

# **Bracknell Forest Council**

**Draft Sustainability Appraisal (SA)**  
**(Incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment)**  
of the  
Draft Bracknell Forest Local Plan

## **Appendix 3 – Detailed SA Framework**

**January 2018**

Bracknell Forest Council

[www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk](http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk)

This appendix sets out the detailed SA Framework. It builds on the SA Framework (set out in Table 3 of the main report) which was developed at the Scoping Stage and was subject to consultation. As the BFLP considers both policies and sites, how the SA Objectives and subsequent questions apply, varies through the assessment. This detailed framework provides further information on the appraisal against each SA Objective to increase transparency, clarity and consistency across the appraisal. The appraisal is an iterative process, with further detailed evidence being taken into account as the options are refined. The SA framework forms one part of the overall assessment of sites during the development of the BFLP. The overall BFLP site selection methodology is available within Figure 2 of the SA Report; which also summarised the evidence that has been used.

SA Objective	<i>Taken from Scoping Report [link] which was agreed with statutory consultees.</i>					
Question:	Applicable to:	SHELAA sites	BFLP policy	BFLP sites	Specific Indicator	
<i>Questions to be asked in relation to the Objective. Taken from Scoping Report which was agreed with statutory consultees.</i>			<i>Not all questions will be applicable to all stages e.g. some questions are not dependent on location or are not known at a high level.</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>These indicators will be used for future monitoring.</i></li> <li><i>Taken from Scoping Report which was agreed with statutory consultees.</i></li> </ul>	
<b>SHELAA Sites</b>						
<b>Corresponding factor(s) in the SHELAA site survey pro-forma</b>	<i>Taken from SHELAA pro-forma</i>					
<b>Source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
<i>Information used to assess SHELAA sites. This is typically high level information, such as designations; although some assessments are subjective.</i>	<i>Criteria used to appraise each site.</i>					
<b>BFLP Site Selection*</b>						
<b>Additional source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
<i>Additional, more detailed, evidence used.</i>	<i>Criteria used to appraise each site.</i>					

\* The assessment takes into account the feasibility and applicability of potential avoidance and mitigation measures. Where this results in design requirements, avoidance or mitigation for sites, these requirements are set out in the site proformas within the Background Paper. Note this approach differs from that taken within the HRA.

**Key**

Scoring	Explanation
✓✓	Significant positive effect on the SA objective
✓	Positive effect on the SA objective
0	Neutral
Imp ✓*	Depends on implementation Positive and negative effects on the SA objective
*	Negative effect on the SA objective
**	Significant negative effect on the SA objective
?	Effect unknown

SA Objective	SA1 Mitigate climate change To address the causes of climate change through reducing emissions of greenhouse gases						
<b>Question:</b>	Applicable to:			SHELAA sites	BFLP policy	BFLP sites	<b>Specific Indicator</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it minimise the emission of greenhouse gases through the development process?</li> <li>Will it minimise the emission of greenhouse gases directly from the end use?</li> <li>Will it minimise the emission of greenhouse gases from transport to and from the development?</li> <li>Will it minimise the emission of greenhouse gases from any other source?</li> </ul>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carbon dioxide emissions</li> </ul>	
<b>SHELAA Sites</b>							
<b>Corresponding factor(s) in the SHELAA site survey pro-forma</b>	<u>Suitability criteria:</u> Proximity to the strategic road network Proximity to public transport Proximity to day to day facilities						
<b>Source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)	
Subjective assessment based on site visits, review of maps and assessments under SA16 Services and SA17 Travel	Very well located in relation to existing sustainable transport infrastructure and services.	Well located in relation to existing sustainable transport infrastructure and services.	✓* Moderately located in relation to existing sustainable transport infrastructure and services.	Poorly located in relation to existing sustainable transport infrastructure and services.	Very poorly located in relation to existing sustainable transport infrastructure and services.	Effect unknown	
<b>BFLP Site Selection</b>							
<b>Additional source of</b>	✓✓	✓	0 (0)	*	**	?	

information	(3)	(2)	Imp (-1) ✓ x (-1)	(-2)	(-3)	(0)																		
<p>Residential Accessibility Assessment * using Accession mapping (travel access and time mapping software that considers both the public highway and public transport) *</p> <p>GIS</p> <p>*Sites not included within this appraisal (Green Belt sites), have been assessed in line with the above SHELAA criteria, or by applying a common sense approach in line with the results for similar neighbouring sites</p>	<p>The sites are appraised against this objective using the Residential Accessibility assessment prepared by Bracknell Forest's Transport Team. The full methodology is available in the Accessibility Assessment; sites were scored from -2 to +2 against each of the following 14 indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to Town Centre</li> <li>• Access to External Centres</li> <li>• Access to Education</li> <li>• Access to Health</li> <li>• Access to Employment</li> <li>• Congestion Hotspots</li> <li>• Road Improvements</li> <li>• Cycling and Pedestrian Provision</li> <li>• Access by Foot to Local Centres</li> <li>• Physical Barriers</li> <li>• Public Transport Access to Town Centre</li> <li>• Potential for Public Transport Improvements</li> <li>• Proximity to Rail Stations</li> <li>• Proximity to Long Distance Bus Routes</li> </ul> <p>The maximum score available was 28 and the minimum was -28. Scores were then translated into SA appraisal as per the table below.</p>																							
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Total Score from Residential Accessibility Assessment</th> <th>SA Appraisal</th> <th>Explanation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>from 28 to 18</td> <td>✓✓</td> <td>Significant positive effect on the SA objective</td> </tr> <tr> <td>from 17 to 7</td> <td>✓</td> <td>Positive effect on the SA objective</td> </tr> <tr> <td>from 6 to -6</td> <td>✓ x or Imp or Neutral</td> <td>Positive and Negative effects/ depends on Implementation/ Neutral</td> </tr> <tr> <td>from -7 to -17</td> <td>x</td> <td>Negative effect on the SA objective</td> </tr> <tr> <td>from -18 to -28</td> <td>xx</td> <td>Significant negative effect on the SA objective</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>							Total Score from Residential Accessibility Assessment	SA Appraisal	Explanation	from 28 to 18	✓✓	Significant positive effect on the SA objective	from 17 to 7	✓	Positive effect on the SA objective	from 6 to -6	✓ x or Imp or Neutral	Positive and Negative effects/ depends on Implementation/ Neutral	from -7 to -17	x	Negative effect on the SA objective	from -18 to -28	xx	Significant negative effect on the SA objective
Total Score from Residential Accessibility Assessment	SA Appraisal	Explanation																						
from 28 to 18	✓✓	Significant positive effect on the SA objective																						
from 17 to 7	✓	Positive effect on the SA objective																						
from 6 to -6	✓ x or Imp or Neutral	Positive and Negative effects/ depends on Implementation/ Neutral																						
from -7 to -17	x	Negative effect on the SA objective																						
from -18 to -28	xx	Significant negative effect on the SA objective																						

