUEs would be expected to provide a degree of self-sufficiency (in terms of the provision of new facilities), opportunities for walking/cycling infrastructure, and would also be well-connected to the existing settlement, to minimise the generation of localised road trips.</p> <p>However, despite the above measures, it is likely, due to continuation of existing travel to work patterns, that localised congestion is likely to increase and will be associated with emissions.</p> <p>A mix of minor positive and minor negative effects on achievement of this objective are considered likely.</p>
<p><b>10. Water Quality</b> To conserve and improve water quality and quantity.</p>	-	<p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) indicated water resources in the East Midlands are significantly constrained with little opportunity to develop new water resource schemes.</p> <p>The shortfall identified in the Watercycle Study (of water supply) is also identified in the more recent Severn Trent Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP, 2019) within the Nottinghamshire Water Resource Zone but the WRMP19 proposes a range of demand and supply measures to ensure sufficient water resources can be maintained up to 2025 (and in outline up to 2030). The draft Water Resource Management Plan 2024 (2022) sets out what is planned between 2025 and 2085 to address water pressures. Ashfield sits in an area under serious water stress as identified by the Environment Agency (Water stressed areas – final classification 2021).</p> <p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) notes that there are no capacity constraints at Ashfield's Wastewater Treatment Works.</p> <p>Ashfield sits on principal and secondary aquifers so the need to protect groundwaters is particularly important, but it is not considered that the strategic spatial options would have an effect, subject to effective measures being put in place during the development process.</p>

Two SUEs adjacent Kirkby/Sutton with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent existing settlements, with moderate Green Belt release.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		Overall, this option is considered to have minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective.
<b>11.Waste</b> To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials.	-	<p>New development will result in increased resource use and the generation of waste in both the short-term during construction and in the longer term once development is complete. However, the specific impacts will depend on arrangements made for recycling and composting and there may also be opportunities for re-use of construction waste, for example with the potential scale of development associated with the two SUE's.</p> <p>All strategic options will increase waste generation and have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective.</p>
<b>10. Climate Change and Flood Risk</b> To adapt to climate change by reducing and manage the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to people, property and the environment.	0/?	<p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2023) identifies that the District has a relatively low risk of flooding from watercourses although some properties in Hucknall and Jacksdale are at risk. Flood risk is mainly away from the urban areas. However, it is recognised that additional water in the River Leen could cause flood issues for Nottingham to the south.</p> <p>Both Mowlands and Sutton Parkway are located in Flood Zone 1. Development in the existing settlements would be dependent on location as to the extent of any effects on flood risk.</p> <p>The loss of any greenfield land under this option could lead to an increased risk of flooding (as a result of the increase in impermeable surfaces). However, it can be reasonably assumed that new development proposals which may result in an increase in flood risk will be accompanied by an FRA and incorporate suitable flood alleviation measures (e.g. SuDS) thereby minimising the risk of flooding.</p> <p>There may be opportunities as part of new development proposals to enhance existing, or incorporate new, green infrastructure which could potentially have a positive effect on this objective by providing space for flood waters to flow through and additional areas for future flood storage.</p> <p>Overall, this option is considered to have neutral effects. However, there is some uncertainty dependent on the location of development.</p>
<b>13.Climate Change and Energy Efficiency</b>	+/-	<p>Development of two SUEs could support the integration of low carbon and renewable energies through, for example, the integration of combined heat and power networks. There is also greater scope to orientate development to maximise solar gain due to scale, siting options and design opportunities. The</p>

Two SUEs adjacent Kirkby/Sutton with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent existing settlements, with moderate Green Belt release.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
To adapt to climate change by minimise energy usage and to develop Ashfield's renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.		<p>development could also support green infrastructure with walking and cycling links that reduces the need to travel by private car, thereby supporting a smaller increase in carbon emissions.</p> <p>Development within and adjoining existing settlements can reinforce existing patterns of travel which can continue current vehicle emission trends.</p> <p>Small site development may reduce the potential for developer contributions to provide public transport links, in contrast to the SUEs. However, the promotion of additional sites within settlements would provide access to existing suitable public transport routes (where available).</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having a mix of positive and negative effects.</p>
<p><b>14.Travel and Accessibility</b> To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys.</p>	+/-	<p>The development of two SUEs could support the planned integration of walking and cycling routes which would support sustainable transport methods. SUEs adjacent to Kirkby/Sutton may support greater connectivity through rail transport, given the proximity to stations on the Robin Hood Line, dependent on how the SUE is integrated and connected with the station. This would support accessibility of Nottingham. The Mowlands sub-option is located in proximity to industrial areas north of the A38.</p> <p>A new settlement may provide the critical mass to support the development of new public transport infrastructure and links, for example new railways stations and bus stops, subject to the location of development.</p> <p>The delivery of a range of smaller sites within existing settlements would have less ability for provision of sustainable travel measures. However, dependent on the specific location, development could take place in close proximity to existing community facilities, services and employment opportunities and be reasonably well connected to the existing public transport network. Development within these areas may also help to maintain existing, and (potentially) stimulate investment in, public transport provision. However, smaller developments are unlikely to generate substantial contributions to public transport provision and may not allow integration of walking/cycling route to services and facilities.</p> <p>Overall, this option is expected to have a mix of minor positive and minor negative effects on this objective.</p>
<p><b>15.Employment</b> To create high quality</p>	+	<p>The development option would support investment within the District, through construction Activities in the short term and through the provision of new jobs in the District and supporting housing in the long term.</p>

Two SUEs adjacent Kirkby/Sutton with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent existing settlements, with moderate Green Belt release.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
employment opportunities including opportunities for increased learn and skills to meet the needs of the District.		<p>The majority of employment in the District is located in Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton in Ashfield and Sherwood Business Park off Junction 27 of the M1. More limited employment opportunities are found to the area west of the M1 (Selston, Jacksdale, Underwood and Bagthorpe). Development would support employment centres of Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton-in-Ashfield through SUE development. Potentially, development adjacent to Kirkby would support greater access to the M1 corridor. Additionally, development within/adjacent to existing settlements would support those centres.</p> <p>Several schools in with Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Sutton-in-Ashfield and Hucknall are at, or above, capacity. Smaller developments are unlikely to drive substantial developer contributions to the provision of school places. The District suffers from poor educational attainment and the option is unlikely to support greater attainment levels.</p> <p>Development under each sub-option would help support access to employment opportunities and is considered to have minor positive effects on achievement of this objective.</p>
<p><b>16. Economy</b> To Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy.</p>	+	<p>The option would support economic investment in the District's main employment centres of Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton-in-Ashfield. Focussing development within two SUEs and providing additional growth in existing settlements would support ongoing economic investment.</p> <p>Development within the A38/M1 corridor may support out commuting to Nottingham however it is also likely to support existing economic investment in these employment areas, aiding greater self-containment in the District. The Sutton Parkway SUE site is located close to Lowmoor Business Park and development of a SUE adjacent to Kirkby may present opportunities for enhancement of employment opportunities in this location.</p> <p>Both sub-options have been assessed as having minor positive effects on achievement of this objective. However, the magnitude of these positive effects is uncertain.</p>
<p><b>17. Town Centres</b> Increase the vitality and</p>	+	<p>This option would focus growth in Sutton-in-Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield through two SUEs with other existing settlements accommodating smaller sites within and adjacent to settlements. This provision of growth is likely to support the vitality and vibrancy of Sutton/Kirkby town centres. The Retail &amp; Leisure</p>

Two SUEs adjacent Kirkby/Sutton with smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent existing settlements, with moderate Green Belt release.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
viability of Ashfield's town centres.		<p>Study (2016) identified that Sutton town centre is relatively healthy and performing moderately well in terms of vacancies and that Kirkby performs an important role and has seen a decline in the number of vacant retail units in recent years. The council is currently in the process of updating the retail study. Each sub-option would support these centres through the development of a SUE. However, the links to these centres would be important. The potential for smaller sites within or adjacent to Hucknall would also support this centre but to a lesser degree. There would also be support for Selston for additional development.</p> <p>A new settlement may provide the critical mass to support the development of a new town centre or could be likely to support the vitality and viability of other town centres, subject to the location of development.</p> <p>Each sub-option is considered to perform similarly against this objective with minor positive effects considered likely.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exact location of development and links to town centres.</li> </ul>

## 7 One new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt

One new settlement (46pprox.. 3,000 dwgs) in Hucknall's Green Belt and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby, and moderate Green Belt release adjoining existing rural settlement.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
<p><b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Ashfield.</p>	<p>++/ ?</p>	<p>This strategic option will support housing delivery across the District with one new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt and smaller sites within and adjacent to Sutton in Ashfield and Kirkby-in-Ashfield and adjoining existing rural settlement. This option would help met the housing needs of Kirkby-Ashfield, Sutton in Ashfield, and the existing rural settlements. This option would support delivery of the requirements set out in the Housing Need Study, which identifies the different housing needs of particular groups in the District.</p> <p>Housing delivery has declined in recent years with total net completions of Class C3, dwelling houses in 2017/18 (397), 2018/19 (300), 2019/20 (173), 2020/21 (265), 2021/22 (412) and 2022/23 (351) well below those experienced in 2015/16 (558) and 2016/17 (544). The option would heavily rely on delivery in one new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt (around two thirds of the 3,000 dwgs to be delivered in the plan period). The new settlement would be dependent on delivery of infrastructure which could lead to a longer lead-in time between adoption of the Local Plan and delivery on the ground. However, the identification of a range of smaller sites within and adjacent to existing settlements would help to meet immediate housing needs as development would be less reliant on longer lead-in times and the provision of infrastructure. Additionally, development in these locations would support the delivery of housing in existing sustainable settlements.</p> <p>The development could provide greater ability to deliver affordable housing, particularly so for the one new settlement as the areas of Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield are recognised as having lower viability for affordable housing than Hucknall and settlements in the rural areas. Smaller sites in existing settlements in these locations, with associated Green Belt release, may therefore support enhanced delivery of affordable housing. Average incomes in Ashfield suggest two thirds of households with a current need are estimated to be likely to have insufficient income to afford market housing, highlighting the importance of provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>This option is considered to have significant positive effects on achievement of this objective, with some uncertainty over the lead in time for a new settlement and how this may impact on housing delivery in the early years of the plan period.</p>
<p><b>2. Health</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.</p>	<p>+/- /?</p>	<p>The health of people in Ashfield is generally worse than the England average. Life expectancy is lower than the UK average, but has improved over the last ten years in line with the England average.</p> <p>There is potential for the construction and operation of new development to have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents near development sites and along transport routes within the District.</p>

One new settlement (46pprox.. 3,000 dwgs) in Hucknall's Green Belt and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby, and moderate Green Belt release adjoining existing rural settlement.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>Effects may include, for example, stress related to disturbance, noise and vibration and respiratory problems exacerbated by construction traffic emissions and dust.</p> <p>The development a new settlement would support opportunities for the integration of open space and green infrastructure, which could be significant given the scale of development. Development of smaller sites at Sutton/Kirkby may provide opportunities for improvements to health provision, areas of open space and improved green infrastructure routes. Smaller sites within and adjacent to existing settlements will provide some open space and improved linkages to green infrastructure (dependent on scale).</p> <p>Development within the District's existing settlements is likely to reduce the need to travel by car and encourage walking/cycling as services and employment opportunities would be more physically accessible. This is expected to generate a positive effect in relation to the promotion of healthy lifestyles. The potential scale of development associated with a new settlement could result in significant positive effects. However, there is some uncertainty around the magnitude of such effects.</p> <p>This option may also maximise the potential for increased investment in existing and new facilities, particularly in Kirkby and Sutton-in-Ashfield which have areas that are amongst the most health deprived areas nationally. However, there is a risk that increased demand from new residents may undermine the quality of existing facilities within these already health deprived areas, unless supported by additional investment in services.</p> <p>The option is considered to have mixed minor positive and minor negative effects on achievement of this objective.</p>
<p><b>3.Historic Environment</b> To conserve and enhance Ashfield's historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.</p>	+/- /?	<p>Development under this option has the potential to adversely affect the character of historic assets both in the short term during associated construction activities (e.g. as a result of vibrations) and in the longer term once development is complete (e.g. due to the built form of new development affecting the setting of the historic assets).</p> <p>There are a number of heritage assets within and in close proximity to Hucknall and also in close proximity to Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield and other existing settlements. Hucknall includes a conservation area and a number of listed buildings. Assets close to Kirkby include three scheduled monuments, a number of Grade II listed buildings and the Kirkby Cross Conservation Area. Sutton has a number of Grade II listed buildings and the Sutton in Ashfield Church &amp; Market Place Conservation Area. Additionally, there are a range of listed buildings and Conservation Areas across the existing settlements.</p>

