

Harrogate District Local Plan 2014 - 2035

Sustainability Appraisal Post-Adoption Statement

December 2020



Harrogate
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Contents

1 Introduction	2
2 How environmental and sustainability considerations have been integrated into the Harrogate District Local Plan	4
3 How the Sustainability Appraisal has been taken into account during the preparation of the plan.	7
4 How the opinions expressed in relation to the SA consultations on the Sustainability Appraisal have been taken into account	9
5 The reasons for choosing the Local Plan as adopted in light of other reasonable alternatives considered	11
6 The measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental and sustainability effects of the implementation of the Harrogate District Local Plan	16

1 Introduction

- 1.1** Harrogate Borough Council adopted the Harrogate District Local Plan 2020 at a meeting of the Full Council held on 4 March 2020. Following adoption a legal challenge was raised against the new settlement policies in the High Court and a judgement was issued on 26 November 2020.
- 1.2** In-line with the court order accompanying the judgement the whole of the local plan was remitted to the council to consider whether or not to accept the Inspector's recommendations in so far as they related to the new settlement policies and whether or not to adopt the local plan with those policies, taking into account the full Sustainability Appraisal (SA) documentation and consultation responses.
- 1.3** The council adopted the local plan with the new settlement policies on 9th December 2020.
- 1.4** As part of the preparation of the Local Plan the Council is required to carry out a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) which must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of Sustainability Appraisal as set out in the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act and the EU Directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA Regulations). Both the SA and the SEA requirements have been incorporated into the Council's sustainability appraisal process. This process commenced in 2014 and has been carried out as an iterative and ongoing process undertaken alongside, and informing, the preparation of the local plan.
- 1.5** Regulation 26 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (2012) sets out a need to publish the final SA Report alongside the Adopted Local Plan. As the Local Plan evolved, it was accompanied by an iteration of the SA Report. The list of documents that comprise the final SA Report are:
- Harrogate District Local Plan: Draft Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report 2014
 - Harrogate District Local Plan: Draft Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report 2015
 - Harrogate District Local Plan: Draft Development Management Policies Consultation Addendum to Interim Report 2015
 - Harrogate District Local Plan: Draft Sustainability Appraisal 2016
 - Harrogate District Local Plan: Sustainability Appraisal Addendum One to the Draft Sustainability Appraisal 2016
 - Harrogate District Local Plan (Publication Version) Sustainability Appraisal Volumes 1 and 2 - January 2018
 - Harrogate District Local Plan (Submission Version) Sustainability Appraisal Volumes 1 and 2 - August 2018
 - Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 2: Broad Locations for Growth 2019
 - Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 3: Main Modifications 2019

The Post adoption Statement

- 1.6** In addition Regulation 16 of the SEA Regulations sets out the post adoption procedures for the SEA, and requires that, as soon as reasonably practicable after the adoption of a plan for which an SA/SEA has been carried out, the planning authority must make a copy of the plan publicly available alongside a copy of the SA Report and an 'SEA adoption statement', and inform the public and consultation bodies about the availability of these documents. The consultation bodies are Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency.
- 1.7** In accordance with the SEA regulations the adoption statement must explain and include the following:
- How environmental and sustainability considerations have been integrated into the Harrogate District Local Plan. (section 2)
 - How the Sustainability Appraisal has been taken into account during the preparation of the plan. (section 3)

Introduction 1

- How the opinions expressed in relation to the SA consultations on the Sustainability Appraisal have been taken into account. (section 4)
- The reasons for choosing the plan as adopted, in light of the other reasonable alternatives considered. (section 5)
- The measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental and sustainability effects of the implementation of the Harrogate District Local Plan. (section 6)

2 How environmental and sustainability considerations have been integrated into the Harrogate District Local Plan

- 2.1** Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a systematic and iterative process that identifies and reports on the likely significant effects of strategies and policies to ensure that decisions are made in accordance with the principles of sustainable development. Prepared in accordance with the requirements set out in the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act and the EU Directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), the SA has been undertaken alongside, and integrated with, local plan preparation. The SA has helped to identify key sustainability issues, predict the likely significant effects of the Local Plan (as well as a range of reasonable alternatives) in order to inform what policies and allocations to include in the local plan.
- 2.2** As an iterative process, a series of SA reports has been produced. Table 1 sets out the local plan stages, accompanying sustainability appraisal reports and associated period of public consultation. This has ensured that environmental and sustainability considerations have been considered and embedded into the Local Plan as it has developed.