SA Objective	SA2 Climate adaptation Adapt to climate change by preparing for extreme weather events, including avoiding and managing the risk of flooding, heat wave, drought and storm damage					
Question:	Applicable to:	SHELAA sites	BFLP policy	BFLP sites	Specific Indicator	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it reduce the vulnerability to flooding?</li> <li>Will it reduce the risks to people as a result of flooding?</li> <li>Will it avoid development within areas of medium and high flood risk?</li> <li>Will it reduce the risk of flooding from surface water?</li> <li>Will it improve water flows by, for example, introducing more permeable surfaces, reducing building footprints, reducing barriers?</li> <li>Will it increase the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs) within developments</li> <li>Will it increase shading and ventilation?</li> <li>Will it reduce the risk of drought by harvesting rainwater or reusing waste water?</li> <li>Will it reduce the risk to people and property resulting from storms?</li> <li>Will it reduce the risk to people and property resulting from wildfires?</li> <li>Will it improve the independence of residents or business in terms of energy or resources?</li> </ul>		✓	✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extent of flood zones</li> <li>Areas at risk of fluvial flooding</li> <li>Areas at risk of surface water flooding<sup>1</sup></li> <li>Areas at risk of groundwater flooding<sup>1</sup></li> <li>New development with sustainable drainage installed</li> </ul>	
<b>SHELAA Sites</b>						
<b>Corresponding factor(s) in the SHELAA site survey pro-forma</b>		<u>Exclusion criteria:</u> Sites wholly within functional flood plains (Flood Zone 3B)				
		<u>Suitability criteria:</u> Flooding (Zone 1, 2, 3a or 3b)				
<b>Source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
Environment Agency mapping flood zones 2 and 3 (GIS) (i.e. fluvial flooding)	Not applicable	Not applicable	0 – site is wholly within flood zone 1.  Imp - a small part of the site is within flood zones 2, 3a and 3b where it would be feasible to avoid	A medium to large part of the site is within flood zones 2, 3a and 3b where it may be technically feasible to mitigate the risk.	The developable area is within flood zones 2, 3a and 3b.  [Also refer to exclusion criteria above]	Effect unknown

<sup>1</sup> The extent of areas at risk of groundwater flooding will only be updated and assessed periodically, typically within revision to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

			development in that area.			
<b>BFLP Site Selection</b>						
<b>Additional source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
SFRA (2017) (considers fluvial, surface water, historic and groundwater flooding; and presence of water courses)  Level 2 SFRA's  Sequential Test  Exception Test  Site Flood Risk Assessments	Not applicable.	Not applicable.	0 – sites with low risk of flooding from all sources (i.e. which pass the Sequential Test, see SFRA for detailed criteria).  Imp - sites where there is a flood risk that can be managed through a sequential approach (i.e. part of the site is within flood zones 2, 3a and 3b; at risk of surface water flooding; groundwater flooding; historic flooding; and/or have a water course present where it would be feasible to avoid development in that area, see SFRA for detailed criteria). N.B. this assumes developable area is reduced to accommodate flood risk.	Sites where a large part of the site is within flood zones 2, 3a and 3b; at risk of surface water flooding; groundwater flooding*; historic flooding; and/or have a water course present where it may be technically feasible to mitigate the risk  *Includes sites at risk of groundwater flooding (0.025-0.5m across approx 75% or more of the site) awaiting Level 2 SFRA results.	Sites where the developable area is within flood zones 2, 3a and 3b; at risk of surface water flooding; groundwater flooding; historic flooding; and/or have a water course present. This includes sites where surface water flooding coincides with groundwater emergence.	Effect unknown

<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>SA3 Biodiversity</b> To conserve and enhance the diversity of wildlife, habitats and geology					
<b>Question:</b>	Applicable to:			<b>Specific Indicator</b>		
	SHELAA sites	BFLP policy	BFLP sites			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it address any adverse effects on the integrity of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area?</li> <li>Will it protect and enhance designated sites and habitats of nature conservation value?</li> <li>Will it facilitate the movement of wildlife along corridors or between habitats?</li> <li>Will it avoid damage to areas of geological interests?</li> </ul>	✓	✓	✓	• Wildlife designations	• Condition of designated sites (SPA, SAC, SSSI, LWS)	• UK priority habitat resource in Bracknell Forest
	✓	✓	✓	• Change in numbers of UK priority species in Bracknell Forest	• Population of wild birds	
	✓	✓	✓			
<b>SHELAA Sites</b>						
<b>Corresponding factor(s) in the SHELAA site survey pro-forma</b>	<u>Exclusion criteria:</u> Sites which lie wholly within Sites of Special Scientific Interest Sites which lie within the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Sites which lie within 400m of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (C3 residential uses will be excluded, and other uses will be considered on a case by case basis depending on nature of the use proposed and impacts upon the SPA) Sites which lie within Special Areas of Conservation Sites which lie wholly within Ancient Woodlands <u>Suitability criteria:</u> National and local ecological designations Trees on site Tree Preservation Orders					
<b>Source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
GIS (e.g. SPA, SAC, SSSI, Ancient Woodland, LWS, LNR, BOA, TPO, area TPO, geological sites)	Not applicable	Not applicable	0 – no negative impact on biodiversity / geological interests.  Imp – effect is dependent on how measures are implemented (e.g. within buffer of ancient woodland, isolated Tree Preservation Orders on site that could be protected)	Site contains features of biodiversity / geological interest of local importance (e.g. LNR, LWS, BOAs, TPOs, area TPOs) which cannot be avoided.	Site contains features of biodiversity / geological interest of more than local importance (e.g. SSSI, SAC, SPA, Ancient Woodland) which cannot be avoided.  [Also refer to exclusion criteria above]	Effect unknown