One new settlement (46 approx. 3,000 dwgs) in Hucknall's Green Belt and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby, and moderate Green Belt release adjoining existing rural settlement.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>Assets, or their settings, to be adversely affected by new development although the 3,000 new dwellings settlement area itself only includes one locally listed building and no designated heritage assets. Any effects will be dependent on the exact type, location and design of new development which is uncertain at this stage. There could also be negative effects on heritage assets in rural settlements subject to the precise location of development.</p> <p>Locating new development near these assets may increase the accessibility of prospective residents to them, generating a potentially positive effect on this objective. There may also be opportunities for heritage-led development, which could serve to protect and enhance areas or buildings of historical, archaeological and cultural value, and potentially to enhance the setting of assets (for example, through the sensitive redevelopment of brownfield sites). The potential scale of development associated with a new settlement could result in significant positive effects, for example with good design there is the potential for these enhancing the setting of existing heritage assets.</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having a mixed positive and negative effect on this objective. As noted above, the proximity of Hucknall and Kirkby to heritage assets has the potential for greater negative effects. However, the magnitude is uncertain.</p>
<p><b>4. Community Safety</b> To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.</p>	0	<p>The spatial strategic options are not considered to influence the ability to improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. The ability to do so depends on the inclusion of design features such as natural surveillance, appropriate lighting and shared spaces. These factors can only be determined through detailed design at the masterplanning/planning application stage and therefore the strategic options for the distribution of growth in the District are not considered to have an effect on this objective.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the option has a neutral effect on this objective.</p>
<p><b>5. Social Inclusion Deprivation</b> To improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas</p>	+	<p>Ashfield, ranked at 68<sup>th</sup> out of 326 local authority areas, performs poorly in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2019).</p> <p>There are significant pockets of deprivation within Ashfield. The development of a new settlement would lead to the integration of some facilities and services within the new development, including green infrastructure and open space, with potential for a primary school dependent on size. However, some reliance would likely</p>



One new settlement (46pprox.. 3,000 dwgs) in Hucknall's Green Belt and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby, and moderate Green Belt release adjoining existing rural settlement.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
and the rest of Ashfield.		<p>still be placed on existing provision. The scale of the new settlement would ensure developer contributions to support new delivery (potentially on site)/enhanced provision elsewhere within Hucknall.</p> <p>Smaller sites in or adjoining Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton in Ashfield may lead to the provision of new facilities and services at a smaller scale. Additionally, the scale of development with smaller sites may support potential for affordable housing (albeit likely at a smaller scale) in an area with poor viability.</p> <p>More broadly, the development of smaller sites within/adjacent to existing settlements has the potential to support services and facilities in existing locations but may not support delivery of enhanced service provision (associated with a critical mass of development) and may not generate sufficient developer contributions.</p> <p>Overall, this option is considered to have minor positive effects on this objective.</p>
<p><b>6. Biodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</b></p> <p>To conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels and Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</p>	<p>+/-</p> <p>R</p>	<p>There are no internationally designated conservation sites within the District although there is a possible potential SPA (ppSPA) for Sherwood Forest, which is recognised as being important for breeding woodlark and Nightjar, in the south and east of the District.</p> <p>There are nine SSSIs across Ashfield including Bulwell Wood and Seller Wood, both of which are located in close proximity of Hucknall. Elsewhere in the District, there is Kirkby Grives SSSI to the south of Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Annesley Woodhouse Quarries SSSI and Bogs Farm SSSI west of Annesley Woodhouse and to the south of Kirkby in Ashfield.</p> <p>There are several tracts of ancient woodland in the District. There are also a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) across the District and four Local Nature Reserves (LNR). A number of LWS are located adjacent to existing settlements, including those of Hucknall, Selston and Underwood and near to some of the areas identified as possible areas for new settlement. The new settlement location is in close proximity to an area of woodland identified in the ppSPA.</p> <p>In consequence, there is the potential for indirect adverse effects on these sites associated with new development (for example, disturbance arising from increased recreational activity and wild bird and mammal loss from cat predation). The precise location of any new settlement would determine effects on biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>The option would see the loss of greenfield land through the development of a new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt (assumed to be overwhelmingly comprised of greenfield land), smaller sites in/adjoining Sutton</p>

**Uncertainties**

- The type and mix of housing, including is unknown at this stage.

**Mitigation**

- Local Plan policies should seek to avoid negative effects on biodiversity and support enhancement where possible.
- Careful consideration should be given to the selection of site allocations to avoid adverse effects on nationally and locally designated sites with mitigation identified.
- ppSPA – Apply any mitigation measured agreed with Natural England.
- Local Plan policies should support a network of green infrastructure assets linked to existing and new development.

**Assumptions**

- It is assumed new development would not be located on designated conservation sites.
- It is assumed that the value of previously developed land is less than greenfield land.

**Uncertainties**

- The exact location of future growth.

One new settlement (46pprox.. 3,000 dwgs) in Hucknall's Green Belt and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby, and moderate Green Belt release adjoining existing rural settlement.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>and Kirkby, and through moderate Green Belt release (which is also assumed to be overwhelmingly comprised of green field land) with development adjoining existing rural settlements, which is also expected to largely comprise greenfield land. However, the development of smaller sites within existing settlements may also support the re-use of brownfield sites which may minimise direct and indirect risks to designated sites, and potentially provide biodiversity gains.</p> <p>This option has been assessed as having a mix of minor positive, significant negative and uncertain effects on this objective due to the potential for adverse effects on adjacent designated sites, and the loss of habitats from the use of greenfield land (including moderate green belt releases). However, uncertainty remains with regard to the exact type, magnitude and duration of effects. Minor positive effects are identified through the potential for the new settlement to provide biodiversity and green infrastructure enhancements.</p>
<p><b>7.Landscape</b> To protect enhance and manage the character and appearance of Ashfield's landscape /townscape, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place.</p>	+ / --	<p>The option would see development of a new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt, smaller sites in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby and additional moderate Green Belt release adjoining existing rural settlements. The Green Belt covers approximately 41% of the District, covering the majority of the District's area extending from Kirkby-in-Ashfield southwards, reflecting the proximity to Nottingham. The new settlement would see the development of approximately 3,000 new dwellings in Hucknall's Green Belt and moderate release elsewhere in the District adjoining existing rural settlements. One of the areas identified as a possible area for new settlements (area 4 South Mansfield Road) is noted as being a strong, attractive rural landscape.</p> <p>The development of smaller sites in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby would see the take up of land that currently contributes to the landscape around these towns, although there may be potential for some landscape mitigation measures to address any negative</p> <p>The development of a new settlement would provide a substantial encroachment into the countryside and surrounding landscape and would result in loss of a sizeable amount of Green Belt land around Hucknall. However, a new settlement would also provide scope for integrated and well-designed landscape mitigation measures to address impact and could be significant, subject to the scale and location of development. Such mitigation should include existing hedgerows and trees where possible.</p> <p>The option would support development adjoining existing rural settlements. There is potential for new development to enhance the quality of the built environment and improve townscapes (subject to more detailed policies on design contained within the Local Plan).</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that this option would have minor positive and significant negative effects on the achievement of this objective, reflecting loss of Green Belt land and scale of landscape effects associated with</p>

One new settlement (46pprox.. 3,000 dwgs) in Hucknall's Green Belt and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby, and moderate Green Belt release adjoining existing rural settlement.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		the development of a new settlement, and development of smaller sites and the moderate Green Belt elsewhere. However, the extent to which negative effects are experienced is dependent on the location of development and the scale of growth proposed.
<b>8.Natural Resources</b> To minimise the loss of natural resources including soils, greenfield land and the best quality agricultural land.	+/-	<p>This option would require the development of greenfield land to enable the development of a new settlement at Hucknall, development of smaller sites in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby and adjoining existing rural settlements.</p> <p>Around Hucknall there is Grade 2 and Grade 3 agricultural land (although it is not possible to determine if this is 3a or 3b). Within the location of Kirkby, the agricultural land is primarily Grade 2 (very good) and for Sutton the land is primarily Grade 3 (although it is not possible to determine where this is 3a or 3b). Depending on the precise location of the new settlement, there could be significant negative effects on agricultural land.</p> <p>Although it would be expected that new development in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby would be dependent to some extent on the release of greenfield, there would be opportunities to redevelop brownfield land. The extent of such positive effects would be dependent on the sites identified and is uncertain at this stage. Moderate Green Belt release adjoining existing rural settlements would be likely to see the development of greenfield land and potentially high-quality agricultural land.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the option would have a mix of significant negative and minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective.</p>
<b>9.Air &amp; noise pollution</b> To reduce air pollution and the proportion of the local population subject to noise pollution.	+/-	<p>There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within Ashfield.</p> <p>There is the potential for the construction and operation of new development to have negative effects on noise and air quality due to emissions generated from plant and HGV movements during construction and increased vehicle movements during operation, which could be significant associated with the development of a new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt. Focusing development in one large new settlement would help to minimise the effects on the wider environment.</p> <p>To be sustainable, the new settlement would be expected to provide a degree of self-sufficiency (in terms of the provision of new facilities), opportunities for walking/cycling infrastructure, and would also be well-connected to other settlements by sustainable transport modes, to minimise the generation of localised road trips.</p>

One new settlement (46pprox.. 3,000 dwgs) in Hucknall's Green Belt and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby, and moderate Green Belt release adjoining existing rural settlement.			
SA Objective	Score	Commentary	
		<p>However, despite the above measures, it is likely, due to continuation of existing travel to work patterns, that localised congestion is likely to increase and will be associated with emissions.</p> <p>Focusing development adjacent to existing rural settlements would support services/facilities in these locations. However, congestion is likely to increase, and the reality of rural growth would be reliance upon the car as primary means of travel.</p> <p>A mix of minor positive and minor negative effects on achievement of this objective are considered likely.</p>	<p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The exact location of future development is uncertain at this stage.</li> <li>The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>
<p><b>10. Water Quality</b> To conserve and improve water quality and quantity.</p>	-	<p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) indicated water resources in the East Midlands are significantly constrained with little opportunity to develop new water resource schemes.</p> <p>The shortfall identified in the Watercycle Study (of water supply) is also identified in the more recent Severn Trent Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP, 2019) within the Nottinghamshire Water Resource Zone but the WRMP19 proposes a range of demand and supply measures to ensure sufficient water resources can be maintained up to 2025 (and in outline up to 2030). The draft Water Resource Management Plan 2024 (2022) sets out what is planned between 2025 and 2085 to address water pressures. Ashfield sits in an area under serious water stress as identified by the Environment Agency (Water stressed areas – final classification 2021).</p> <p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) notes that there are no capacity constraints at Ashfield's Wastewater Treatment Works.</p> <p>Ashfield sits on principal and secondary aquifers so the need to protect groundwaters is particularly important, but it is not considered that the strategic spatial options would have an effect, subject to effective measures being put in place during the development process.</p> <p>Overall, this option is considered to have minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan policies should support water efficiency measures, the implementation of SuDs, and wastewater treatment capacity enhancements where necessary.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New development will increase water use</li> <li>The Council will continue to liaise with Severn Trent Water regarding infrastructure requirements.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The exact location of developments and the potential impact on waterbodies is uncertain.</li> <li>The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is currently unknown.</li> </ul>
<p><b>11. Waste</b> To minimise waste and increase the re-use and</p>	-	<p>New development will result in increased resource use and the generation of waste in both the short-term during construction and in the longer term once development is complete. However, the specific impacts will depend on arrangements made for recycling and composting and there may also be opportunities for re-use of construction waste, for example with the potential scale of development associated with a new settlement.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan policies should support opportunities to reduce/recycle waste.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified.</li> </ul>

One new settlement (46pprox.. 3,000 dwgs) in Hucknall's Green Belt and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby, and moderate Green Belt release adjoining existing rural settlement.			
SA Objective	Score	Commentary	
recycling of waste materials.		All strategic options will increase waste generation and have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective.	<b>Uncertainties</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul>
<b>12. Climate Change and Flood Risk</b> To adapt to climate change by reducing and manage the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to people, property and the environment.	0/?	<p>The majority of the land around Hucknall is flood zone 1, although there are some small areas of flood zones 2 and 3. There is some flood zone 3 land to the East of Sutton, with other surrounding areas flood zone 1. Kirkby is in flood zone 1. Development adjoining existing rural settlements would be dependent on location as to the extent of any effects on flood risk.</p> <p>The loss of any greenfield land under this option could lead to an increased risk of flooding (as a result of the increase in impermeable surfaces). However, it can be reasonably assumed that new development proposals which may result in an increase in flood risk will be accompanied by an FRA and incorporate suitable flood alleviation measures (e.g. SuDS) thereby minimising the risk of flooding.</p> <p>There may be opportunities as part of new development proposals to enhance existing, or incorporate new, green infrastructure which could potentially have a positive effect on this objective by providing space for flood waters to flow through and additional areas for future flood storage. This could be significant as part of the development of a new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall, this option is considered to have neutral effects. However, there is some uncertainty dependent on the location of development.</p>	<b>Mitigation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan policies should avoid development in areas of flood risk (i.e. Flood Zones 2 and 3).</li> <li>• Local Plan policies should plan for a network of green infrastructure assets to provide opportunities for flood storage where appropriate.</li> <li>• Local Plan policies should seek to promote as close to greenfield runoff rates as possible.</li> </ul> <b>Assumptions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new settlement would avoid areas at greatest risk of flooding.</li> <li>• It is assumed that FRAs will accompany development proposals where appropriate.</li> <li>• New development will achieve greenfield runoff rates.</li> </ul> <b>Uncertainties</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exact location of development.</li> </ul>
<b>13. Climate Change and Energy Efficiency</b> To adapt to climate change by minimise energy usage and to develop Ashfield's renewable energy	+/-	<p>Development of a new settlement and smaller sites in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby could support the integration of low carbon and renewable energies through, for example, the integration of combined heat and power networks (although the scale of any such opportunities would be more limited on smaller sites). There is also greater scope to orientate development to maximise solar gain. The development could also support green infrastructure with walking and cycling links that reduces the need to travel by private car, thereby supporting a smaller increase in carbon emissions.</p> <p>Development within and adjoining existing settlements can reinforce existing patterns of travel which can continue current vehicle emission trends.</p>	<b>Mitigation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan policies should support the integration of renewable energy in new development.</li> </ul> <b>Assumptions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is assumed that over the plan period there will be a decarbonisation of the electricity</li> </ul>