Local Plan Stage	Sustainability Appraisal
<p>'Call for Sites'</p> <p>An initial 'call for sites' was made between 15 September and 24 October 2014</p>	<p>SA Scoping Report Prepared</p> <p>This was the subject of targeted consultation from 5 September to 17 October (including the 3 key consultation bodies) with information provided on the Council's website</p>
<p>Issues and Options Report</p> <p>Public consultation on vision and priorities, growth options and emerging policies 17 July - 28 August 2015</p>	<p>Draft Sustainability Appraisal: Interim Report 2015</p> <p>Public consultation alongside the Issues and Options Report</p>
<p>Public consultation on Draft Development Management policies</p> <p>6 November - 18 December 2015</p>	<p>Draft Sustainability Appraisal: Addendum to Interim Report 2015</p> <p>Public consultation alongside the Draft Development Management Policies.</p>
<p>Harrogate District Local Plan: Draft Local Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Public consultation 11 November -23 December 2016 ● Additional sites consultation 14 July-25 August 2017 	<p>Draft Sustainability Appraisal 2016 and Addendum 1</p> <p>Public consultation alongside the Draft Local Plan and Additional sites.</p>
<p>Harrogate District Local Plan Publication Draft</p> <p>Regulation 19 consultation 26 January-9 March 2018</p>	<p>Sustainability Appraisal 2018</p> <p>Public consultation alongside the Publication draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Sustainability Appraisal Report updated in August 2018 following consultation and submitted alongside the Local Plan.</p>
<p>Examination</p> <p>Inspector requested that the Council undertake further work to 'assess broad locations around each of the potential new settlement sites'</p>	<p>Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 2</p> <p>SA of broad locations around new settlement options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Informal targeted consultation 8 May- 30 May 2019 ● Public consultation 26 July-20 September
<p>Schedule of Main Modifications and Erratum</p> <p>Public consultation 26 July - 20 September 2019</p>	<p>Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 3</p> <p>SA of the proposed modifications to the Local Plan</p>

How environmental and sustainability considerations have been integrated into the Harrogate District Local Plan 2

Local Plan Stage	Sustainability Appraisal
	Public consultation alongside the Main Modifications

Table 1

SA Framework

- 2.3** Central to the Sustainability Appraisal process is the Sustainability Framework; this provides a format for describing, analysing and comparing sustainability effects. The SA framework was used at each stage of the SA for assessing the likely effects of the options and policies for the Local Plan. Using the same SA framework ensures that alternatives were assessed in a comparable way at each stage of developing the Local Plan.
- 2.4** The SA Framework was initially developed at the Scoping stage and was based on that previously used by the Council for assessing earlier Plans modified to reflect any changing local concerns and priorities, the introduction of the NPPF and the nature of the Local Plan now being developed. The resulting SA framework comprised of 16 objectives alongside a decision making rationale developed for appraising site allocations. Updates to the scope (baseline position and policy reviews) were undertaken throughout the local plan process to ensure that the scope remained up to date. This alongside consultation responses received at the Scoping and SA Interim Report stage 2015, resulted in amendments to the SA Framework.
- 2.5** The approach taken is a standard approach and the objectives cover matters necessary to meet the SEA regulations (Schedule 2) as demonstrated in table 2 below.