<b>BFLP Site Selection</b>						
<b>Additional source of information</b>	<b>✓✓ (3)</b>	<b>✓ (2)</b>	<b>0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)</b>	<b>* (-2)</b>	<b>** (-3)</b>	<b>? (0)</b>
<p>GIS (e.g. Heathland extent, heathland potential, veteran trees, local geological sites)</p> <p>Phase 1 habitat surveys (John Wenman Associates, 2017)<sup>2</sup></p> <p>Habitat Regulation Assessment (BFC, 2017)</p> <p>Green Infrastructure Review (TVERC, 2017)</p>	<p>No negative impact on biodiversity connectivity/interests AND likely to be able to deliver enhancement of biodiversity to deliver wider than local benefits. Enhancement measures are considered feasible.</p> <p>No direct impact to geological interest.</p>	<p>No negative impact on biodiversity connectivity/interests AND likely to be able to deliver enhancement of biodiversity to deliver local benefits to enhance the status of biodiversity. Enhancement measures are considered feasible.</p> <p>No direct impact to geological interest.</p>	<p>0 – limited negative impact on biodiversity connectivity/interest or geological interests.</p> <p>Imp - impacts to biodiversity connectivity/interests or geological interests are likely to be able to be mitigated, however depends on implementation.</p>	<p>Overall negative impact on biodiversity interests and connectivity of local importance (e.g. LNR, LWS, BOAs, protected species, priority habitats, TPOs, area TPOs, veteran trees, heathland extent, heathland potential). Potential mitigation is likely to be feasible to reduce impact on local biodiversity.</p> <p>Overall negative impact on biodiversity interests of more than local importance where mitigation is likely to be feasible.</p> <p>Impact to geological interest<sup>3</sup>.</p>	<p>Overall, significant negative impact on biodiversity interests and connectivity of more than local importance (e.g. SSSI, SAC, SPA, Ancient Woodland).</p> <p>Potential mitigation is likely to be not feasible / disproportionately costly / unlikely to deliver the necessary improvements.</p>	<p>Effect unknown</p>

<sup>2</sup> Phase 1 habitat surveys were carried out for sites outside of the Green Belt. Sites within the town centre that are previously developed land were not surveyed (unless significant areas of vegetation were present) due to their lower ecological potential. For sites without ecological surveys, professional judgement was used to make the assessment.

<sup>3</sup> None of the SHELAA sites contain, or are in the vicinity of the three local geological sites within the borough.



SA Objective	SA4 Landscape & historic To protect and enhance the Borough's characteristic landscape and its historic environment in urban and rural areas					
Question:	Applicable to:	SHELAA sites	BFLP policy	BFLP sites	Specific Indicator	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it increase the significance of any heritage assets and their settings?</li> <li>Will it enhance heritage assets and their settings?</li> <li>Will it result in new development that would make the most of the opportunities provided by heritage assets?</li> <li>Will it minimise any adverse effect on views of an important landscape or townscape, both from short distances and from further afield?</li> <li>Will it result in or contribute towards the creation of a new high-quality landscape?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Number of designated heritage assets</li> <li>Number and proportion of designated heritage assets at risk</li> <li>% of conservation areas in Bracknell Forest with an up-to-date character appraisal</li> <li>Key character areas identified in the landscape character assessment</li> </ul>	
SHELAA Sites						
Corresponding factor(s) in the SHELAA site survey pro-forma	<u>Suitability criteria:</u> Historic landscape designations Presence of historic buildings Archaeological or geological interest Conservation Areas					
Source of information	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
<b>SA4a Landscape:</b> GIS (Character Areas, river corridors (current policy XXX), TPOs, LCAs) Greenfield sites			0 - No effect on landscape interests  Imp – effect on landscape will vary with implementation (e.g. level changes across site).	Overall negative effect on landscape interests of local importance (e.g. river corridors, TPOs, LCAs, greenfield site outside of the greenbelt or PDL in greenbelt or smaller scale greenfield sites in the greenbelt adjacent to existing settlement). Or Professional judgement shows landscape is likely to be a key constraint.	Overall, significant negative effect on landscape interests of more than local importance (e.g. greenfield site in the greenbelt some distance from, or out likely to be out of scale with, existing settlement, or erodes a gap)	

<p><b>SA4b Historic environment:</b> GIS (Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Historic Parks and Gardens)</p> <p>Landscape Character Assessment (2015) and Landscape Recommendations Report (2015)</p>			<p>0 – No effect on known heritage assets</p> <p>Imp – Heritage asset within the vicinity of the site (not directly adjacent to the site) may be affected by development.</p>	<p>Overall negative effect on historic interests of local importance (e.g. Locally Listed Building, Conservation Area, Historic Parks and Gardens). Including sites in the directly adjacent to historic features which may affect their setting. Including archaeological sites and their setting.</p>	<p>Overall, significant negative effect on historic interests of more than local importance (e.g. Scheduled Ancient Monument, Listed Building). Including sites directly adjacent to such features which may affect their setting.</p>	
<b>BFLP Site Selection</b>						
<p><b>Additional source of information</b></p>	<p>✓✓ (3)</p>	<p>✓ (2)</p>	<p>0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)</p>	<p>* (-2)</p>	<p>** (-3)</p>	<p>? (0)</p>
<p><b>SA4a Landscape:</b> Landscape Sensitivity Appraisal of Potential Housing and Employment Sites in Bracknell Forest Borough (2017)*</p> <p>Historic Landscape Character (reviewed 2017)</p> <p>Archaeological site assessment (HER reviewed 2017)</p> <p>*Sites not included within this appraisal, have been assessed in line with the above SHELAA criteria, or by</p>			<p>0 – Site rated 'low' in Landscape Sensitivity Report 'The character, function and value of the landscape or characteristics of the site have a low susceptibility to being changed as a result of introducing the development type, or impacts can be easily mitigated.'</p> <p>✓* - Site rated 'low-medium' within Landscape Sensitivity Report (see report for full details of assessment criteria): Low-medium – 'The character, function</p>	<p>Site rated 'medium' within Landscape Sensitivity Report (see report for full details of assessment criteria):</p> <p>Medium - 'The character, function and value of the landscape or characteristics of the site are moderately susceptible to being changed as a result of introducing the development type, or impacts may be mitigated to a degree'.</p>	<p>Site rated 'High' or 'Medium-High' within Landscape Sensitivity Report (see report for full details of assessment criteria):</p> <p>High – 'The character, function and value of the landscape or characteristics of the site are highly susceptible to being changed as a result of introducing the development type, and cannot be mitigated'.</p> <p>Medium-High – 'The character, function and value of the</p>	