One new settlement (46 approx.. 3,000 dwgs) in Hucknall's Green Belt and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby, and moderate Green Belt release adjoining existing rural settlement.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.		<p>Small site development may reduce the potential for developer contributions to provide public transport links, in contrast to the new settlement. However, the promotion of sites within settlements would provide access to existing suitable public transport routes (where available).</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having a mix of positive and negative effects.</p>
<p><b>14.Travel and Accessibility</b> To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys.</p>	+ / --	<p>The development of a new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt could support the planned integration of walking and cycling routes which would support sustainable transport methods. Hucknall is a terminus for the Nottingham Express Transport (NET) tram route to Nottingham so a new settlement could support greater connectivity to the tram system. There is also the Robin Hood Railway Line station at Hucknall.</p> <p>Development of smaller sites/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby may support greater connectivity through rail transport, given the proximity to stations on the Robin Hood Line. This would support accessibility of Nottingham. Development of sites in/adjoining Sutton could be located in proximity to industrial areas north of the A38 which would then help to reduce the need to travel for employment.</p> <p>A new settlement may provide the critical mass to support the development of new public transport infrastructure and links, for example new railway stations and bus stops, subject to the location of development. A new settlement would be likely to support improved public transport links and walking/cycling routes.</p> <p>The delivery of a range of smaller sites within existing settlements would have less ability for provision of sustainable travel measures. However, dependent on the specific location, development could take place in close proximity to existing community facilities, services and employment opportunities and be reasonably well connected to the existing public transport network. Development within these areas may also help to maintain existing, and (potentially) stimulate investment in, public transport provision. However, smaller developments are unlikely to generate substantial contributions to public transport provision and may not allow integration of walking/cycling route to services and facilities.</p> <p>Overall, this option is assessed as having minor positive and significant negative effects on this objective.</p>
<p><b>15.Employment</b> To create high quality</p>	+	<p>The development option would support investment within the District, through construction activities in the short term and through the provision of new jobs in the District and supporting housing in the long term.</p>

One new settlement (46pprox.. 3,000 dwgs) in Hucknall's Green Belt and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby, and moderate Green Belt release adjoining existing rural settlement.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
employment opportunities including opportunities for increased learn and skills to meet the needs of the District.		<p>The majority of employment in the District is located in Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton in Ashfield and Sherwood Business Park off Junction 27 of the M1. More limited employment opportunities are found to the area west of the M1 (Selston, Jacksdale, Underwood and Bagthorpe). There is potential for a new settlement at Hucknall to provide new employment opportunities, which could be significant given the scale of development. As part of the Function Economic Market Area for Greater Nottingham there are employment opportunities associated within the wider Greater Nottingham area. Development would support employment centres of Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton in Ashfield through smaller sites development. Potentially, development in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby would support greater access to the M1 corridor. Additionally, development within/adjacent to existing settlements would support those centres.</p> <p>Several schools in with Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Sutton in Ashfield and Hucknall are at, or above, capacity. A new 3,000 dwelling new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt could support the development of a new primary school and would be likely to support an increase in capacity at existing secondary schools. Smaller developments are unlikely to drive substantial developer contributions to the provision of school places. The District suffers from poor educational attainment, but the development of a new settlement may support a new school or upgrades of existing schools and in turn support greater attainment levels.</p> <p>This option would help support access to employment opportunities and is considered to have minor positive effects on achievement of this objective.</p>
<p><b>16. Economy</b> To Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy.</p>	+/?	<p>The option would support economic investment in the District's main employment centres of Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton in Ashfield. Focussing development within one new settlement would support economic investment opportunities with Hucknall and the Greater Nottingham Functional Economic Area. Development in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby provides additional growth in existing settlements and would support ongoing economic investment.</p> <p>Development within the A38/M1 corridor may support out commuting to Nottingham however it is also likely to support existing economic investment in these employment areas, aiding greater self-containment in the District. Development in/adjoining Sutton/Kirkby may present opportunities for enhancement of employment opportunities in this location.</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having minor positive effects on achievement of this objective. However, the magnitude of these positive effects is uncertain.</p>

One new settlement (46pprox.. 3,000 dwgs) in Hucknall's Green Belt and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjointing Sutton and Kirkby, and moderate Green Belt release adjoining existing rural settlement.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
<b>17. Town Centres</b> Increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield's town centres.	++/ +	<p>This option would focus growth in a new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt and in/adjacent Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield and smaller development adjoining existing rural settlements. This provision of growth is likely to support the vitality and vibrancy of Hucknall and Sutton/Kirkby town centres and other smaller development may support local shopping centres/parades, subject to the location of development. The development of 3,000 homes in Hucknall's Green Belt could contribute to significantly increasing the vitality and viability of Hucknall town centre whilst it would include a new retail facilities which would support new communities.</p> <p>The Retail &amp; Leisure Study (2016) identified that Hucknall has a 13.1% vacancy rate, and this has increased since 2011 but that significant rebuilding and redevelopment within the town centre is attributable to these vacancies, Sutton town centre is relatively healthy and performing moderately well in terms of vacancies and that Kirkby performs an important role and has seen a decline in the number of vacant retail units in recent years. However, the links to these centres would be important. The Council is currently in the process of updating the retail study.</p> <p>Overall this option is assessed as having significant positive and minor positive effects reflecting the potential for a new settlement at Hucknall to significantly increase the vitality and viability of its town centre and development in/adjacent Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield to support these centres, and smaller development supporting rural settlements centres.</p>

**Mitigation**

- None identified.

**Assumptions**

- None identified.

**Uncertainties**

The exact location of development and links to town centres.

## 8 Two new settlements

Two new settlements (approx. 1,250 and 1,750 dwgs) and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent Sutton and Kirkby, moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
<b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Ashfield.	++/ ?	<p>This strategic option will support housing delivery across the District with two new settlements and smaller sites within and adjacent to Sutton and Kirkby, moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements. This option would help met the housing needs of Kirkby-Ashfield, Sutton-in-Ashfield, and the existing rural settlements and other areas of the district, subject to the location of the new settlements. This option would</p>

**Mitigation**

- None identified.

**Assumptions**

- None identified.



Two new settlements (approx. 1,250 and 1,750 dwgs) and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent Sutton and Kirkby, moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>support delivery of the requirements set out in the Housing Need Study, which identifies the different housing needs of particular groups in the District.</p> <p>Housing delivery has declined in recent years with total net completions of Class C3, dwelling houses in 2017/18 (397), 2018/19 (300), 2019/20 (173), 2020/21 (265) 2021/22 (412) and 2022/23 (351) well below those experienced in 2015/16 (558) and 2016/17 (544). The proportion of delivery of the total housing requirement within two new settlements is similar to the proportion on one new settlement (Option 7), there is therefore a reliance on the two settlements. As noted previously there are longer lead-in times for delivery of housing within new settlements. However, the identification of a range of smaller sites within and adjacent to existing settlements would help to meet immediate housing needs as development would be less reliant on longer lead-in times and the provision of infrastructure. Additionally, development in these locations would support the delivery of housing in existing sustainable settlements.</p> <p>The development could provide greater ability to deliver affordable housing, particularly so for the two new settlements. However, the areas of Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield are recognised as having lower viability for affordable housing than Hucknall and settlements in the rural areas. Smaller sites in existing settlements in these locations, with associated Green Belt release, may therefore support enhanced delivery of affordable housing. Average incomes in Ashfield suggest two thirds of households with a current need are estimated to be likely to have insufficient income to afford market housing, highlighting the importance of provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>This option is considered to have significant positive effects on achievement of this objective, with some uncertainty over the lead in time for the development of two new settlements and how this may impact on housing delivery in the early years of the plan period.</p>
<p><b>2. Health</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.</p>	<p>+/- /?</p>	<p>The health of people in Ashfield is generally worse than the England average. Life expectancy is lower than the UK average, but has improved over the last ten years in line with the England average.</p> <p>There is potential for the construction and operation of new development to have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents near development sites and along transport routes within the District. Effects may include, for example, stress related to disturbance, noise and vibration and respiratory problems exacerbated by construction traffic emissions and dust.</p> <p>The development of two new settlements would support opportunities for the integration of open space and green infrastructure, which could be significant given the scale of development. Development of smaller sites in/adjacent to Sutton and Kirkby may provide opportunities for improvements to health provision, areas of open</p>

Two new settlements (approx. 1,250 and 1,750 dwgs) and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent Sutton and Kirkby, moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements.			
SA Objective	Score	Commentary	
		<p>space and improved green infrastructure routes. Smaller sites adjacent to Hucknall existing settlements will provide some open space and improved linkages to green infrastructure (dependent on scale).</p> <p>Development within the District's existing settlements is likely to reduce the need to travel by car and encourage walking/cycling as services and employment opportunities would be more physically accessible. This is expected to generate a positive effect in relation to the promotion of healthy lifestyles. However, two new settlements would be likely to increase car use, though mitigated to an extent by promotion of sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>This option may also maximise the potential for increased investment in existing and new facilities, particularly for the two new settlements and in Kirkby and Sutton-in-Ashfield which have areas that are amongst the most health deprived areas nationally. However, there is a risk that increased demand from new residents may undermine the quality of existing facilities within these already health deprived areas, unless supported by additional investment in services.</p> <p>The option is considered to have mixed minor positive and minor negative effects on achievement of this objective with some uncertainty.</p>	<p>can be promoted as part of new development.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exact location of new development is unknown at present.</li> <li>• The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.Historic Environment</b> To conserve and enhance Ashfield's historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.</p>	<p>+/- /?</p>	<p>Development under this option has the potential to adversely affect the character of historic assets both in the short term during associated construction activities (e.g. as a result of vibrations) and in the longer term once development is complete (e.g. due to the built form of new development affecting the setting of the historic assets).</p> <p>Assets close to Kirkby-in-Ashfield include three scheduled monuments, a number of Grade II listed buildings and the Kirkby Cross Conservation Area. Sutton in Ashfield has a Scheduled Monument in the north east, several Grade II listed buildings and the Sutton in Ashfield Church &amp; Market Place Conservation Area. A number of the existing settlements also include conservation areas, and a range of listed buildings. Hucknall includes a conservation area and a number of listed buildings.</p> <p>Development may have a direct impact on cultural heritage features where it involves the loss of, or alteration to, assets or indirect adverse effects on their settings. In this context, there are a number of cultural heritage assets within and in close proximity to some of the areas identified as possible areas for new settlements. Possible new settlement locations at North and South of Wild Hill are within the setting of Hardwick Hall and a new settlement at South of Mansfield Road in Felley could potentially impact on the setting of Felley Priory, a listed building. Cauldwell Road, West of Stonehills plantation has Hamilton Hill scheduled monument located to the north west (which could be impacted) but the Kirkby Lane/Pinxton Lane location is less sensitive with regards to heritage assets.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies contained within the Local Plan should seek to conserve and, where possible, enhance cultural heritage assets including by promoting heritage-led development.</li> <li>• Policies within the Local Plan should promote high standards of architectural and urban design.</li> <li>• The Local Plan should set out a strategic framework to preserve and enhance historic areas and promote high standards of new development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p>

Two new settlements (approx. 1,250 and 1,750 dwgs) and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent Sutton and Kirkby, moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>There is the potential for these assets, or their settings, to be adversely affected by new development (particularly so for the two new settlements), although this will be dependent on the exact type, location and design of new development which is uncertain at this stage. There could also be negative effects on heritage assets in rural settlements subject to the precise location of development. Negative effects may be greater dependent on the location of new settlements, particularly in the context of the setting of Hardwick Hall.</p> <p>Locating new development near these assets may increase the accessibility of prospective residents to them, generating a potentially positive effect on this objective. There may also be opportunities for heritage-led development, which could serve to protect and enhance areas or buildings of historical, archaeological and cultural value, and potentially to enhance the setting of assets (for example, through the sensitive redevelopment of brownfield sites). The potential scale of development associated with new settlements could result in significant positive effects, for example with good design enhancing the setting of existing heritage assets.</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having a mixed positive and negative effect on this objective. As noted above, the proximity of Hucknall and Kirkby to heritage assets has the potential for greater negative effects. However, the magnitude is uncertain.</p>
<p><b>4.Community Safety</b> To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.</p>	0	<p>The spatial strategic options are not considered to influence the ability to improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. The ability to do so depends on the inclusion of design features such as natural surveillance, appropriate lighting and shared spaces. These factors can only be determined through detailed design at the masterplanning/planning application stage and therefore the strategic options for the distribution of growth in the District are not considered to have an effect on this objective.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the option has a neutral effect on this objective.</p>
<p><b>5.Social Inclusion Deprivation</b> To improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas</p>	+/?	<p>Ashfield, ranked at 68th out of 326 local authority areas, performs poorly in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2019).</p> <p>There are significant pockets of deprivation within Ashfield. The development of two new settlements would lead to the integration of some facilities and services within the new development, including green infrastructure and open space, with potential for a primary school dependent on size. However, some reliance would likely still be</p>