SA Objective	SEA issues
1. Quality housing available to everyone	Material assets
2. Conditions and services to engender good health	Human health
3. Safety and security for people and property	Human health
4. Vibrant communities that participate in decision making	Human health
5. Culture, leisure and recreation facilities available to all	Human health
6. Local Needs met locally	Human health
7. Education and training opportunities which build on the skills and capacity of the population	Human health
8. Biodiversity and importance of the natural environment	Biodiversity, fauna, flora, landscape
9. Minimal pollution levels	Soil, water, air
10. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental effects	Climatic factors, air
11. Minimise greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to climate change	Climatic factors
12. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	Climatic factors, material assets
13. Protect and enhance the historic environment	Cultural heritage
14. Quality built environment and efficient land use pattern	Landscape, soil
15. Good quality employment opportunities available to all	Human health

2 How environmental and sustainability considerations have been integrated into the Harrogate District Local Plan

SA Objective	SEA issues
16. Conditions for business success, economic growth and investment	Material assets

Table 2

- 2.6** At various stages of plan making, the SA has appraised and informed emerging Local Plan policies and allocations. The SA primarily influenced the Plan through the development and appraisal of reasonable alternatives as well as through the appraisal of the emerging Draft Plan (proposed policies and allocations).
- 2.7** Alongside the SA the Local Plan has also be the subject of a Habitats Regulation Assessment undertaken in accordance with Article 6(3) and Article 6 (4) of Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats of Wild Flora and Fauna and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. Like the SA, this is also an iterative process and has assessed at each stage of plan preparation whether any aspect of the draft plan would be likely to have a significant effect on a European designated site for nature conservation. Whilst prepared separately to the SA, effective integration between the two processes has been important for the evolution of the plan.

How the Sustainability Appraisal has been taken into account during the preparation of the plan. 3

- 3.1** As noted in table 1, there were a number of iterations of the sustainability appraisal in order that it could inform and assess the impacts of the local plan as it was developed. Each stage was accompanied by a report that set out the work that had been undertaken and provided a commentary on the likely significant effects.

Scoping

- 3.2** This provided a characterisation of the area drawn from the baseline information and a review of other plans and programmes and identified key sustainability issues. It also outlined the approach taken to the development of the Sustainability Appraisal Framework. An initial assessment of the Local Plan objectives was undertaken which helped to refine the objectives of the Local Plan that were then subject to further assessment at subsequent stages. Following reports accompanying the Issues and Options and Development Management consultations held in 2015, and the Draft Local Plan (regulation 18) consultation held in October 2016 the local plan objectives were rationalised to create seven key objectives.

Issues and options: Draft Sustainability Appraisal: Interim Report 2015 and Addendum to the Interim Report 2015

- 3.3** At this stage two SA reports were produced. The Draft SA Interim Report set out an initial appraisal of 11 growth strategies. This provided a picture of the potential overall social, economic and environmental effects of each of the options. Subsequently this was further refined to assess the significant effects of each option. This Draft SA Interim Report was used to inform the choice of growth options included in the Local Plan Issues and Options consultation. An Addendum to the SA Interim Report was also prepared that provided an initial assessment of the likely effects of the proposed development management policies.

Draft Local Plan: Draft Sustainability Appraisal 2016 and Addendum 1

- 3.4** In October 2016 a Draft Sustainability Appraisal was consulted on alongside the Draft Local plan. This SA report provided further assessment to inform the plan's growth strategy, appraisals of all of the sites (those proposed as draft allocations and those rejected), including an appraisal on a like for like basis of all sites capable of delivering a new settlement. The SA highlighted, in broad terms, which sites performed better against the sustainability objectives than others. This has been important in influencing the choice of draft allocations. The SA report made recommendations on whether sites should be taken forward as allocations, and in the case of the new settlement concluded that two options should be taken forward initially for further consideration.
- 3.5** Consideration was also given to whether implementation of the draft policies would be likely to have any significant effects on the SA objectives and whether the effects were expected to be short, medium or long term and if they might change over time as the policy had time to take effect. Amendments to policies and new policies were included at this stage.
- 3.6** Following the October 2016 consultation the Council reviewed both its housing and employment land requirements in early 2017 to take account of the latest demographic and economic forecasts. This resulted in the need to identify additional draft allocations for housing and employment. Further SA work was undertaken to inform the choice of additional allocations. This assessed new sites that had been submitted as part of the Draft Plan consultation and reviewed those sites that had previously been assessed but not recommended for allocation. It also confirmed the location of the new settlement.