<p>applying a common sense approach in line with the results for similar neighbouring sites.</p>			<p>and value of the landscape or characteristics of the site are low-moderately susceptible to being changed as a result of introducing the development type, or impacts may be mitigated'.</p>		<p>landscape or characteristics of the site are moderate-highly susceptible to being changed as a result of introducing the development type, and cannot easily be mitigated.'</p>	
<p><b>SA4b Historic environment:</b></p> <p>Archaeological site assessments, Berkshire Archaeology 2017</p> <p>Bracknell Forest Historic Environment Assessment of SHELAA Sites (unpublished draft)</p>	<p>No negative impact on historic interests and measures to enhance historic interests to deliver wider than local benefits.</p> <p>Opportunity for new uses in historic buildings and the enhancement of heritage assets which are currently 'at risk'.</p>	<p>No negative impact on historic interests and measures to enhance current historic interests to deliver local benefits which will enhance the status of local historic interests.</p> <p>Opportunity for new uses in old buildings and the enhancement of heritage assets.</p>	<p>No impact on historic interests; or impacts can be mitigated.</p>	<p>Overall negative impact on historic interests that are of more than local importance (e.g. Locally Listed Building, Conservation Area, Historic Parks and Gardens). Including sites in the vicinity of historic features which may effect their setting.</p>	<p>Overall significant negative impact on historic interests and historic features that are of more than local importance (e.g. Scheduled Ancient Monument, Listed Building). Including sites directly adjacent to such features which may effect their setting.</p>	



SA Objective	SA6 Pollution Minimise air, water, soil / ground, noise and light pollution and improve the quality of air, water and contaminated land					
Question:	Applicable to:	SHELAA sites	BFLP policy	BFLP sites	Specific Indicator	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it maintain or improve water quality?</li> <li>Will it avoid air, surface water, groundwater pollution?</li> <li>Will it avoid soil pollution?</li> <li>Would it enable the remediation of contaminated land?</li> <li>Will it maintain and enhance the quality of the Borough's soils?</li> <li>Will it avoid noise pollution?</li> </ul>		✓	✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chemical and biological river water quality</li> <li>Incidents of major and significant water pollution</li> <li>Air quality in the Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA)</li> <li>Contaminated land remediated</li> </ul>	
<b>SHELAA Sites</b>						
<b>Corresponding factor(s) in the SHELAA site survey pro-forma</b>	<u>Suitability criteria:</u> Ground conditions Contamination Landfill site/proximity to a Landfill site Noise and pollution Impact on neighbouring properties					
<b>Source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA)  Landfill records (Environment Agency and BFC)  Contaminated land (through discussion with Environmental Health)  Proximity to noise and odour sources (based on review of surrounding land uses)			0 No air quality, water quality, contaminated land, noise or odour issues identified (based on high level desk based research only).  ✓* – some positive, some negatives effects on air quality, water quality, contaminated land, noise or odour issues.	Landfill within 250m of site.  Site is within proximity of an AQMA.  Site is within proximity of a significant noise or odour source (based on review of surrounding land uses).  Site is known or suspected to be contaminated; or possibly contaminated from previous use (localised).	Landfill on site.  Site within AQMA.  Site is known or suspected to be contaminated; or possibly contaminated from previous use (large scale).	Effect unknown

<b>BFLP Site Selection</b>						
<b>Additional source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
<p><b>SA6a Air, Soil, Noise</b> Air Quality Management Area Reports?</p> <p>GIS (general mapping, landfill records, groundwater source protection zone)</p>			<p>0 No air quality, water quality, contaminated land, noise or odour issues identified at this stage.</p> <p>Imp – effect on air quality, water quality (including source protection zones), contaminated land, noise or odour issues will depend on implementation (e.g. in river corridor).</p> <p>✓* – potential noise and air quality issues from proximity to A road/motorway or railway.</p>	<p>Landfill within 250m of site.</p> <p>Commuting offsite may impact an area with existing air quality concern (e.g. within a designated AQMA or where air quality monitoring results suggest further traffic may lead to designation of an AQMA).</p> <p>Site is known or suspected to be contaminated (localised), remediation considered unlikely/unfeasible.</p>	<p>Landfill on site.</p> <p>Commuting offsite is likely to impact an area with existing air quality concern (e.g. within a designated AQMA or where air quality monitoring results suggest further traffic may lead to designation of an AQMA).</p> <p>Site is known or suspected to be contaminated (large scale), remediation considered unlikely/unfeasible.</p>	Effect unknown
<p><b>SA6b Wastewater</b> Air Quality Management Area Reports?</p> <p>Water Cycle Study: Phase 1 Scoping Report (JBA, Draft Report, June 2017)</p>	<p>Opportunity to enhance water environment within development and help achieve WFD objectives as part of a wider scheme.</p>	<p>Opportunity to enhance water environment within development.</p> <p>WwTW flow capacity green – capacity available to serve the proposed growth.</p> <p>Odour screening green – unlikely to be impacted by odour from WwTW.</p>		<p>WwTW flow capacity amber – upgrades required but no significant constraints.</p> <p>Odour screening amber – odour impact assessment required.</p>	<p>WwTW flow capacity red – upgrades required, major constraints.</p> <p>Odour screening red – site within area of confirmed WwTW odour issues.</p>	Effect unknown