Two new settlements (approx. 1,250 and 1,750 dwgs) and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent Sutton and Kirkby, moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements.			
SA Objective	Score	Commentary	
and the rest of Ashfield.		<p>placed on existing provision. The scale of the new settlements would ensure developer contributions to support new delivery/enhanced provision elsewhere within Hucknall.</p> <p>Smaller sites in or adjoining Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton-in-Ashfield and adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements may lead to the provision of new facilities and services at a smaller scale. Additionally, the scale of development with smaller sites may support potential for affordable housing (albeit likely at a smaller scale) in an area with poor viability.</p> <p>More broadly, the development of smaller sites within/adjacent to existing settlements has the potential to support services and facilities in existing locations but may not support delivery of enhanced service provision (associated with a critical mass of development) and may not generate sufficient developer contributions.</p> <p>The development of two new settlements may not close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield, subject to the location of the settlements.</p> <p>Overall, this option is considered to have minor positive effects on this objective with some uncertainty over how much new settlements would close the deprivation gap for the benefit of all residents in the district.</p>	<p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The type and mix of housing, including is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6. Biodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</b> To conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels and Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</p>	<p>+/- R</p>	<p>There are no internationally designated conservation sites within the District although there is a possible potential SPA (ppSPA) for Sherwood Forest, which is recognised as being important for breeding woodlark and Nightjar, in the south and east of the District.</p> <p>There are nine SSSIs across Ashfield including Bulwell Wood and Seller Wood, both of which are located in close proximity of Hucknall. Elsewhere in the District, there is Kirkby Grives SSSI to the south of Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Annesley Woodhouse Quarries SSSI and Bogs Farm SSSI west of Annesley Woodhouse and to the south of Kirkby in Ashfield.</p> <p>There are several tracts of ancient woodland in the District. There are also a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) across the District and four Local Nature Reserves (LNR). A number of LWS are located adjacent to existing settlements, including those of Hucknall, Selston and Underwood and some of the areas identified as possible areas for new settlements. Part of one of these areas (Cauldwell Road) falls within 400 metres of woodland included in the ppSPA.</p> <p>In consequence, there is the potential for indirect adverse effects on these sites associated with new development (for example, disturbance arising from increased recreational activity and wild bird and mammal loss from cat</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan policies should seek to avoid negative effects on biodiversity and support enhancement where possible.</li> <li>Careful consideration should be given to the selection of site allocations to avoid adverse effects on nationally and locally designated sites with mitigation identified.</li> <li>ppSPA - Apply any mitigation measured agreed with Natural England.</li> <li>Local Plan policies should support a network of green infrastructure assets linked to existing and new development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p>

Two new settlements (approx. 1,250 and 1,750 dwgs) and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent Sutton and Kirkby, moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>predation). The precise location of any new settlement would determine effects on biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>The option would see the loss of greenfield land through the development of two new settlements, smaller sites in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby, and through moderate Green Belt release (which is assumed to be overwhelmingly comprised of green field land) adjoining Hucknall and development adjoining existing rural settlements, which is also expected to largely comprise greenfield land. However, the development of smaller sites in/adjacent to Sutton and Kirkby and within existing rural settlements may also support the re-use of brownfield sites which may minimise direct and indirect risks to designated sites, and potentially provide biodiversity gains.</p> <p>This option has been assessed as having mixed minor positive, significant negative and uncertain effect on this objective due to the potential for significant adverse effects on adjacent designated sites, and the loss of habitats from the use of greenfield land (including moderate green belt releases) which could be significant through the development of two new settlements , although uncertainty remains with regard to the exact type, magnitude and duration of effects. Minor positive effects are identified through the potential for two new settlements to provide biodiversity and green infrastructure enhancements.</p>
<p><b>7.Landscape</b> To protect enhance and manage the character and appearance of Ashfield's landscape /townscape, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place.</p>	+ / --	<p>The option would see development of two new settlements, smaller sites in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby and moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements. The Green Belt covers approximately 41% of the District, covering the majority of the District's area extending from Kirkby-in-Ashfield southwards, reflecting the proximity to Nottingham. One of the areas identified as a possible area for new settlements (area 4 South Mansfield Road) is noted as being a strong, attractive rural landscape.</p> <p>The development of new settlements would provide a substantial encroachment into the countryside and surrounding landscape and would result in loss of a sizeable amount of greenfield land and site number 4 (in the areas identified as possible areas for new settlements) would see the loss of Green Belt. However, new settlements would also provide scope for integrated and well-designed landscape mitigation measures to address impact and could be significant, subject to the scale and location of development. Such mitigation should include existing hedgerows and trees where possible.</p> <p>The development of smaller sites in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby would see the take up of land that currently contributes to the landscape around these towns, although there may be potential for some landscape mitigation measures to address any negative effects and may result in the development of brownfield land which could have positive landscape effects.</p>

Two new settlements (approx. 1,250 and 1,750 dwgs) and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent Sutton and Kirkby, moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>The option would support development adjoining Hucknall and in existing rural settlements through moderate Green Belt release. There is potential for new development to enhance the quality of the built environment and improve townscapes (subject to more detailed policies on design contained within the Local Plan).</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that this option would have minor positive and significant negative effects on the achievement of this objective, reflecting loss of Green Belt land (subject to location) and scale of landscape effects associated with the development of new settlements, and development of smaller sites and the moderate Green Belt elsewhere. However, the extent to which negative effects are experienced is dependent on the location of development and the scale of growth proposed.</p>
<p><b>8.Natural Resources</b> To minimise the loss of natural resources including soils, greenfield land and the best quality agricultural land.</p>	+ / --	<p>This option would require the development of greenfield land (potentially Green Belt) to enable the development of new settlements, development of smaller sites in/adjointing Sutton and Kirkby and adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements.</p> <p>There is Grade 2 and Grade 3 agricultural land (although it is not possible to determine if this is 3a or 3b) in various locations throughout the district, which could be adversely affected by the development of new settlements, subject to the precise location.</p> <p>Around Hucknall there is Grade 2 and Grade 3 agricultural land (although it is not possible to determine if this is 3a or 3b). Within the location of Kirkby, the agricultural land is primarily Grade 2 (very good) and for Sutton the land is primarily Grade 3 (although it is not possible to determine where this is 3a or 3b).</p> <p>Although it would be expected that new development in/adjointing Sutton and Kirkby would be dependent to some extent on the release of greenfield, there would be opportunities to redevelop brownfield land. The extent of such positive effects would be dependent on the sites identified and is uncertain at this stage.</p> <p>Moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements would be likely to see the development of greenfield land and potentially high quality agricultural land.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the option would have a mix of significant negative and minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective.</p>
<p><b>9.Air &amp; noise pollution</b></p>	+ / -	<p>There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within Ashfield.</p>

Two new settlements (approx. 1,250 and 1,750 dwgs) and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent Sutton and Kirkby, moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
To reduce air pollution and the proportion of the local population subject to noise pollution.		<p>There is the potential for the construction and operation of new development to have negative effects on noise and air quality due to emissions generated from plant and HGV movements during construction and increased vehicle movements during operation, which could be significant associated with the development of two new settlements. Whilst focusing development in two new settlements would help to minimise the effects on the wider environment, development of a new settlement at Pinxton may have noise and air quality issues linked to the M1.</p> <p>To be sustainable, the new settlements would be expected to provide a degree of self-sufficiency (in terms of the provision of new facilities), opportunities for walking/cycling infrastructure, and would also be well-connected by sustainable transport to adjacent communities, to minimise the generation of localised road trips.</p> <p>Focusing development adjacent to Hucknall and existing rural settlements would support services/facilities in these locations. However, congestion is likely to increase, and the reality of rural growth would be reliance upon the car as primary means of travel.</p> <p>A mix of minor positive and minor negative effects on achievement of this objective are considered likely.</p>
<p><b>10. Water Quality</b> To conserve and improve water quality and quantity.</p>	-	<p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) indicated water resources in the East Midlands are significantly constrained with little opportunity to develop new water resource schemes.</p> <p>The shortfall identified in the Watercycle Study (of water supply) is also identified in the more recent Severn Trent Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP, 2019) within the Nottinghamshire Water Resource Zone but the WRMP19 proposes a range of demand and supply measures to ensure sufficient water resources can be maintained up to 2025 (and in outline up to 2030). The draft Water Resource Management Plan 2024 (2022) sets out what is planned between 2025 and 2085 to address water pressures. Ashfield sits in an area under serious water stress as identified by the Environment Agency (Water stressed areas – final classification 2021).</p> <p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) notes that there are no capacity constraints at Ashfield's Wastewater Treatment Works.</p> <p>Ashfield sits on principal and secondary aquifers so the need to protect groundwaters is particularly important, but it is not considered that the strategic spatial options would have an effect, subject to effective measures being put in place during the development process.</p> <p>Overall, this option is considered to have minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective.</p>

Two new settlements (approx. 1,250 and 1,750 dwgs) and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent Sutton and Kirkby, moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
<b>11.Waste</b> To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials.	-	<p>New development will result in increased resource use and the generation of waste in both the short-term during construction and in the longer term once development is complete. However, the specific impacts will depend on arrangements made for recycling and composting and there may also be opportunities for re-use of construction waste, for example with the potential scale of development associated with a new settlement.</p> <p>All strategic options will increase waste generation and have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective.</p>
<b>10. Climate Change and Flood Risk</b> To adapt to climate change by reducing and manage the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to people, property and the environment.	0/?	<p>The majority of the land around Hucknall is flood zone 1, although there are some small areas of flood zones 2 and 3. There is some flood zone 3 land to the East of Sutton, with other surrounding areas flood zone 1. Kirkby-in-Ashfield is substantially in flood zone 1. However, Flood Zone 2 and 3 are located in close proximity to the River Erewash from the land south of Lane End, Kirkby-in-Ashfield. Development of new settlements and development adjoining existing rural settlements would be dependent on location as to the extent of any effects on flood risk.</p> <p>The loss of any greenfield land under this option could lead to an increased risk of flooding (as a result of the increase in impermeable surfaces). However, it can be reasonably assumed that new development proposals which may result in an increase in flood risk will be accompanied by an FRA and incorporate suitable flood alleviation measures (e.g. SuDS) thereby minimising the risk of flooding.</p> <p>There may be opportunities as part of new development proposals to enhance existing, or incorporate new, green infrastructure which could potentially have a positive effect on this objective by providing space for flood waters to flow through and additional areas for future flood storage. This could be significant as part of the development of two new settlements.</p> <p>Overall, this option is considered to have neutral effects. However, there is some uncertainty dependent on the location of development, particularly so for the new settlements given the potential scale of development.</p>
<b>13.Climate Change and Energy Efficiency</b>	+/-	<p>Development of two new settlements and smaller sites in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby and Hucknall/existing rural settlements could support the integration of low carbon and renewable energies through, for example, the integration of combined heat and power networks (although the scale of any such opportunities would be more</p>



Two new settlements (approx. 1,250 and 1,750 dwgs) and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent Sutton and Kirkby, moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
<p>To adapt to climate change by minimise energy usage and to develop Ashfield's renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.</p>		<p>limited on smaller sites) which . There is also greater scope to orientate development to maximise solar gain. The development could also support green infrastructure with walking and cycling links that reduces the need to travel by private car, thereby supporting a smaller increase in carbon emissions.</p> <p>Development within and adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements can reinforce existing patterns of travel which can continue current vehicle emission trends.</p> <p>Small site development may reduce the potential for developer contributions to provide public transport links, in contrast to the new settlements. However, the promotion of sites within settlements would provide access to existing suitable public transport routes (where available).</p> <p>The links to services and facilities, and the potential for contributions to public transport, may not be able to be developed as successfully as through larger scale development. However, the promotion of sites within settlements would provide such benefits, should suitable public transport links be forthcoming.</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having a mix of positive and negative effects.</p>
<p><b>14.Travel and Accessibility</b> To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys.</p>	<p>++/ --</p>	<p>Development of two new settlements may provide the critical mass to support the development of new public transport infrastructure and links, for example new railways stations and bus stops, subject to the location of development.</p> <p>Development of smaller sites/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby may support greater connectivity through rail transport, given the proximity to stations on the Robin Hood Line. This would support accessibility of Nottingham.</p> <p>Development of sites in/adjointing Sutton could be located in proximity to industrial areas north of the A38 which would then help to reduce the need to travel for employment. Moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall may support greater connectivity through use of the Nottingham tram system which runs to Hucknall.</p> <p>The delivery of a range of smaller sites within Hucknall and existing rural settlements would have less ability for provision of sustainable travel measures. However, dependent on the specific location, development could take place in close proximity to existing community facilities, services and employment opportunities and be reasonably well connected to the existing public transport network. Development within these areas may also help to maintain existing, and (potentially) stimulate investment in, public transport provision. However, smaller developments are unlikely to generate substantial contributions to public transport provision and may not allow integration of walking/cycling route to services and facilities.</p> <p>Overall, this option is expected to have a mix of significant positive and negative effects on this objective.</p>