3 How the Sustainability Appraisal has been taken into account during the preparation of the plan.

Publication: Sustainability Appraisal 2018, amended for submission

3.7 The SA Report produced at this stage updated the 2016 SA and its Addendum and charted changes in the appraisal process and how this helped to inform the development of the plan. This included:

- testing updated objectives for the plan against the 16 sustainability objectives
- addressing the cumulative impacts of the plan as required by the SEA Directive
- mitigation - linking individual site assessments/sustainability appraisals to the site requirements produced for allocations in the local plan. Together with the policies in the plan these address site mitigation requirements
- further assessment of options for a new/expanded settlement with a move from a defined boundary to a broad location for growth
- updated sustainability appraisal of amended draft Development Management policies.

Examination: Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 2

3.8 Following the examination hearing sessions in January/February 2019 the Inspector wrote to the Council on 11 March 2019 setting out his initial thoughts. He considered it sensible for the SA to assess broad locations around each of the proposed potential new settlement sites that had been considered by the Council in preparing the Local Plan. Addendum 2 to the SA Report documents the approach to defining and assessing the broad locations for growth. It concludes that the Hammerton/Cattal broad location should be identified as the broad location for growth.

Main Modifications: Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 3

3.9 Addendum 3 was prepared in order to assess whether the Main Modifications affected the outcomes of the Sustainability Appraisal process. The first stage of assessment involved the 'screening' of the Main Modifications in order to identify whether or not they had the potential to change the SA outcome. This concluded that a small number of policies and allocations required a more detailed assessment and of this two policies had a more positive outcome on the SA objectives. Addendum 3 also included a number of amendments to the SA report that were agreed at the hearing sessions in respect of the New Settlement assessments.

How the opinions expressed in relation to the SA consultations on the Sustainability Appraisal have been taken into account 4

4.1 As shown in table 1, each key stage of plan preparation has been accompanied by an SA report for consultation. Consultation was carried out with key consultation bodies set out in the SEA regulations (Historic England, the Environment Agency and Natural England), other key stakeholders and the general public. Consultation has helped to ensure that the SA is comprehensive, robust and adequate to support the Local Plan during the examination.

4.2 Set out below is a summary of the SA consultation for each of the key local plan stages.

Scoping Stage

4.3 Natural England, Historic England and the Environment Agency were consulted, alongside other key organisations such as North Yorkshire County Council, adjacent authorities, LEPs and the Nidderdale AONB. In addition information about the scoping stage was put on the Council's web site. Comments were particularly sought in relation to whether any further policies, programmes or plans, which would affect the local plan, should be included and whether any further information could be added to the baseline information to be collected.

4.4 Comments were received from Historic England, the Environment Agency, Natural England and Knaresborough Town Council which led to amendments to the next iteration of the SA including: reviewing additional plans and programmes, updating terminology used in relation to the historic environment, amendments to the sustainability framework included and amendments to explain the relationship between the SA and the Habitats Regulations Assessment more clearly. Comments received in response to the scoping report can be found in Appendix 5 of the SA report.

Issues and Options Stage

4.5 Two public consultations were undertaken at this stage in 2015 accompanied by the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Interim Report and Addendum to the Interim Report. Consultation responses were summarised at Appendix 5 of the SA report together with a response as to how the comment has been addressed. The comments covered matters such as the policies and plans reviewed, baseline data, the SA framework and assessment rationale, scoring for some of the growth strategies, assessment of development management policies. As a result of the consultation, amendments were made to the appraisal in some areas.

Draft Local Plan Stage

4.6 Again two public consultations were undertaken at this stage accompanied by the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report 2016 (comments received were summarised at Appendix 5 of the SA report) and Addendum 1 (comments received were summarised in the Statement of consultation and Key Issues, November 2017). In both cases a response was provided as to how the comment has been addressed. The majority of comments at this stage related to how individual sites had been assessed (including new settlement options) against the SA framework. Other comments related to report structure and content, the SA framework and the baseline data.