SA Objective	SA7 Resource use Ensure appropriate, efficient, reliable and careful use and supply of energy, water, minerals, food and other natural resources. [energy issues considered in SA8 below to prevent double counting]					
Question:	Applicable to:	SHELAA sites	BFLP policy	BFLP sites	Specific Indicator	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it result in the efficient use of energy, water, minerals, food and other natural resources</li> <li>Will it reduce water consumption?</li> <li>Will it contribute to increased supply of energy, water, minerals, food and other natural resources?</li> <li>If so, will that increased supply be appropriate in terms of environmental, social and economic effects?</li> <li>Will it result in greater independence or reliability in terms of supply of energy, water, minerals, food and other natural resources?</li> <li>Will it retain the Borough's best and most versatile agricultural land?</li> </ul>		✓	✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agricultural land quality</li> <li>Water consumption</li> </ul>	
<b>SHELAA Sites</b>						
<b>Corresponding factor(s) in the SHELAA site survey pro-forma</b>		<u>Suitability criteria:</u> Agricultural Land grading (Grade 1, 2 or 3a) Minerals				
<b>Source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
Agricultural land classification <sup>4</sup>  Waste and Minerals Plan/Sand and Gravel (superficial) BGS data <sup>5</sup>			0 Overall neutral impact on natural resources including Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land, mineral deposits and aquifers. Includes areas, classified by the ALC system as grade 3b, 4		Overall significant loss of natural resources of more than local importance (e.g. mineral resources, Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land – ALC grading Grade 1, 2 or 3a).	Effect unknown

<sup>4</sup> Natural England Technical Information Note TIN049 states 'The ALC system is used by Natural England and others to give advice to planning authorities, developers and the public if development is proposed on agricultural land or other greenfield sites that could potentially grow crops.' As such the ALC shall only be considered for agricultural land or other greenfield sites that could potentially grow crops. The view has been taken that sites currently in mainly residential, forestry or parkland use (for example) would not be used to grow crops.

<sup>5</sup> Minerals are not considered for PDL sites currently in mainly residential, forestry or parkland use or in build up areas. Where located within a landfill sites, minerals are assumed to have already been extracted.

			and 5, ungraded, urban etc.			
<b>BFLP Site Selection</b>						
<b>Additional source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
<b>SA7a Other Resources</b> Groundwater Source Protection Zone (GIS)  Waste and Minerals Plan/Sand and Gravel (superficial) BGS data <sup>6</sup>  [Energy considered within SA8]			0 Overall neutral impact on natural resources including Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land, mineral deposits and aquifers. Includes areas, classified by the ALC system as grade 3b, 4 and 5, ungraded, urban etc.	Overall negative impact on natural resources:  Within Groundwater Source Protection Zone.  Overall limited loss natural resources of more than local importance (e.g. mineral resources, Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land – ALC grade 3 <sup>7</sup> ).	Overall significant loss natural resources of more than local importance (e.g. mineral resources, Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land – ALC grading Grade 1, 2 or 3a).	Effect unknown
<b>SA7b Water Supply</b> Water Cycle Study: Phase 1 Scoping Report (JBA, Draft Report, June 2017).		Water resource green – WRMP can meet supply demand.  Water supply green – capacity available to serve proposed growth.		Water resources amber – insufficient evidence that increased demand can be met.  Water supply amber – infrastructure or treatment work upgrades required but no significant constraint.	Water resources red – additional water resources may be required.  Water supply red – infrastructure or treatment work upgrades required, major constraint identified.	Effect unknown

<sup>6</sup> Minerals are not considered for PDL sites currently in mainly residential, forestry or parkland use or in built up areas. Where located within a landfill sites, minerals are assumed to have already been extracted.

<sup>7</sup> ALC grade 3 is subdivided into 3a (better quality) and 3b (poorer quality). However availability of this information is very limited, as such grade 3 is appraised as between the higher and lower grades within this assessment.



SA Objective	SA8 Energy To increase energy efficiency and support the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy					
Question:	Applicable to:	SHELAA sites	BFLP policy	BFLP sites	Specific Indicator	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it lead to an increase in energy efficiency?</li> <li>Will it result in the provision of any renewable energy or low carbon energy generation?</li> <li>Will it result in the use of a higher proportion of renewable or low carbon energy?</li> </ul>			✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Installed capacity of sites generating electricity and / or heat from renewable sources</li> <li>Domestic emissions</li> </ul>	
<b>SHELAA Sites</b>						
<b>Corresponding factor(s) in the SHELAA site survey pro-forma</b>		None (not applicable at early stage of location assessment)				
Source of information	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
			Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)			
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>BFLP Site Selection</b>						
Additional source of information	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
			Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)			
N/A to differentiate between sites	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SA Objective		SA9 Economy & employment Facilitate sustainable economic growth and regeneration that provides employment opportunities for everyone and supports a successful, competitive, and balanced local economy that meets the needs of the area				
Question:		Applicable to:	SHELAA sites	BFLP policy	BFLP sites	Specific Indicator
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it result in increased local jobs which meet the needs of Bracknell Forest?</li> <li>Will it result in additional economic activity in Bracknell Forest?</li> <li>Will it lead to economic regeneration in areas where this is needed?</li> <li>Will it result in added value to the economy?</li> <li>Will any additional economic activity be of a type and scale that can be supported by the existing infrastructure (including housing supply) and workforce of Bracknell?</li> <li>If not, will the economic activity contribute to measures that mitigate its impact on the existing infrastructure and workforce?</li> <li>Will it actively contribute to a balance of activity in the area, in terms of type and scale, or would it instead result in an over-specialisation of the economy that is vulnerable to economic fluctuations?</li> <li>Will it support the urban economy?</li> <li>Will it support the rural economy?</li> <li>Will it result in a diverse retail offer?</li> <li>Will it result in the flexibility to accommodate needs not necessarily anticipated and allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li></li> <li></li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion of people of working age in employment</li> <li>Change in VAT registered business stock</li> <li>GVA per job (per head)</li> <li>Births and deaths of new enterprises and active enterprises</li> <li>Firm size and Industry Groups</li> </ul>	
SHELAA Sites						
Corresponding factor(s) in the SHELAA site survey pro-forma		<u>Proposed use:</u> Nature of use  <u>Site Description:</u> Current use				
Source of information	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
Current land use and proposed land use	Sites identified as having a potentially large net gain for the economy and employment	Sites are identified as having a potential net gain for the economy and employment (e.g. includes a neighbourhood centre or care home)	0 no direct loss or gain for the economy or employment in terms of longer term land use (i.e. not taking into effect any construction)	Sites are identified as having a potential net loss for the economy and employment	Sites are identified as having a potentially large net loss for the economy and employment	Effect unknown