Two new settlements (approx. 1,250 and 1,750 dwgs) and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent Sutton and Kirkby, moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
<p><b>15. Employment</b> To create high quality employment opportunities including opportunities for increased learn and skills to meet the needs of the District.</p>	<p>++/ ?</p>	<p>The development option would support investment within the District, through construction activities in the short term and through the provision of new jobs in the District and supporting housing in the long term.</p> <p>The majority of employment in the District is located in Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton-in-Ashfield and Sherwood Business Park off Junction 27 of the M1. More limited employment opportunities are found to the area west of the M1 (Selston, Jacksdale, Underwood and Bagthorpe). There is potential for two new settlements to provide new employment opportunities, which could be significant given the scale of development. Development would support employment centres of Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton in Ashfield through smaller sites development. Potentially, development in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby would support greater access to the M1 corridor. Additionally, development adjacent to Hucknall and to existing settlements would support those centres.</p> <p>Several schools in with Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Sutton in Ashfield and Hucknall are at, or above, capacity. Two new settlements could support the development of new school(s) or would be likely to support an increase in capacity at existing schools. Smaller developments are unlikely to drive substantial developer contributions to the provision of school places. The District suffers from poor educational attainment and the option could help to support greater attainment levels through developer contributions to new school(s) or existing school upgrades.</p> <p>This option would help support access to employment opportunities and education and is considered to have a significant positive effect on achievement of this objective, with some uncertainty over the extent of the positive effects.</p>
<p><b>16. Economy</b> To Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy.</p>	<p>++/ ?</p>	<p>The option would support economic investment in the District's main employment centres of Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton in Ashfield. Focussing development within two new settlements and in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby and providing additional growth in existing settlements would support ongoing economic investment.</p> <p>Development within the A38/M1 corridor may support out commuting to Nottingham however it is also likely to support existing economic investment in these employment areas, aiding greater self-containment in the District. Sutton is located close to Lowmoor Business Park and development in/adjacent to Kirkby may present opportunities for enhancement of employment opportunities in this location.</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having significant positive effects on achievement of this objective. However, the magnitude of these positive effects is uncertain.</p>

Two new settlements (approx. 1,250 and 1,750 dwgs) and smaller sites (less than 500 dwgs) in/adjacent Sutton and Kirkby, moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements.			
SA Objective	Score	Commentary	
			The exact location of future development at each settlement is unknown at this stage.
<b>17. Town Centres</b> Increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield's town centres.	++/ ?	<p>This option would focus growth in two new settlements and in/adjacent Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield and smaller development adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements. This provision of growth is likely to support the vitality and vibrancy of Hucknall and Sutton/Kirkby town centres and may support local shopping centres/parades, subject to the location of development. The development of two new settlements could provide new town centres or significantly increase the vitality and viability of existing centres, subject to the location of development.</p> <p>Overall this option is assessed as having significant positive and uncertain effects reflecting the potential for two new settlements to either provide a new town centre, or significantly increase the vitality and viability of existing centres, and development in/adjacent Sutton-in-Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield to support these centres, and smaller development supporting Hucknall and rural settlements centres.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The exact location of development and links to town centres.</p>

## 9 Three new settlements including one in Green Belt

Three New Settlements (68prox.. 1,250, 1,750 and 3,000) including one in Green Belt, with no other large sites over 500 dwellings.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
<p><b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Ashfield.</p>	<p>++/- R</p>	<p>This strategic option will support housing delivery across the District with three new settlements but then no other large sites over 500 dwellings, although it is assumed that development on smaller sites would occur within settlements to meet some local housing needs throughout the district. The delivery expected would be above the expected housing need.</p> <p>The population of the District is due to rise by around 11% to 136,350 by 2033 so the three new settlements would make a significant contribution to meeting future housing needs. This option may support delivery of the requirements set out in the Housing Need Study, which identifies the different housing needs of particular groups in the District.</p> <p>Housing delivery has declined in recent years with total net completions of Class C3, dwelling houses in 2017/18 (397), 2018/19 (300), 2019/20 (173), 2020/21 (265) 2021/22 (412) and 2022/23 (351) well below those experienced in 2015/16 (558) and 2016/17 (544). The option relies on three new settlements. Given the scale of development envisaged and the proportion of the requirement that would be met by the new settlements (around 4,000 dwellings delivered in the plan period), there is concern that this may affect the lead in times for delivery on the ground, affecting meeting needs in the short/medium term, and provide less flexibility within the plan period to address housing needs elsewhere. However, it is assumed that development of a range of smaller sites within the district would occur to help to meet immediate local housing needs to some extent. Additionally, development in these locations would be likely to support the delivery of housing in existing sustainable settlements.</p> <p>The development of three new settlements could provide greater ability to deliver affordable housing. However, provision of no other large sites may not result in the scale of development needed to deliver a significant amount of affordable housing to meet local needs. Average incomes in Ashfield suggest two thirds of households with a current need are estimated to be likely to have insufficient income to afford market housing, highlighting the importance of provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>This option is considered to have mixed significant positive effects and mixed minor negative effects on achievement of this objective with some uncertainty over the lead in times for the development of three new settlements and how this may impact on housing delivery in the early years of the plan period.</p>
<p><b>2. Health</b> To improve health and wellbeing and</p>	<p>+/- R</p>	<p>The health of people in Ashfield is generally worse than the England average. Life expectancy is lower than the UK average, but has improved over the last ten years in line with the England average.</p>
		<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst there would be no large sites over 500 dwellings, it is assumed that there would be the development of smaller sites to meet local housing needs throughout the district.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extent to which new housing development meets local needs will be dependent on the mix of housing delivered (in terms of size, type and tenure) which is currently unknown.</li> <li>• The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan policies should ensure that open space and/or health facilities are provided on</li> </ul>

Three New Settlements (68 approx.. 1,250, 1,750 and 3,000) including one in Green Belt, with no other large sites over 500 dwellings.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
reduce health inequalities.		<p>There is potential for the construction and operation of new development to have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents near development sites and along transport routes within the District. Effects may include, for example, stress related to disturbance, noise and vibration and respiratory problems exacerbated by construction traffic emissions and dust.</p> <p>The development of three new settlements would support opportunities for the integration of open space and green infrastructure, which could be significant given the scale of development. Whilst there would be no other large sites over 500 dwellings, it is assumed development of smaller sites would occur and this may provide opportunities for improvements to health provision, areas of open space and improved green infrastructure routes.</p> <p>Development of three new settlements may create demand for new or improved public transport which would help to reduce the need to travel by car and encourage walking/cycling as services and employment opportunities would then be more physically accessible. This is expected to generate a positive effect in relation to the promotion of healthy lifestyles.</p> <p>This option may also maximise the potential for increased investment in existing and new facilities, for the three new settlements and it is assumed that development of smaller sites under 500 dwellings would occur, which may also result in investment in facilities. However, there is a risk that increased demand from new residents may undermine the quality of existing facilities within these already health deprived areas, unless supported by additional investment in services.</p> <p>The option is considered to have mixed minor positive and minor negative effects on achievement of this objective with some uncertainty. Kirkby and Sutton-in-Ashfield have areas that are amongst the most health deprived areas nationally and this issue may not be addressed by the development of new settlements, subject to location.</p>
<p><b>3.Historic Environment</b> To conserve and enhance Ashfield's historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.</p>	+/- /?	<p>Development under this option has the potential to adversely affect the character of historic assets both in the short term during associated construction activities (e.g. as a result of vibrations) and in the longer term once development is complete (e.g. due to the built form of new development affecting the setting of the historic assets).</p> <p>Assets close to Kirkby include three scheduled monuments, a number of Grade II listed buildings and the Kirkby Cross Conservation Area. Sutton has a number of listed buildings and the Sutton in Ashfield Church &amp; Market Place Conservation Area. To the north east is a Scheduled Monument. A number of the existing settlements also include conservation areas including and listed buildings. Hucknall includes a</p>

Three New Settlements (68 approx.. 1,250, 1,750 and 3,000) including one in Green Belt, with no other large sites over 500 dwellings.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>conservation area and a number of listed buildings. There are a range of other heritage assets located throughout the district</p> <p>Development may have a direct impact on cultural heritage features where it involves the loss of, or alteration to, assets or indirect adverse effects on their settings. In this context, there are a number of cultural heritage assets within and in close proximity to some of the areas identified as possible areas for new settlements. Possible new settlement locations at North and South of Wild Hill are within the setting of Hardwick Hall and a new settlement at South of Mansfield Road in Felley could potentially impact on the setting of Felley Priory, a listed building. Cauldwell Road, West of Stonehills plantation has Hamilton Hill scheduled monument located to the north west (which could be impacted) but the Kirkby Lane/Pinxton Lane location is less sensitive with regards to heritage assets.</p> <p>There is the potential for these assets, or their settings, to be adversely affected by new development (particularly so for the three new settlements), although this will be dependent on the exact type, location and design of new development which is uncertain at this stage. There could also be negative effects on heritage assets in rural settlements subject to the precise location of and any development in these locations. Negative effects may be greater dependent on the location of new settlements, particularly in the context of the setting of Hardwick Hall.</p> <p>Locating new development near these assets may increase the accessibility of prospective residents to them, generating a potentially positive effect on this objective. There may also be opportunities for heritage-led development, which could serve to protect and enhance areas or buildings of historical, archaeological and cultural value, and potentially to enhance the setting of assets (for example, through the sensitive redevelopment of brownfield sites). The potential scale of development associated with new settlements could result in significant positive effects, for example with good design enhancing the setting of existing heritage assets.</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having a mixed positive and negative effect on this objective. As noted above, the proximity of Hucknall and Kirkby to heritage assets has the potential for greater negative effects. However, the magnitude is uncertain.</p>
<p><b>4. Community Safety</b> To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.</p>	0	<p>The spatial strategic options are not considered to influence the ability to improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. The ability to do so depends on the inclusion of design features such as natural surveillance, appropriate lighting and shared spaces. These factors can only be determined through detailed design at the masterplanning/planning application stage and therefore the strategic options for the distribution of growth in the District are not considered to have an effect on this objective.</p>
		<p>areas and promote high standards of new development.</p> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst there would be no large sites over 500 dwellings, it is assumed that there would be the development of smaller sites.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exact location of new development is uncertain at this stage.</li> <li>• The form and function of any development will have the potential to enhance or detract from designated heritage and cultural assets and/or their settings.</li> <li>• The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan policies should support measures to design out crime.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p>

Three New Settlements (68prox.. 1,250, 1,750 and 3,000) including one in Green Belt, with no other large sites over 500 dwellings.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>It is therefore considered that the option has a neutral effect on this objective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst there would be no large sites over 500 dwellings, it is assumed that there would be the development of smaller sites.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified.</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.Social Inclusion Deprivation</b> To improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield.</p>	+/?	<p>Ashfield, ranked at 68<sup>th</sup> out of 326 local authority areas, performs poorly in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2019).</p> <p>There are significant pockets of deprivation within Ashfield. The development of three new settlements would lead to the integration of some facilities and services within the new development, including green infrastructure and open space, with potential for a primary school dependent on size. However, some reliance would likely still be placed on existing provision. The scale of the new settlements would ensure developer contributions to support new delivery/enhanced provision elsewhere.</p> <p>It is assumed that there would still be development of smaller sites (under 500 dwellings) and so this may lead to the provision of new facilities and services at a smaller scale. Additionally, the scale of development with smaller sites may support potential for affordable housing (albeit likely at a smaller scale) in an area with poor viability.</p> <p>More broadly, the development of smaller sites within/adjacent to existing settlements has the potential to support services and facilities in existing locations but may not support delivery of enhanced service provision (associated with a critical mass of development) and may not generate sufficient developer contributions.</p> <p>The development of three new settlements may not close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield, subject to the location of the settlements.</p> <p>Overall, this option is considered to have minor positive effects on this objective with some uncertainty over how much new settlements would close the deprivation gap.</p>
<p><b>6. Biodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</b></p>	+/-- /?	<p>There are no internationally designated conservation sites within the District although there is a possible potential SPA (ppSPA) for Sherwood Forest, which is recognised as being important for breeding woodlark and Nightjar, in the south and east of the District.</p>

Three New Settlements (68prox.. 1,250, 1,750 and 3,000) including one in Green Belt, with no other large sites over 500 dwellings.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
To conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels and Green & Blue Infrastructure		<p>There are nine SSSIs across Ashfield including Bulwell Wood and Seller Wood, both of which are located in close proximity of Hucknall. Elsewhere in the District, there is Kirkby Grives SSSI to the south of Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Annesley Woodhouse Quarries SSSI and Bogs Farm SSSI west of Annesley Woodhouse and to the south of Kirkby in Ashfield.</p> <p>There are several tracts of ancient woodland in the District. There are also a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) across the District and four Local Nature Reserves (LNR). A number of LWS are located adjacent to existing settlements, including those of Hucknall, Selston and Underwood and some of the areas identified as possible areas for new settlements. Two of the possible new settlement locations are located in close proximity to an area of woodland identified in the ppSPA (Cauldwell Road and Hucknall's Green Belt).</p> <p>In consequence, there is the potential for indirect adverse effects on these sites associated with new development (for example, disturbance arising from increased recreational activity and wild bird and mammal loss from cat predation). The precise location of any new settlements would determine effects on biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>The option would see the loss of greenfield land through the development of three new settlements, and the Green Belt as one of the potential new settlement locations is in the Green Belt. It is also assumed that there would be development of smaller sites (below 500 dwellings) which would be likely to lead to the loss of some greenfield land and potentially Green Belt, subject to the location of such sites. However, the development of smaller sites may also support the re-use of brownfield sites which may minimise direct and indirect risks to designated sites, and potentially provide biodiversity gains.</p> <p>This option has been assessed as having mixed minor positive, significant negative and uncertain effects on this objective due to the potential for significant adverse effects on adjacent designated sites, and the loss of habitats from the use of greenfield land (including Green Belt for one the new settlements) which could be significant through the development of three new settlements, although uncertainty remains with regard to the exact type, magnitude and duration of effects. Minor positive effects are identified through the potential for three new settlements to provide biodiversity and green infrastructure enhancements.</p>
<b>7.Landscape</b> To protect enhance and manage the character and appearance of	+/--	<p>The option would see development of three new settlements, one of which would be in the Green Belt and no other large sites over 500 dwellings. The Green Belt covers approximately 41% of the District, covering the majority of the District's area extending from Kirkby-in-Ashfield southwards, reflecting the proximity to Nottingham. One of the areas identified as a possible area for new settlements (area 4 South Mansfield Road) is noted as being a strong, attractive rural landscape.</p>

- Careful consideration should be given to the selection of site allocations to avoid adverse effects on nationally and locally designated sites with mitigation identified.
- ppSPA – Apply any mitigation measured agreed with Natural England.
- Local Plan policies should support a network of green infrastructure assets linked to existing and new development.