Publication Draft Local Plan stage

4.7 An SA report was published alongside the Publication Draft Local Plan. 'Duly made' comments at this stage were submitted to the Inspector appointed to examine the Local Plan. Comments were summarised in the Key Issues at Regulation 19 Report.⁽¹⁾ In summary they related to the assessment of individual sites, the SA framework and the approach to the assessment (including cumulative impacts and mitigation), how new

¹ The Key Issues at Regulation 19 Report has been amended to include a summary of comments made on behalf of Flaxby Park Ltd

4 How the opinions expressed in relation to the SA consultations on the Sustainability Appraisal have been taken into account

settlement options had been treated, lack of transparency in process, failure to take account of consultation responses and how consultation responses have influenced the development of the SA).

4.8 As a result of these comments the Council engaged consultants to provide a 'health check' of the SA work. The SA report was updated in response to their recommendations and to comments made at the publication stage prior to submission. This was in order to improve clarity on the following elements of the SA:

- Providing a better concluding explanation of the consideration of the alternatives and the choice of growth strategy.
- Providing additional detail in relation to the identification of significant effects, including cumulative effects of the plan.
- Providing more clarity on why sites/locations had been selected over others.

Examination

4.9 Prior to submitting additional SA work to the Inspector in respect of the broad location for a new settlement, the Council undertook informal consultation with key interested parties. These comments were considered by the Council and helped to inform the preparation of Addendum 2 to the SA report. Comments were made on a range of matters, including legal requirements, the SA framework and methodology, scoring, alleged errors, cumulative impacts and mitigation measures, submission of additional land. The Council submitted the comments received to the informal consultation, together with a summary of the Council's response to the matters raised to the Inspector alongside the SA Addendum 2, in addition to publishing them on the Council's website.

Main Modifications

4.10 Comments made on the Main Modifications and accompanying SA Addendum 3 were sent to the Inspector for his consideration. Alongside the Main Modifications the Council consulted formally on the SA Report Addendum 2. Comments made on Addendum 2 were sent to the Inspector. In addition the Council provided a summary response to comments made by Flaxby Park Ltd and Keep the Hammertons Green at the request of the Inspector.

The reasons for choosing the Local Plan as adopted in light of other reasonable alternatives considered 5

5.1 The sustainability appraisal has assessed the likely significant effects associated with the draft local plan as well as a range of reasonable alternatives. In the context of the evolution of the plan these relate to alternatives on the overall growth strategy (quantum of housing and employment growth as well as distribution) and site allocations from a range of site options.

Growth Strategies: Quantum

5.2 The Sustainability Appraisal has assessed the impact of delivering the objectively assessed need (OAN) figure set out in the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA). Seeking to provide a figure lower than that identified in the HEDNA, for example the demographic start point, was not considered to be a reasonable alternative as no substantial constraints were identified to the delivery of the identified objectively assessed need that would warrant such an approach within the context of national planning policy. A higher figure was not tested in the SA as the OAN figure included a significant uplift from the base demographic to support economic ambitions that would also deliver affordable housing and tackle market constraints.

5.3 The HEDNA also provided evidence to support the amount of employment land that the Local Plan needed to deliver. In a similar way to the housing figure the, SA did not consider a lower figure for employment land, as this would not meet the economic needs and aspirations of the District. In order to ensure an effective balance of homes and jobs a higher employment land figure was not assessed as a reasonable alternative.

Growth Strategies: Spatial distribution

5.4 Eleven potential growth strategies were identified and tested against the SA framework. The strategies assessed were:

1. The existing approach: the growth strategy in the adopted Core Strategy 2009.
2. Focus growth in the largest settlements: most growth to take place in Harrogate, Knaresborough and Ripon.
3. Growth in the district's market towns: Pateley Bridge, Masham, Boroughbridge.
4. A dispersed approach: spreading development across the widest range of settlements including small settlements previously undefined.
5. A new settlement (close to the A1(M).
6. Growth in sustainable village clusters.
7. Growth in villages close to Harrogate, Knaresborough and Ripon.
8. Growth in villages close to market towns.
9. Growth in villages with large areas of previously developed land (e.g. airfields at Tockwith and Dishforth).
10. Concentrate growth in strategic transport corridors (Harrogate rail line and strategic bus routes).
11. Concentrate growth around the strategic east-west road corridor

5.5 The assessment of the identified potential strategies highlighted that no single strategy could meet the needs of the district in a wholly sustainable manner. With the exception of Strategy 4, which performed poorly against the 16 sustainability objectives, each of the other strategies had a mix of positive and negative effects.