			<p>Imp effect will depend on implementation (e.g. development will result in loss of current economic /employment uses however other economic/employment uses proposed; or more than one land use proposed)</p> <p>✓ * loss of potential economic/employment (e.g. loss of vacant commercial or education building)</p>			
<b>BFLP Site Selection</b>						
<b>Additional source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓ * (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
Current land use and proposed land use <sup>8</sup>	Sites identified as having a potentially large net gain for the economy and employment	Sites are identified as having a potential net gain for the economy and employment (e.g. includes a neighbourhood centre <sup>9</sup> or care home)	<p>0 no direct loss or gain for the economy or employment in terms of longer term land use (i.e. not taking into effect any construction)</p> <p>Imp effect will depend on implementation (e.g. development will result in loss of</p>	Sites are identified as having a potential net loss for the economy and employment	Sites are identified as having a potentially large net loss for the economy and employment; or loss of land included within an Article 4.	Effect unknown

<sup>8</sup> The FEMA report identifies the functional economic market area; the EDNA report assess the land/floorspace required for economic development uses; and the Retail and Leisure Study identifies the retail and main town centre requirements to 2036. The ability of the CLP to meet these needs will be considered as a strategic matter in the CLP. On a site by site basis, the potential loss or gain of economic and employment land uses is relevant and as such has been considered for each site. The scoring method takes no account of loss of jobs within agriculture as it is not always apparent if land is used for economic agricultural production.

<sup>9</sup> In line with the SHELAA methodology, a neighbourhood centre is assumed to be required for site yielding 700+ dwellings

			<p>current economic /employment uses however other economic/employment uses proposed; or more than one land use proposed)</p> <p>✓ ✖ loss of potential economic/employment (e.g. loss of vacant commercial or education building)</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--



SA Objective		SA11 Housing need To meet local housing needs by ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live in a high quality, well designed and affordable home				
Question:		Applicable to:	SHELAA sites	BFLP policy	BFLP sites	Specific Indicator
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it increase the supply and / or quality of housing?</li> <li>Will it increase the supply and / or quality of affordable housing?</li> <li>Will it make the housing stock more responsive to the needs of the area i.e. for specific groups such as the elderly and disabled, gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople?</li> <li>Will it encourage development at an appropriate density, standard, size and mix?</li> <li>Will it lead to a decrease in hazardous homes?</li> <li>Will it lead to a good Home Quality Mark rating?</li> </ul>			✓	✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Net dwellings completed per annum</li> <li>Net affordable dwellings completed per annum</li> <li>Ratio of house prices v earnings</li> <li>Households on the Housing Register</li> <li>Hazardous homes</li> <li>Net additional pitches (Gypsy and Travellers)</li> <li>Dwelling types and sizes</li> <li>Percentage of new dwellings completed at various densities</li> <li>Housing Quality (Building for Life Assessments)</li> <li>Home Quality Mark ratings</li> </ul>
<b>SHELAA Sites</b>						
Corresponding factor(s) in the SHELAA site survey pro-forma		<u>Proposed use:</u> Nature of use  <u>Site Description:</u> Current use				
Source of information	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
SHELAA	Sites identified as providing 1ha and above for all types of housing; or high density town centre sites. Assumes provision of affordable dwellings.	Sites identified as having a potential net gain of five or more dwellings (or over 0.4ha for residential institutions). Sites over 15 net dwellings assumed to provide affordable homes.	0 Limited, or no overall effect on housing number or affordable housing	Sites identified as having a potential net loss of five or more dwellings (or over 0.4ha for residential institutions).	Sites identified as losing 1ha and above of land for all types of housing.	Effect unknown
<b>BFLP Site Selection</b>						
Additional source of	✓✓	✓	0 (0)	*	**	?

information	(3)	(2)	Imp (-1) ✓ x (-1)	(-2)	(-3)	(0)
BFLP site proformas	Sites identified as having a potential net gain of 25 more dwellings (or over 0.4ha for residential institutions). Assumes provision of affordable dwellings and dwellings of an appropriate density, standard, type and mix.	Sites identified as having a potential net gain of five or more dwellings (or over 0.4ha for residential institutions). Assumes provision of affordable dwellings for sites over 15 net dwellings and of an appropriate density, standard, type and mix.	0 Limited, or no overall effect on housing number or affordable housing	Sites identified as having a potential net loss of five or more dwellings (or over 0.4ha for residential institutions).	Sites identified as losing 1ha and above of land for all types of housing.	Effect unknown

<b>SA Objective</b>		<b>SA12 Health</b> To protect and enhance human health and well-being				
<b>Question:</b>		Applicable to:	SHELAA sites	BFLP policy	BFLP sites	<b>Specific Indicator</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it support appropriate health infrastructure?</li> <li>Will it result in good access to health facilities for everyone?</li> <li>Will it reduce contributors to poor physical health, for example poor air quality?</li> <li>Will it reduce contributors to poor mental health, for example noise and disturbance?</li> <li>Will it contribute to reducing obesity?</li> <li>Will it reduce potential exposure to accident or injury?</li> </ul>				✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open Space accessibility</li> <li>Proximity to Public Rights of Way</li> <li>Access to Leisure facilities</li> <li>Noise</li> <li>Congestion Hotspots</li> </ul>
		✓	✓	✓	✓	
		✓	✓	✓	✓	
				✓	✓	
				✓	✓	
<b>SHELAA Sites</b>						
<b>Corresponding factor(s) in the SHELAA site survey pro-forma</b>		<b>Suitability criteria:</b> Noise and pollution (e.g. proximity to AQMA as a contributor to poor physical health)				
<b>Source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
GIS (AQMA)	Site has the potential to deliver significant health and well being benefits available to site residents and others (e.g. improved health facilities, open space (OSPV and SANG) more than 5ha).	Site has the potential to deliver health and well being benefits available to site residents (e.g. improved health facilities, publically accessible open space (OSPV and SANG) less than 5ha).	Imp – site has the potential to deliver health and well being benefits residents (e.g. improved health facilities, publically accessible open space), although it is not clear at this stage if it is achievable.	Overall negative impact on health and well being (e.g. will result in loss of a portion of recreational open space).	Overall significant negative impact on health and well being (e.g. will result in loss of a recreational open space or loss of an existing health facility).	Effect unknown
<b>BFLP Site Selection</b>						
<b>Additional source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
GIS	A desktop exercise was used to score sites against the five indicators below. Data on the access and proximity of sites to Open Spaces, Public Rights of Way and Leisure facilities was taken from the Green Infrastructure Review and data on congestion hotspots and noise levels were from the Residential Accessibility Assessment					
Indices of Multiple Deprivation [2015]						
Green Infrastructure Review (TVERC, 2017)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open Space accessibility</li> <li>Public Rights of Way</li> <li>Leisure facilities (publicly accessible)</li> </ul>					