#### Assumptions

- It is assumed new development would not be located on designated conservation sites.
- It is assumed that the value of previously developed land is less than greenfield land.
- Whilst there would be no large sites over 500 dwellings, it is assumed that there would be the development of smaller sites.

#### Uncertainties

- The exact location of future growth.
- The exact quantum of growth to be delivered.

#### Mitigation

- Detailed policies in the Local Plan should support high quality design in new development.



Three New Settlements (68 approx.. 1,250, 1,750 and 3,000) including one in Green Belt, with no other large sites over 500 dwellings.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
Ashfield's landscape /townscape, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place.		<p>The development of new settlements would provide a substantial encroachment into the countryside and surrounding landscape and would result in loss of a sizeable amount of greenfield land and one of the new settlements would see the loss of Green Belt (which could be significant given the potential size of the new settlements). However, new settlements would also provide scope for integrated and well-designed landscape mitigation measures to address impact and could be significant, subject to the scale and location of development. Such mitigation should include existing hedgerows and trees where possible.</p> <p>It is assumed that this option would see the development of smaller sites below 500 dwellings. Development of these sites would be likely to involve the loss of greenfield land, could result in encroachment into the countryside and may see loss of Green Belt land, all of which would have negative landscape effects. However, there is potential for new development to enhance the quality of the built environment and improve townscapes (subject to more detailed policies on design contained within the Local Plan).</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that this option would have minor positive and significant negative effects on the achievement of this objective, reflecting loss of Green Belt land (which could be significant given the scale of development associated with a new settlement)) and scale of landscape effects associated with the development of new settlements, and development of smaller sites elsewhere. However, the extent to which negative effects are experienced is dependent on the location of development and the scale of growth proposed.</p>
<p><b>8.Natural Resources</b></p> <p>To minimise the loss of natural resources including soils, greenfield land and the best quality agricultural land.</p>	+/--	<p>This option would require the development of greenfield land to enable the development of new settlements and for one settlement use of Green Belt land and then no other large sites over 500 dwellings.</p> <p>There is Grade 2 and Grade 3 agricultural land (although it is not possible to determine if this is 3a or 3b) in various locations throughout the district, which could be significantly adversely affected by the development of new settlements, subject to the precise location.</p> <p>Around Hucknall there is Grade 2 and Grade 3 agricultural land (although it is not possible to determine if this is 3a or 3b). Within the location of Kirkby, the agricultural land is primarily Grade 2 (very good) and for Sutton the land is primarily Grade 3 (although it is not possible to determine where this is 3a or 3b).</p> <p>Although it would be expected that the development of smaller sites (below 550 dwellings) would be dependent to some extent on the release of greenfield, there would be opportunities to redevelop brownfield land. The extent of such positive effects would be dependent on the sites identified and is uncertain at this stage.</p>

Three New Settlements (68 approx.. 1,250, 1,750 and 3,000) including one in Green Belt, with no other large sites over 500 dwellings.			
SA Objective	Score	Commentary	
		<p>It is therefore considered that the option would have a mix of significant negative and minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exact location of future development at each settlement is unknown at this stage.</li> <li>• The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>9. Air &amp; noise pollution</b> To reduce air pollution and the proportion of the local population subject to noise pollution.</p>	+ / --	<p>There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) within Ashfield.</p> <p>There is the potential for the construction and operation of new development to have negative effects on noise and air quality due to emissions generated from plant and HGV movements during construction and increased vehicle movements during operation, which could be significant associated with the development of three new settlements. Whilst focusing development in three new settlements would help to minimise the effects on the wider environment, development of a new settlement at Pinxton may have noise and air quality issues linked to the M1.</p> <p>To be sustainable, the new settlements would be expected to provide a degree of self-sufficiency (in terms of the provision of new facilities), opportunities for walking/cycling infrastructure, and would also be well-connected by sustainable transport to Sutton and Kirkby, to minimise the generation of localised road trips.</p> <p>Development of smaller sites (below 500 dwellings) would be likely support services/facilities in other locations in the District, including rural locations. However, congestion is likely to increase, and the reality of rural growth would be reliance upon the car as primary means of travel.</p> <p>Overall, this option is assessed as having a mix of minor positive and significant negative effects on this objective. This reflects the potential scale of emissions from the development of three new settlements both during construction and subsequent operation, but also potential to promote use of sustainable construction techniques and sustainable modes of transport for future occupiers.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan policies should support the protection of amenity.</li> <li>• Local Plan policies should seek to reduce congestion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst there would be no large sites over 500 dwellings, it is assumed that there would be the development of smaller sites.</li> <li>• It is assumed that proposals to ensure no sale of new diesel/petrol engine vehicles after 2035, which will lead to an increased proportion of e-vehicles over time, may benefit air quality over the long-term.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The exact location of future development is uncertain at this stage.</li> <li>• The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>
<p><b>10. Water Quality</b> To conserve and improve water quality and quantity.</p>	-	<p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) indicated water resources in the East Midlands are significantly constrained with little opportunity to develop new water resource schemes.</p> <p>The shortfall identified in the Watercycle Study (of water supply) is also identified in the more recent Severn Trent Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP, 2019) within the Nottinghamshire Water Resource Zone but the WRMP19 proposes a range of demand and supply measures to ensure sufficient water resources can be maintained up to 2025 (and in outline up to 2030). The draft Water Resource Management Plan 2024 (2022) sets out what is planned between 2025 and 2085 to address water</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Plan policies should support water efficiency measures, the implementation of SuDs, and wastewater treatment capacity enhancements where necessary.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New development will increase water use</li> </ul>

Three New Settlements (68 approx.. 1,250, 1,750 and 3,000) including one in Green Belt, with no other large sites over 500 dwellings.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>pressures. Ashfield sits in an area under serious water stress as identified by the Environment Agency (Water stressed areas – final classification 2021).</p> <p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) notes that there are no capacity constraints at Ashfield's Wastewater Treatment Works.</p> <p>Ashfield sits on principal and secondary aquifers so the need to protect groundwaters is particularly important, but it is not considered that the strategic spatial options would have an effect, subject to effective measures being put in place during the development process.</p> <p>Overall, this option is considered to have minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective.</p>
<p><b>11. Waste</b> To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials.</p>	-	<p>New development will result in increased resource use and the generation of waste in both the short-term during construction and in the longer term once development is complete. However, the specific impacts will depend on arrangements made for recycling and composting and there may also be opportunities for re-use of construction waste, for example with the potential scale of development associated with a new settlement.</p> <p>All strategic options will increase waste generation and have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective.</p>
<p><b>12. Climate Change and Flood Risk</b> To adapt to climate change by reducing and manage the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to people, property and the environment.</p>	0/?	<p>For the district as a whole there are pockets of flood zones 2 and 3, but the majority of the district is located in flood zone 1. The majority of the land around Hucknall is flood zone 1, although there are some small areas of flood zones 2 and 3. There is some flood zone 3 land to the East of Sutton, with other surrounding areas flood zone 1.</p> <p>Kirkby-in-Ashfield is substantially in flood zone 1. However, Flood Zone 2 and 3 are located in close proximity to the River Erewash from the land south of Lane End, Kirkby-in-Ashfield. Development of new settlements and any sites below 500 dwellings would be dependent on location as to the extent of any effects on flood risk.</p> <p>The loss of any greenfield land under this option could lead to an increased risk of flooding (as a result of the increase in impermeable surfaces). However, it can be reasonably assumed that new development proposals which may result in an increase in flood risk will be accompanied by an FRA and incorporate suitable flood alleviation measures (e.g. SuDS) thereby minimising the risk of flooding.</p>

Three New Settlements (68 approx.. 1,250, 1,750 and 3,000) including one in Green Belt, with no other large sites over 500 dwellings.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>There may be opportunities as part of new development proposals to enhance existing, or incorporate new, green infrastructure which could potentially have a positive effect on this objective by providing space for flood waters to flow through and additional areas for future flood storage. This could be significant as part of the development of three new settlements.</p> <p>Overall, this option is considered to have neutral effects. However, there is some uncertainty dependent on the location of development, particularly so for the new settlements given the potential scale of development.</p>
<p><b>13.Climate Change and Energy Efficiency</b> To adapt to climate change by minimise energy usage and to develop Ashfield's renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources.</p>	<p>++/- -</p>	<p>Development of three new settlements could support the integration of low carbon and renewable energies through, for example, the integration of combined heat and power networks (the scale of any such opportunities could be significant given the potential size of the new settlements). There is also greater scope to orientate development to maximise solar gain. The development could also support green infrastructure with walking and cycling links that reduces the need to travel by private car, thereby supporting a smaller increase in carbon emissions. There would still likely be a significant increase in car use.</p> <p>Development of sites below 500 dwellings would be likely to be within existing settlements and would likely reinforce existing patterns of travel which can continue current vehicle emission trends. Smaller sites also may generate lower developer contributions to public transport provision. However, the promotion of some smaller sites within settlements would provide access to existing suitable public transport routes (where available).</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having a mix of significant positive and negative effects, reflecting the significant opportunities with the development of new settlements to incorporate low carbon and renewable energies and promote sustainable transport (and reduce emissions) but that there would also likely be an increase in car use.</p>
<p><b>14.Travel and Accessibility</b> To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need</p>	<p>++/- -</p>	<p>Development of three new settlements may provide the critical mass to support the development of new public transport infrastructure and links, for example new railways stations and bus stops, or the expansion of the Nottingham tram network, subject to the location of development.</p> <p>Additionally, new settlements may increase patterns of commuting as residents of new settlements still access services and facilities in existing locations</p>

Three New Settlements (68prox.. 1,250, 1,750 and 3,000) including one in Green Belt, with no other large sites over 500 dwellings.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys.		<p>There would be opportunities to promote the use of sustainable modes of transport with the development of three new settlements (which could be significant with the potential scale of development). However, there would likely also be a significant increase in HGV use (during construction) and car use during subsequent</p> <p>Dependent on the specific location, development could take place in close proximity to existing community facilities, services and employment opportunities and be reasonably well connected to the existing public transport network. Development within these areas may also help to maintain existing, and (potentially) stimulate investment in, public transport provision. However, smaller developments are unlikely to generate substantial contributions to public transport provision and may not allow integration of walking/cycling route to services and facilities.</p> <p>Overall, this option is expected to have a mix of significant positive and negative effects on this objective.</p>
<p><b>15. Employment</b> To create high quality employment opportunities including opportunities for increased learn and skills to meet the needs of the District.</p>	++/?	<p>The development option would support investment within the District, through construction activities in the short term (which could be significant given the scale of development associated with three new settlements) and through the provision of new jobs in the District and supporting housing in the long term.</p> <p>The majority of employment in the District is located in Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton-in-Ashfield and the area west of the M1 (Selston, Jacksdale, Underwood and Bagthorpe). There is potential for three new settlements to provide new employment opportunities, which could be significant given the scale of development. Development could support employment centres of Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton-in-Ashfield through these new settlements and smaller sites development (below 500 units). Potentially, development in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby would support greater access to the M1 corridor. Additionally, development adjacent to Hucknall and to existing settlements would support those centres.</p> <p>Several schools in with Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Sutton-in-Ashfield and Hucknall are at, or above, capacity. Three new settlements could support the development of new school(s) or would be likely to support an increase in capacity at existing schools. Smaller developments are unlikely to drive substantial developer contributions to the provision of school places. The District suffers from poor educational attainment and the option could help to support greater attainment levels through developer contributions to new school(s) or existing schools' upgrades.</p> <p>This option would help support access to employment opportunities and education and is considered to have a significant positive effect on achievement of this objective, with some uncertainty over the extent of</p>