5.6 Strategies 2 and 10 were assessed as having the most significant positive effects against the sustainability objectives compared to the other assessed strategies, and performed particularly well in respect of accessibility to services and facilities thereby minimising the need to travel. Both of these strategies were identified as likely to have negative or uncertain effects on the environment (biodiversity, the historic environment and pollution levels) as

5 The reasons for choosing the Local Plan as adopted in light of other reasonable alternatives considered

new development has the potential to impact on the environment and the extent of that impact is dependent upon the location of development, which in terms of specific development sites was at that stage unknown. Through the selection of development sites and the implementation of any necessary mitigation measures it was recognised that there was an opportunity to minimise these impacts. The principle of a new settlement was seen to have positive effects in respect of a number of the sustainability objectives and it may, depending on the chosen location for the new settlement, be possible to turn some of the negative effects into positive effects.

5.7 As a result of the above assessment work, five options were identified for the Issues and Options Consultation (2015), that took elements from the better performing options, centred around three themes:

- Most growth concentrated in Harrogate, Knaresborough and Ripon
- Most growth concentrated in public transport corridors
- A New Settlement in A1(M) corridor

5.8 The five growth strategies identified and assessed against the SA framework were:

1. Focus growth in the main urban areas
2. Focus growth in the main urban areas and surrounding villages
3. Growth around key public transport corridors, principally to the east
4. Growth around key public transport corridors particularly to the south
5. A new settlement close to the A1 (M)

5.9 The assessment of the refined growth strategies highlighted that those options that focused development in the main urban areas performed the best against the SA framework. In particular Option 2 (focusing development in the main urban areas and surrounding settlements) demonstrated significant positive effects against seven of the objectives, particularly around housing provision and accessibility to services and facilities. All other options shared a similar mix of positive and negative effects.

5.10 Options 3 and 4 were assessed as having the most significant positive effects against sustainability objective 10 (a transport system that maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impacts) compared to the other options due to the focus of development taking place in key public transport corridors, which includes the three main urban areas.

5.11 As with the assessment of the initial growth strategies, it was considered that all five options would be likely to have negative or uncertain effects on the environment (biodiversity and the historic environment) as new development would have the potential to impact on the environment and the extent of that impact would be dependent upon the location of the development, which in terms of specific development sites was unknown. The selection of development sites and the implementation of any necessary mitigation measures remained an opportunity to minimise these impacts.

5.12 In taking forward the preferred growth strategy, it became clear that a combination of options would be needed to provide a sustainable solution. Three factors underpinned this:

- **Sustainability Appraisal:** the growth options related to the key public transport corridor performed well against the sustainability appraisal; in part this also over-lapped with the area of search for a new settlement.
- **Availability of sites:** a significant number of the most sustainable sites were located in existing settlements with the best access to jobs, services and infrastructure and

The reasons for choosing the Local Plan as adopted in light of other reasonable alternatives considered 5

where it is generally easier and more cost effective to deliver growth. Most sites identified were in Harrogate, Knaresborough and Ripon, the main settlements in the district.

- **Amount of land required:** there were not enough suitable and available sites to meet the housing target within the main settlements, or in other settlements included in the settlement hierarchy, to meet this need without unacceptable impact. A new settlement was therefore identified as being required to meet the housing needs of the District.