<p>Residential Accessibility Assessment, using Accession mapping (travel access and time mapping software that considers both the public highway and public transport)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Noise</li></ul> <p>Congestion Hotspots</p>
--	--





SA Objective	SA15 Community To create and sustain vibrant, locally distinctive and socially cohesive communities					
Question:	Applicable to:	SHELAA sites	BFLP policy	BFLP sites	Specific Indicator	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it result in good access to formal and informal community meeting spaces for everyone?</li> <li>Will it enhance community cohesion?</li> <li>Will it enhance the vitality of rural communities?</li> <li>Will it support urban communities?</li> </ul>			✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of people satisfied with their local area as a place to live</li> <li>Percentage of people who feel their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together</li> </ul>	
<b>SHELAA Sites</b>						
<b>Corresponding factor(s) in the SHELAA site survey pro-forma</b>		Not applicable at this early stage of assessment				
<b>Source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
<b>BFLP Site Selection</b>						
<b>Additional source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
<p>Community facilities (such as community meeting spaces, green infrastructure access network, recreation facilities) based on GIS (existing facilities) and planned facilities that have some certainty of coming forward.</p> <p>POSS study</p> <p>Transport assessment</p> <p>Green Infrastructure Review (TVERC, 2017)</p>	The site is likely to deliver a range of community facilities that will benefit both new and existing residents.	The site is likely to deliver sufficient community facilities.	0 – There are likely to be existing adequate community facilities which will be accessed by the development.	There are inadequate existing community facilities which will be accessed by the development. Sufficient additional facilities are not likely to be delivered through the development.	The development will result in loss of existing community facilities, or place significant increased pressure on existing facilities.	Effect unknown

<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>SA16 Services</b> To provide accessible essential services, facilities and infrastructure					
<b>Question:</b>	Applicable to:			<b>Specific Indicator</b>		
	SHELAA sites	BFLP policy	BFLP sites			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it result in good access to essential services and facilities for everyone?</li> <li>Will it result in good access to cultural, leisure and recreational facilities for everyone?</li> <li>Will it result in good access to a diverse retail offer?</li> </ul>		✓		✓		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to key services</li> <li>Access to open space, sports or leisure facilities</li> </ul>
<b>SHELAA Sites</b>						
<b>Corresponding factor(s) in the SHELAA site survey pro-forma</b>						
<b>Source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
Subjective assessment based on site visits and review of maps, takes no account of capacity of existing services to accommodate development	Well located to existing settlement with good existing services (e.g. Bracknell, Crowthorne). Larger sites may also generate the need for provision of additional services.	Close to existing settlement with some existing services (e.g. Binfield, Cranbourne); or relatively close to a larger settlement with more services. Larger sites may also generate the need for provision of additional services.	Imp - Larger sites may generate the need for provision of additional services	Close to small existing settlement with limited existing services (e.g. Brockhill) OR relatively close to a settlement with some existing services (e.g. Binfield) OR some distance from existing settlement with services, however size of development likely to generate the need for provision of additional services	Some distance from existing settlement with services (e.g. rural areas)	
<b>BFLP Site Selection</b>						
<b>Additional source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
Residential Accessibility Assessment * using Accession mapping (travel access and time	The sites are appraised against this objective using the Residential Accessibility assessment prepared by Bracknell Forest's Transport Team. The full methodology is available in the assessment; sites were scored from -2 to +2 against each of the following five indicators: Access to Town Centre, Access to External Centres, Access to Education, Access to Health and Access to Employment. The maximum score available was 10 and the minimum was -10. Scores were then translated into SA appraisal as per the table below.					

mapping software that considers both the public highway and public transport) *  GIS  *Sites not included within this appraisal, (Green Belt sites) have been assessed in line with the above SHELAA criteria, or by applying a common sense approach in line with the results for similar neighbouring sites.		<b>Total score from Residential Accessibility Assessment</b>	<b>SA Appraisal</b>	<b>Explanation</b>	
		from + 7 to +10	✓✓	Significant positive effect on the SA objective	
		from +3 to +6	✓	Positive effect on the SA objective	
		from -2 to + 2	✓ * or Imp or 0	Positive and Negative effects/ depends on Implementation/ Neutral	
		from -6 to -3	*	Negative effect on the SA objective	
		from -10 to -7	**	Significant negative effect on the SA objective	
			?	Effect unknown	

<b>SA Objective</b>		<b>SA17 Travel</b> To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys				
<b>Question:</b>		Applicable to:	SHELAA sites	BFLP policy	BFLP sites	<b>Specific Indicator</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it result in reduced distances between homes, jobs and services to reduce the need to travel?</li> <li>Will it result in a reduction in journeys by car?</li> <li>Will it result in an increase in journeys by foot or cycle?</li> <li>Will it result in an increase in journeys by public transport?</li> <li>Will it improve the quality of parking in the town centres?</li> <li>Will it identify sites to develop infrastructure to widen transport choice?</li> <li>Will it comply with local car park standards?</li> <li>Will it support the expansion of electronic communications networks?</li> </ul>			✓	✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Travel to work</li> <li>Mode of travel to school and work</li> <li>Traffic flows</li> <li>Pedestrian and cycle flows</li> <li>Bus patronage</li> <li>Proportion of completed non-residential development complying with or lower than policy car parking standards</li> </ul>
<b>SHELAA Sites</b>						
<b>Corresponding factor(s) in the SHELAA site survey pro-forma</b>		<u>Suitability criteria:</u> Proximity to the Strategic road network Proximity to public transport Proximity to day to day facilities				
<b>Source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
Subjective assessment based on site visits and review of maps, takes no account of capacity of travel networks to accommodate development	Travel to/from site offers significant potential for walking, cycling or use of public transport.	Travel to/from site offers good potential for walking, cycling or use of public transport.	✓* Travel to/from site offers potential for walking or cycling to local facilities, but would be dependent on car use for wider travel OR some public transport links available for wider travel however location may not promote walking or cycling locally	Travel to/from site is likely to be largely dependent on car use.	Travel to/from site is likely to be heavily dependent on car use.	