Three New Settlements (68prox.. 1,250, 1,750 and 3,000) including one in Green Belt, with no other large sites over 500 dwellings.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		the positive effects. There is uncertainty for example with construction jobs as it would depend upon the approach taken by housebuilders and the skills set of the local workforce.
<b>16. Economy</b> To Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy.	++/?	<p>The option would support economic investment both during construction for three new settlements and then development of sites below 500 dwellings. The three new settlements would provide 6,000 new dwellings and in turn a sizeable workforce and could attract people to live in the district from elsewhere.</p> <p>This new workforce would be likely to support the District's main employment centres of Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton-in-Ashfield. The development of sites under 500 dwellings would support ongoing economic investment – likely in these main employment centres, but also elsewhere in the district.</p> <p>Subject to the location of the new settlements, development within the A38/M1 corridor may support out commuting to Nottingham however it is also likely to support existing economic investment in these employment areas, aiding greater self-containment in the District. Sutton is located close to Lowmoor Business Park and development in/adjacent to Kirkby may present opportunities for enhancement of employment opportunities in this location.</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having significant positive effects on achievement of this objective. However, the magnitude of these positive effects is uncertain.</p>
<b>17. Town Centres</b> Increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield's town centres.	++/?	<p>This option would focus growth in three new settlements with no other large sites over 500 dwellings. Subject to the location of the new settlements, they would be likely to support the vitality and viability of Ashfield's town centres (which could be significant given the scale of development) and may generate demand for a new town centre.</p> <p>The links to these centres would be important. Whilst three new settlements could provide a new town centre, it would be likely that future occupiers would still utilise services and facilities.</p> <p>Overall this option is assessed as having significant positive effects with some uncertainty, reflecting the potential for three new settlements to either provide a new town centre, or significantly increase the vitality and viability of existing centres, and for the development of smaller sites (below 500 dwellings) to support existing town centres and rural centres subject to location. There is some uncertainty over the scale of positive effects.</p>

10 Two new settlements: One in Hucknall's Green Belt and one at Cauldwell Road

Two New Settlements with one in Hucknall's Green Belt (approx. 3,000 dwgs) and one at Cauldwell Road (approx. 300 dwgs in plan period) with further moderate Green Belt release around Hucknall.			
SA Objective	Score	Commentary	
<p><b>1. Housing</b> To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Ashfield.</p>	<p>++/ ?</p>	<p>This strategic option will support housing delivery across the District with one new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt and one at Cauldwell Road (that would be expected to provide housing towards the end of the plan period). The option would also support additional Green Belt release at Hucknall with more limited development in the rural areas, Sutton and Kirkby. This option would support delivery of the requirements set out in the Housing Need Study, which identifies the different housing needs of particular groups in the District.</p> <p>Housing delivery has declined in recent years with total net completions of Class C3, dwelling houses in 2017/18 (397), 2018/19 (300), 2019/20 (173), 2020/21 (265) 2021/22 (412) and 2022/23 (351) well below those experienced in 2015/16 (558) and 2016/17 (544). The option would heavily rely on delivery at the new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt (around half of the 3,000 dwgs to be delivered in the plan period) and other Green Belt releases around Hucknall as the Cauldwell Road site would be expected to deliver around 300 dwellings towards the end of the plan period. There is also some uncertainty at this stage about the deliverability and viability of development at Cauldwell Road.</p> <p>The new settlements would be dependent on delivery of infrastructure which could lead to a longer lead-in time between adoption of the Local Plan and delivery on the ground. However, the identification of a range of smaller sites in Hucknall would support meeting needs here as they would be less reliant on longer lead-in times and the provision of infrastructure. Additionally, development in other locations within the District would support the delivery of housing in existing sustainable settlements. The development could provide greater ability to deliver affordable housing, particularly so for Hucknall and rural settlements, which are assessed as having a higher viability than Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield. However, given viability and deliverability issues at Cauldwell Road there is a concern about the likelihood of any significant affordable housing being delivery in this location.</p> <p>This option is considered to have significant positive effects on achievement of this objective, with some uncertainty over the lead in time for new settlements and how this may impact on housing delivery in the early years of the plan period.</p> <p>This option is considered to have significant positive effects on achievement of this objective, with some uncertainty over the lead in time for the development of two new settlements and how this may impact on housing delivery in the early years of the plan period.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The extent to which new housing development meets local needs will be dependent on the mix of housing delivered (in terms of size, type and tenure) which is currently unknown.</li> <li>• The exact quantum of growth to be delivered over the plan period is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>

Two New Settlements with one in Hucknall's Green Belt (approx. 3,000 dwgs) and one at Cauldwell Road (approx. 300 dwgs in plan period) with further moderate Green Belt release around Hucknall.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
<p><b>2. Health</b> To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities.</p>	+/- /?	<p>The health of people in Ashfield is generally worse than the England average. Life expectancy is lower than the UK average, but has improved over the last ten years in line with the England average.</p> <p>There is potential for the construction and operation of new development to have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents near development sites and along transport routes within the District. Effects may include, for example, stress related to disturbance, noise and vibration and respiratory problems exacerbated by construction traffic emissions and dust.</p> <p>Development of two new settlements may create demand for new or improved public transport which would help to reduce the need to travel by car and encourage walking/cycling as services and employment opportunities would then be more physically accessible. This is expected to generate a positive effect in relation to the promotion of healthy lifestyles.</p> <p>This option may also maximise the potential for increased investment in existing and new facilities which may also result in investment in facilities. However, there is a risk that increased demand from new residents may undermine the quality of existing facilities within these already health deprived areas (particularly Sutton and Kirkby), unless supported by additional investment in services.</p> <p>The option is considered to have mixed minor positive and minor negative effects on achievement of this objective with some uncertainty. Kirkby and Sutton-in-Ashfield have areas that are amongst the most health deprived areas nationally and this issue may not be addressed by the development of new settlements, subject to location.</p>
<p><b>3. Historic Environment</b> To conserve and enhance Ashfield's historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.</p>	+/- /?	<p>Development under this option has the potential to adversely affect the character of historic assets both in the short term during associated construction activities (e.g. as a result of vibrations) and in the longer term once development is complete (e.g. due to the built form of new development affecting the setting of the historic assets).</p> <p>There are a number of heritage assets within and in close proximity to Hucknall and also in close proximity to Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield and other existing settlements. Hucknall includes a conservation area and a number of listed buildings. Assets close to Kirkby include three scheduled monuments, a number of Grade II listed buildings and the Kirkby Cross Conservation Area. Sutton has a number of Grade II listed buildings and the Sutton in Ashfield Church &amp; Market Place Conservation Area. Cauldwell Road has Hamilton Hill scheduled monument located to the north west (which could be impacted). Additionally, there are a range of listed buildings and Conservation Areas across the existing settlements.</p>



Two New Settlements with one in Hucknall's Green Belt (approx. 3,000 dwgs) and one at Cauldwell Road (approx. 300 dwgs in plan period) with further moderate Green Belt release around Hucknall.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>There is the potential for these assets, or their settings, to be adversely affected by new development although the area for a new settlement at Hucknall only includes one locally listed building and no other designated heritage assets. Any effects will be dependent on the exact type, location and design of new development which is uncertain at this stage. There could also be negative effects on heritage assets in rural settlements subject to the precise location of development.</p> <p>Locating new development near these assets may increase the accessibility of prospective residents to them, generating a potentially positive effect on this objective. There may also be opportunities for heritage-led development, which could serve to protect and enhance areas or buildings of historical, archaeological and cultural value, and potentially to enhance the setting of assets (for example, through the sensitive redevelopment of brownfield sites). The potential scale of development associated with a new settlement could result in significant positive effects, for example with good design enhancing the setting of existing heritage assets.</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having a mixed positive and negative effect on this objective. As noted above, the proximity of potential development at Hucknall and Cauldwell Road to heritage assets has the potential for greater negative effects. However, the magnitude is uncertain.</p>
<p><b>4.Community Safety</b> To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime.</p>	0	<p>The spatial strategic options are not considered to influence the ability to improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. The ability to do so depends on the inclusion of design features such as natural surveillance, appropriate lighting and shared spaces. These factors can only be determined through detailed design at the masterplanning/planning application stage and therefore the strategic options for the distribution of growth in the District are not considered to have an effect on this objective.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the option has a neutral effect on this objective.</p>
<p><b>5.Social Inclusion Deprivation</b> To improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield.</p>	+/?	<p>Ashfield, ranked at 68th out of 326 local authority areas, performs poorly in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2019).</p> <p>There are significant pockets of deprivation within Ashfield. The development of two new settlements would lead to the integration of some facilities and services within the new development, including green infrastructure and open space, with potential for a primary school dependent on size. However, some reliance would likely still be placed on existing provision. The scale of the new settlements would ensure developer contributions to support new delivery/enhanced provision elsewhere within Hucknall.</p>

Two New Settlements with one in Hucknall's Green Belt (approx. 3,000 dwgs) and one at Cauldwell Road (approx. 300 dwgs in plan period) with further moderate Green Belt release around Hucknall.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>Smaller sites in or adjoining Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton-in-Ashfield and existing rural settlements also may lead to the provision of new facilities and services at a smaller scale. Additionally, the scale of development with smaller sites may support potential for affordable housing (albeit likely at a smaller scale) in an area with poor viability.</p> <p>More broadly, the development of smaller sites within/adjacent to existing settlements has the potential to support services and facilities in existing locations but may not support delivery of enhanced service provision (associated with a critical mass of development) and may not generate sufficient developer contributions.</p> <p>The development of two new settlements may not close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield, subject to the location of the settlements.</p> <p>Overall, this option is considered to have minor positive effects on this objective with some uncertainty over how much new settlements would close the deprivation gap for the benefit of all residents in the district.</p>
<p><b>6. Biodiversity &amp; Green Infrastructure</b> To conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels and Green &amp; Blue Infrastructure</p>	<p>+/- ?</p>	<p>There are nine SSSIs across Ashfield including Bulwell Wood and Seller Wood, both of which are located in close proximity of Hucknall. Elsewhere in the District, there is Kirkby Grives SSSI to the south of Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Annesley Woodhouse Quarries SSSI and Bogs Farm SSSI west of Annesley Woodhouse and to the south of Kirkby in Ashfield.</p> <p>There are several tracts of ancient woodland in the District. There are also a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) across the District and four Local Nature Reserves (LNR). A number of LWS are located adjacent to existing settlements, including those of Hucknall, Selston and Underwood and near to some of the areas identified as possible areas for new settlement. The new settlement location at Hucknall is in close proximity to an area of woodland identified in the ppSPA whilst Cauldwell Road is also within the buffer zone.</p> <p>In consequence, there is the potential for indirect adverse effects on these sites associated with new development (for example, disturbance arising from increased recreational activity and wild bird and mammal loss from cat predation). The precise location of any new settlement would determine effects on biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>The option would see the loss of greenfield land through the development of a new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt (assumed to be overwhelmingly comprised of greenfield land), a range of other sites in Hucknall's Green Belt (which is also assumed to be overwhelmingly comprised of green field land) with more limited development in/adjointing Sutton and Kirkby and rural settlements, which is also expected to largely comprise greenfield land. However, the development of smaller sites within existing settlements may also support the re-use</p>

Two New Settlements with one in Hucknall's Green Belt (approx. 3,000 dwgs) and one at Cauldwell Road (approx. 300 dwgs in plan period) with further moderate Green Belt release around Hucknall.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>of brownfield sites which may minimise direct and indirect risks to designated sites, and potentially provide biodiversity gains.</p> <p>This option has been assessed as having a mix of minor positive, significant negative and uncertain effects on this objective due to the potential for adverse effects on adjacent designated sites, and the loss of habitats from the use of greenfield land (including substantial Green Belt releases). However, uncertainty remains with regard to the exact type, magnitude and duration of effects. Minor positive effects are identified through the potential for the new settlements to provide biodiversity and green infrastructure enhancements.</p>
<p><b>7.Landscape</b> To protect enhance and manage the character and appearance of Ashfield's landscape /townscape, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place.</p>	+ / - -	<p>The option would see development of two new settlements, one in Hucknall's Green Belt and one at Cauldwell Road (albeit delivery would be expected later in the plan period here), additional moderate Green Belt release at Hucknall and more limited development in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby and existing rural settlements. The Green Belt covers approximately 41% of the District, covering the majority of the District's area extending from Kirkby-in-Ashfield southwards, reflecting the proximity to Nottingham. The new settlement would see the development of approximately 3,000 new dwellings in Hucknall's Green Belt (with 1,600 developed in the plan period) and moderate release of other sites at Hucknall and potentially elsewhere in the District.</p> <p>The development of smaller sites in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby would see the take up of land that currently contributes to the landscape around these towns, although there may be potential for some landscape mitigation measures to address any negative</p> <p>The development of a new settlement at Hucknall (and other more moderate releases here) would provide a substantial encroachment into the countryside and surrounding landscape and would result in loss of a sizeable amount of Green Belt land. However, a new settlement would also provide scope for integrated and well-designed landscape mitigation measures to address impact and could be significant, subject to the scale and location of development. Such mitigation should include existing hedgerows and trees where possible. The development at Cauldwell Road would similarly be expected to include such mitigation.</p> <p>The option would support development adjoining existing rural settlements. There is potential for new development to enhance the quality of the built environment and improve townscapes (subject to more detailed policies on design contained within the Local Plan).</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that this option would have minor positive and significant negative effects on the achievement of this objective, reflecting loss of Green Belt land and scale of landscape effects associated with the development of a new settlement at Hucknall, and more moderate Green Belt release at Hucknall and potentially elsewhere. Cauldwell Road is not located within the Green Belt but would see release of greenfield land.</p>