Site allocations

- 5.13** Site options appraised as part of the SA process were identified through a number of sources including a call for sites, sites submitted in response to consultation on the Local Plan and sites promoted outside of formal consultations.
- 5.14** Each site was assessed against the SA framework using a standardised decision making rationale. The appraisal process showed that against the social and economic objectives the sites generally performed in a similar way. With site's development providing for much needed homes sites scored well against social objectives. In terms of the economic objectives those sites assessed for employment purposes (or mixed use schemes) would have positive effects. Unless a site being assessed for housing would result in the loss of employment land, a site's development would have a neutral effect on the local economy. The loss of employment land to housing is likely to have a negative effect on the local economy. It was assessment against the environmental objectives differentiated between the sites, with significant adverse effects being identified against some of the objectives. This was reflective of the fact that many were greenfield sites on the edge of settlements.
- 5.15** As far as possible sites chosen as draft allocations were those which did not have a red score for landscape impact, impact on heritage assets or ecology. This was not possible in every case and where sites were chosen that included a red score for one or more of these objectives, the identified harm was balanced against the wider benefits that new development would bring and the extent to which the identified harm could be mitigated. In some instances, sites have not been allocated even though they do not produce a red score against those key criteria. This was because other planning reasons were identified for not doing so, for example where a site is in use, that use remains the most appropriate and should be retained, or the site was not well related to the existing pattern of development. Overall the appraisal of sites indicated that sufficient allocations could be made without necessitating the need to review the green belt, therefore sites in areas of Green Belt have not been taken forward for housing or employment purposes.
- 5.16** Each assessment included a summary of the significant positive and negative effects. Key mitigation requirements were also identified and these informed the site requirements accompanying the draft allocations.
- 5.17** Chapter 6 of the SA Report 2018 documents the appraisal of the draft allocations and provides a commentary on why the option has been selected. Appendix 7 provides an appraisal of rejected alternatives, together with the reasons for not selecting them.

New Settlement

- 5.18** An important part of the overall growth strategy, as noted above, is a new settlement. In identifying a broad location for growth within which a new settlement would be located a number of reasonable alternatives were considered.
- 5.19** Initially the following sites were identified as having the potential to deliver large scale housing growth and associated facilities required to support that scale of growth. These were:
- CA4: Land at Cattal

5 The reasons for choosing the Local Plan as adopted in light of other reasonable alternatives considered

- DF7: Dishforth Airfield
- FX3: Land at Flaxby
- GH11/GH12: Land at Green Hammerton
- KB5: Land at Kirby Hill
- OC5: Land at Deighton Grange Farm, near Kirk Deighton

5.20 Following consideration of the results of the SA undertaken in 2016, four sites were discounted. KB5 had not been promoted since the Issues and Options stage of plan making and therefore was not included in the assessment of alternatives as being an option that was still reasonable. DF7 and OC5 were discounted because they were not in a public transport corridor and did not fit the growth strategy. CA4 was discounted as the size of site being promoted would only deliver in the region of 1000 homes, below the threshold for the number of dwellings the council envisaged a new settlement delivering.

5.21 The Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report, 2016, to accompany the Draft Local Plan identified two potential options for a new settlement, one at Flaxby (FX3) and one at Green Hammerton (GH11). Both of these were to the east of Knaresborough, within the public transport corridor. These were identified for the purposes of consultation, with only one proposed to be taken forward.

5.22 At the Draft Local Plan stage, two additional sites (CA5 and OC11) were promoted to the Council. Whilst OC11 sat within the public transport corridor, the scale of the land being promoted would not deliver the quantum of homes the council envisaged a new settlement delivering. Accordingly OC11 was discounted.

5.23 Sites CA5, FX3 and GH11 lie within the public transport corridor to the east of Knaresborough. However, maximising public transport is one of the council's objectives for the new settlement and sites CA5 and GH11 were best placed to achieve this with direct access to train stations. Whilst the promoters of site FX3 indicated that provision of a new station was possible there was no evidence that this could be delivered during the plan period, if at all. Sites CA5 and GH11 also offered a greater opportunity to grow in the longer term, beyond the current plan period and, therefore, had more potential to support a wider range of services and jobs whereas site FX3 was more restricted by virtue of its proximity to the A1(M) and Knaresborough to the west. For these reasons FX3 was discounted in 2017.