<b>BFLP Site Selection</b>																											
<b>Additional source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓x (-1)	x (-2)	xx (-3)	? (0)																					
<p>Residential Accessibility Assessment* using Accession mapping (travel access and time mapping software that considers both the public highway and public transport)</p> <p>*Sites not included within this appraisal, have been assessed in line with the above SHELAA criteria, or by applying a common sense approach in line with the results for similar neighbouring sites.</p>	<p>SA appraisal for BFLP derived from the total scores for travel related indicators in the Residential Accessibility Assessment. Each site is given a score between -2 and +2 against the following indicators; Congestion Hotspots, Road Improvements, Cycling and Pedestrian Provision, Access by Foot to Local Centres, Physical Barriers, Public Transport Access to Town Centre, Potential for Public Transport Improvements, Proximity to Rail Stations and Proximity to Long Distance Bus Routes.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 30%;">Total score from Residential Accessibility Assessment</th> <th style="width: 30%;">SA Appraisal</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Explanation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #00b050; color: white;">from +18 to +12</td> <td style="background-color: #00b050; color: white;">✓✓</td> <td>Significant positive effect on the SA objective</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #92d050;">from +11 to +5</td> <td style="background-color: #92d050;">✓</td> <td>Positive effect on the SA objective</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #ffff00;">from +4 to -4</td> <td style="background-color: #ffff00;">✓x or Imp or 0</td> <td>Positive and Negative effects/ depends on Implementation/ Neutral</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #ffcc00;">from -5 to -11</td> <td style="background-color: #ffcc00;">x</td> <td>Negative effect on the SA objective</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #cc0000; color: white;">from -12 to -18</td> <td style="background-color: #cc0000; color: white;">xx</td> <td>Significant negative effect on the SA objective</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="background-color: #cccccc;">?</td> <td style="background-color: #cccccc;">?</td> <td>Effect unknown</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						Total score from Residential Accessibility Assessment	SA Appraisal	Explanation	from +18 to +12	✓✓	Significant positive effect on the SA objective	from +11 to +5	✓	Positive effect on the SA objective	from +4 to -4	✓x or Imp or 0	Positive and Negative effects/ depends on Implementation/ Neutral	from -5 to -11	x	Negative effect on the SA objective	from -12 to -18	xx	Significant negative effect on the SA objective	?	?	Effect unknown
Total score from Residential Accessibility Assessment	SA Appraisal	Explanation																									
from +18 to +12	✓✓	Significant positive effect on the SA objective																									
from +11 to +5	✓	Positive effect on the SA objective																									
from +4 to -4	✓x or Imp or 0	Positive and Negative effects/ depends on Implementation/ Neutral																									
from -5 to -11	x	Negative effect on the SA objective																									
from -12 to -18	xx	Significant negative effect on the SA objective																									
?	?	Effect unknown																									



SA Objective	SA18 Land use To encourage sustainable development by improving efficiency in land use, design and layout. This includes making best use of previously developed land in meeting future development needs					
Question:	Applicable to:	SHELAA sites	BFLP policy	BFLP sites	Specific Indicator	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it maximise the efficiency of use of previously-developed land?</li> <li>Will it avoid displacing any other activities onto undeveloped land?</li> <li>Will it result in a development that is well-designed and is appropriate to the character of the area?</li> <li>Will it be consistent with existing Masterplans and Planning Briefs?</li> <li>Will it result in areas that are well-maintained and kept free of litter and vandalism?</li> <li>Will it result in or contribute towards the creation of a new high-quality townscape?</li> <li>Will it ensure that occupiers of buildings and spaces have sufficient natural light and appropriate levels of privacy?</li> <li>Will it ensure that public spaces are sufficiently well lit?</li> <li>Will it maintain tranquil areas?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> <li>✓</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gross dwelling completions on PDL</li> <li>Vacant dwellings</li> <li>Extent to which development proposals are informed by tools to promote good design</li> </ul>	
SHELAA Sites						
Corresponding factor(s) in the SHELAA site survey pro-forma	<u>Suitability criteria:</u> Is the site greenfield? Is the site located within the defined settlement? Is the site located within the countryside? Is the site located within the Green Belt? If outside of a defined settlement, is the site adjacent to an existing settlement? Current use Surrounding uses					
Source of information	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
GIS mapping	PDL within defined settlement boundary.	PDL within countryside.  Greenfield within settlement.	✓* Greenfield site within countryside adjacent to existing settlement.	Greenfield site within countryside not adjacent to existing settlement.  PDL within Green Belt.	Surrounding land uses are sensitive and incompatible.  Greenfield within Green Belt.	Effect unknown

<b>BFLP Site Selection</b>						
<b>Additional source of information</b>	✓✓ (3)	✓ (2)	0 (0) Imp (-1) ✓* (-1)	* (-2)	** (-3)	? (0)
	SHELAA (BFC, 2017)  Green Belt Review (Amec Foster Wheeler, 2016)	PDL <sup>10</sup> within defined settlement boundary.	PDL within countryside.  Greenfield within settlement.	✓* Greenfield site within countryside adjacent to existing settlement.	Greenfield site within countryside not adjacent to existing settlement.  PDL within Green Belt where the Green Belt contributes to the purposes of the Green Belt.	Surrounding land uses are sensitive and incompatible.  Greenfield within Green Belt where the Green Belt contributes to the purposes of the Green Belt.

<sup>10</sup> In line with the SHELAA, where a site comprises PDL and greenfield the majority designation (i.e. whichever classification is greater) will be taken to be the main classification for the site.