Two New Settlements with one in Hucknall's Green Belt (approx. 3,000 dwgs) and one at Cauldwell Road (approx. 300 dwgs in plan period) with further moderate Green Belt release around Hucknall.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
<p><b>8.Natural Resources</b> To minimise the loss of natural resources including soils, greenfield land and the best quality agricultural land.</p>	+ / --	<p>This option would require the development of greenfield land to enable the development of a new settlement at Hucknall and at Cauldwell Road, and development of smaller sites in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby and adjoining existing rural settlements.</p> <p>Around Hucknall there is Grade 2 and Grade 3 agricultural land (although it is not possible to determine if this is 3a or 3b). Within the location of Kirkby, the agricultural land is primarily Grade 2 (very good) and for Sutton the land is primarily Grade 3 (although it is not possible to determine where this is 3a or 3b). Depending on the precise location of the new settlement, there could be significant negative effects on agricultural land.</p> <p>Additionally, further, more moderate Green Belt release adjoining Hucknall and existing rural settlements would be likely to see the development of greenfield land and potentially high-quality agricultural land.</p> <p>Although it would be expected that new development in/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby would be dependent to some extent on the release of greenfield, there would be opportunities to redevelop brownfield land. The extent of such positive effects would be dependent on the sites identified and is uncertain at this stage.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the option would have a mix of significant negative and minor positive effects on the achievement of this objective.</p>
<p><b>9.Air &amp; noise pollution</b> To reduce air pollution and the proportion of the local population subject to noise pollution.</p>	+ / -	<p>There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) within Ashfield.</p> <p>There is the potential for the construction and operation of new development to have negative effects on noise and air quality due to emissions generated from plant and HGV movements during construction and increased vehicle movements during operation, which could be significant associated with the development of a new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt and at Cauldwell Road. Focusing development in large new settlements would help to minimise the effects on the wider environment.</p> <p>To be sustainable, new settlements would be expected to provide a degree of self-sufficiency (in terms of the provision of new facilities), opportunities for walking/cycling infrastructure, and would also be well-connected to other settlements by sustainable transport modes, to minimise the generation of localised road trips.</p> <p>However, despite the above measures, it is likely, due to continuation of existing travel to work patterns, that localised congestion is likely to increase and will be associated with emissions.</p>

Two New Settlements with one in Hucknall's Green Belt (approx. 3,000 dwgs) and one at Cauldwell Road (approx. 300 dwgs in plan period) with further moderate Green Belt release around Hucknall.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
		<p>Focusing development adjacent to Sutton and Kirkby and existing rural settlements would support services/facilities in these locations. However, congestion is likely to increase, and the reality of growth in rural locations would be reliance upon the car as primary means of travel.</p> <p>A mix of minor positive and minor negative effects on achievement of this objective are considered likely.</p>
<p><b>10. Water Quality</b> To conserve and improve water quality and quantity.</p>	-	<p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) indicated water resources in the East Midlands are significantly constrained with little opportunity to develop new water resource schemes.</p> <p>The shortfall identified in the Watercycle Study (of water supply) is also identified in the more recent Severn Trent Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP, 2019) within the Nottinghamshire Water Resource Zone but the WRMP19 proposes a range of demand and supply measures to ensure sufficient water resources can be maintained up to 2025 (and in outline up to 2030). The draft Water Resource Management Plan 2024 (2022) sets out what is planned between 2025 and 2085 to address water pressures. Ashfield sits in an area under serious water stress as identified by the Environment Agency (Water stressed areas – final classification 2021).</p> <p>The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) notes that there are no capacity constraints at Ashfield's Wastewater Treatment Works.</p> <p>Ashfield sits on principal and secondary aquifers so the need to protect groundwaters is particularly important, but it is not considered that the strategic spatial options would have an effect, subject to effective measures being put in place during the development process.</p> <p>Overall, this option is considered to have minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective.</p>
<p><b>11. Waste</b> To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials.</p>	-	<p>New development will result in increased resource use and the generation of waste in both the short-term during construction and in the longer term once development is complete. However, the specific impacts will depend on arrangements made for recycling and composting and there may also be opportunities for re-use of construction waste, particularly at the scale of a new settlement development.</p> <p>All strategic options will increase waste generation and have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective.</p>

Two New Settlements with one in Hucknall's Green Belt (approx. 3,000 dwgs) and one at Cauldwell Road (approx. 300 dwgs in plan period) with further moderate Green Belt release around Hucknall.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
<p><b>12. Climate Change and Flood Risk</b> To adapt to climate change by reducing and manage the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to people, property and the environment.</p>	0/?	<p>The majority of the land around Hucknall is flood zone 1, although there are some small areas of flood zones 2 and 3. Cauldwell Road is within flood zone 1. There is some flood zone 3 land to the East of Sutton, with other surrounding areas flood zone 1. Kirkby is in flood zone 1. Development adjoining existing rural settlements would be dependent on location as to the extent of any effects on flood risk.</p> <p>The loss of any greenfield land under this option could lead to an increased risk of flooding (as a result of the increase in impermeable surfaces). However, it can be reasonably assumed that new development proposals which may result in an increase in flood risk will be accompanied by an FRA and incorporate suitable flood alleviation measures (e.g. SuDS) thereby minimising the risk of flooding.</p> <p>There may be opportunities as part of new development proposals to enhance existing, or incorporate new, green infrastructure which could potentially have a positive effect on this objective by providing space for flood waters to flow through and additional areas for future flood storage. This could be significant as part of the development of a new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt.</p> <p>Overall, this option is considered to have neutral effects. However, there is some uncertainty dependent on the location of development.</p>
<p><b>13. Climate Change and Energy Efficiency</b> To adapt to climate change by minimise energy usage and to develop Ashfield's renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on</p>	+/-	<p>Development of two new settlements (one in Hucknall's Green Belt and one at Cauldwell Road) alongside more moderate release of Green Belt at Hucknall, limited development in/in adjoining Sutton and Kirkby and existing rural settlements could support the integration of low carbon and renewable energies through, for example, the integration of combined heat and power networks (although the scale of any such opportunities would be more limited on smaller sites). There is also greater scope to orientate development to maximise solar gain on larger development schemes. The development could also support green infrastructure with walking and cycling links that reduces the need to travel by private car, thereby supporting a smaller increase in carbon emissions.</p> <p>Development within and adjoining existing rural settlements can reinforce existing patterns of travel which can continue current vehicle emission trends.</p>

Two New Settlements with one in Hucknall's Green Belt (approx. 3,000 dwgs) and one at Cauldwell Road (approx. 300 dwgs in plan period) with further moderate Green Belt release around Hucknall.		
SA Objective	Score	Commentary
non-renewable sources.		<p>More limited development in may reduce the potential for developer contributions to provide public transport links, in contrast to the new settlements. However, the promotion of sites within settlements would provide access to existing suitable public transport routes (where available).</p> <p>The links to services and facilities, and the potential for contributions to public transport, may not be able to be developed as successfully as through larger scale development. However, the promotion of sites within settlements would provide such benefits, should suitable public transport links be forthcoming.</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having a mix of positive and negative effects.</p>
<p><b>14.Travel and Accessibility</b> To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys.</p>	<p>++ / --</p>	<p>The development of a new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt could support the planned integration of walking and cycling routes which would support sustainable transport methods. Hucknall is a terminus for the Nottingham Express Transport (NET) tram route to Nottingham so a new settlement could support greater connectivity to the tram system. There is also the Robin Hood Railway Line station at Hucknall.</p> <p>Development of smaller sites/adjoining Sutton and Kirkby may support greater connectivity through rail transport, given the proximity to stations on the Robin Hood Line. This would support accessibility of Nottingham.</p> <p>Development of sites in/adjoining Sutton could be located in proximity to industrial areas north of the A38 which would then help to reduce the need to travel for employment.</p> <p>However, development of a new settlement at Cauldwell Road could support out commuting to neighbouring Mansfield but the area is also located close to existing employment areas at Summit Park and Coxmoor Road. Given the likely delivery towards the end of the plan period, such effects may only become apparent in the long term and then beyond the plan period.</p> <p>New settlements may provide the critical mass to support the development of new public transport infrastructure and links, for example new railways stations and bus stops, subject to the location of development. A new settlement would be likely to support improved public transport links and walking/cycling routes.</p> <p>The delivery of a range of smaller sites within existing settlements would have less ability for provision of sustainable travel measures. However, dependent on the specific location, development could take place in close proximity to existing community facilities, services and employment opportunities and be reasonably well connected to the existing public transport network. Development within these areas may also help to maintain existing, and (potentially) stimulate investment in, public transport provision. However, smaller developments are unlikely to generate substantial contributions to public transport provision and may not allow integration of walking/cycling route to services and facilities.</p>

Two New Settlements with one in Hucknall's Green Belt (approx. 3,000 dwgs) and one at Cauldwell Road (approx. 300 dwgs in plan period) with further moderate Green Belt release around Hucknall.			
SA Objective	Score	Commentary	
		Overall, this option is assessed as having minor positive and significant negative effects on this objective.	
<b>15. Employment</b> To create high quality employment opportunities including opportunities for increased learn and skills to meet the needs of the District.	++/ ?	<p>The development option would support investment within the District, through construction activities in the short term and through the provision of new jobs in the District and supporting housing in the long term. The majority of employment in the District is located in Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton-in-Ashfield and Sherwood Business Park off Junction 27 of the M1. More limited employment opportunities are found to the area west of the M1 (Selston, Jacksdale, Underwood and Bagthorpe).</p> <p>There is potential for a new settlement at Hucknall to provide new employment opportunities, which could be significant given the scale of development. As part of the Function Economic Market Area for Greater Nottingham there are also employment opportunities associated within the wider Greater Nottingham area. The new settlement at Cauldwell Road is expected towards the end of the plan period although benefits would be accrued, however, as set out above there is some uncertainty over delivery. Development would also support employment centres of Kirkby-in-Ashfield/Sutton in Ashfield through smaller sites development. Potentially, development in/adjointing Sutton and Kirkby would support greater access to the M1 corridor.</p> <p>Several schools in with Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Sutton in Ashfield and Hucknall are at, or above, capacity. A new 3,000 dwelling new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt (with 1,600 delivered in the plan period) could support the development of a new primary school and would be likely to support an increase in capacity at existing secondary schools. Similarly, a new settlement at Cauldwell Road could drive investment in education. Smaller developments are unlikely to drive substantial developer contributions to the provision of school places. The District suffers from poor educational attainment, but the development of a new settlement may support a new school or upgrades of existing schools and in turn support greater attainment levels.</p> <p>This option would help support access to employment opportunities and education and is considered to have a significant positive effect on achievement of this objective, with some uncertainty over the extent of the positive effects.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The type and scale of employment land to be delivered is unknown at this stage.</li> <li>• The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market) and the recruitment policies of prospective employers.</li> <li>• The exact location of future development at each settlement is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>
<b>16. Economy</b> To Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of	++/ ?	<p>The option would support economic investment in the District's main employment centres of Hucknall, Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Sutton in Ashfield. Focussing development within a new settlement at Hucknall would support economic investment opportunities with Hucknall and the Greater Nottingham Functional Economic Area. Cauldwell Road would provide opportunities towards the end of the Plan period. Providing additional growth in/adjointing Sutton and Kirkby and existing rural settlements would support ongoing economic investment.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul>



Two New Settlements with one in Hucknall's Green Belt (approx. 3,000 dwgs) and one at Cauldwell Road (approx. 300 dwgs in plan period) with further moderate Green Belt release around Hucknall.			
SA Objective	Score	Commentary	
the local economy.		<p>Development within the A38/M1 corridor, and on the edge of Hucknall, may support out commuting to Nottingham however it is also likely to support existing economic investment in these employment areas, aiding greater self-containment in the District. Similarly, development at Cauldwell Road may support commuting to Mansfield, although it is close to existing employment areas at Summit Park and Coxmoor Road. Development in/adjoining Sutton/Kirkby may also present opportunities for enhancement of employment opportunities in this location.</p> <p>Overall, this option has been assessed as having significant positive effects on achievement of this objective. However, the magnitude of these positive effects is uncertain.</p>	<p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The type and scale of employment land to be delivered is unknown at this stage.</li> <li>• The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market) and the recruitment policies of prospective employers.</li> <li>• The exact location of future development at each settlement is unknown at this stage.</li> </ul>
<p><b>17. Town Centres</b> Increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield's town centres.</p>	<p>+++/+</p>	<p>This option would focus growth in a new settlement in Hucknall's Green Belt with additional development at Cauldwell Road towards the end of the plan period and more limited development in/adjoining Sutton in Ashfield and Kirkby-in-Ashfield, and existing rural settlements. This provision of growth is likely to support the vitality and vibrancy of Hucknall and Sutton/Kirkby town centres and other smaller development may support local shopping centres/parades, subject to the location of development. The development of 3,000 homes in Hucknall's Green Belt (around 1,600 in the plan period) and further Green Belt releases here could contribute to significantly increasing the vitality and viability of Hucknall town centre whilst it would include new retail facilities which would support new communities.</p> <p>The Retail &amp; Leisure Study (2016) identified that Hucknall has a 13.1% vacancy rate, and this has increased since 2011 but that significant rebuilding and redevelopment within the town centre is attributable to these vacancies, Sutton town centre is relatively healthy and performing moderately well in terms of vacancies and that Kirkby performs an important role and has seen a decline in the number of vacant retail units in recent years. However, the links to these centres would be important. The Council is currently in the process of updating the retail study.</p> <p>Overall, this option is assessed as having significant positive and minor positive effects reflecting the potential for a new settlement, and other Green Belt releases, at Hucknall to significantly increase the vitality and viability of its town centre and more limited development in/adjacent to Sutton in Ashfield/Kirkby-in-Ashfield to support these centres, and smaller development supporting rural settlements centres.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <p>The exact location of development and links to town centres.</p>