5.24 Sites CA5 and GH11 share many similarities, indeed part of the site areas overlap. Accessibility to services that can meet the day to day needs of residents, and by sustainable modes, in the early stages of the development was considered to be an advantage of GH11. On balance it initially concluded that site GH11 should be the preferred site for a new settlement. However following the Additional Sites Consultation, having reviewed all the very latest evidence (including additional material provided by the various site promoters) alongside wider consultation feedback, the Council considered that the optimum approach to ensure the best possible place making solution for the future would be to continue to focus on the Green Hammerton area, but introduce additional flexibility to consider what the optimum boundary should be for a new settlement by bringing in land at Cattal (Maltkiln) to create a broad location for growth. The key reasons for this were:

- The area has direct and convenient access to the Leeds Harrogate York rail corridor providing opportunities for sustainable travel via two operational rail stations. The scale of development would support the improvement and enhancement of existing rail facilities and services, realising substantial positive environmental, social and economic benefits.
- The area is also located with convenient access onto the A59 for local bus services as well as providing accessibility to the highways network. It is sufficiently far enough away from the A1(M) to not suffer from noise or disturbance from that corridor.

The reasons for choosing the Local Plan as adopted in light of other reasonable alternatives considered 5

- The area provides greater scope to deliver funding for infrastructure and wider planning obligations to support the creation of a quality place.
- A large area of land has been promoted for development providing scope to define the best possible site boundary and inclusion of necessary infrastructure through future comprehensive master planning.
- The area is located close to existing village settlements which provide some local services. These could assist in the very early phases of development to provide for day to day needs of new residents (albeit over time the new settlement will be expected to address its needs through the provision of a comprehensive range of new services and facilities).

5.25 Following the examination hearing sessions in January/February 2019 the Inspector wrote to the Council on 11th March 2019 setting out his initial thoughts. He considered it sensible for the SA to assess broad locations around each of the proposed potential new settlement sites that had been considered by the Council in preparing the Local Plan. Broad locations were defined around the new settlement options based on known available land. Alongside the broad location for growth identified at Hammerton/Cattal (OC12), three additional broad locations were identified. These were:

- Flaxby (OC16)
- Dishforth Airfield (OC18)
- Deighton Grange, near Wetherby (OC19)

5.26 The additional SA work concluded that:

- OC12 should be selected as the preferred Broad Location for growth. It sits within the key public transport corridor and offers the added advantage of having two operational rail stations. The area of land promoted offers significant scope to define the optimum boundary and deliver effective place making, alongside delivery of necessary infrastructure.
- OC16 should not be selected as it does not offer the same locational advantages as OC12. It is currently not served by a key bus service (albeit it is considered that there is scope to extend existing services), it does not have an operational rail station nor any surety that one can be provided and the extent of available land makes effective place making more difficult.
- OC18 should not be selected as it does not fit with the identified public transport corridor, and would deliver a limited amount of development within the Plan period.
- OC19 should not be selected as it is not of sufficient scale to deliver the minimum number of homes needed to meet policy DM4 and is not a best fit with the identified public transport corridor.

5.27 The reasons for choosing the Harrogate District Local Plan as adopted is therefore a culmination of this process. The Local Plan as adopted provides the Council with a plan which can deliver the objectives of the local plan whilst balancing social, economic and environmental objectives and mitigating the negative impacts.

6 The measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental and sustainability effects of the implementation of the Harrogate District Local Plan

- 6.1** The SEA Directive requires that significant effects arising from the implementation of the Harrogate District Local Plan are monitored.
- 6.2** The effectiveness of the policies in the local plan will therefore be monitored to ensure they are:
- achieving the local plan objectives and delivering sustainable development
 - delivering new homes and jobs
 - not having any unintended consequences.
- 6.3** In developing the proposals for monitoring of the SA regard has been paid to:
- The objectives, targets and indicators developed for the Sustainability Framework.
 - Baseline information and identified sustainability issues.
 - Likely significant effects that were identified.
 - Proposed mitigation measures.
- 6.4** Monitoring proposals need to consider both positive and negative impacts. It is not necessary to monitor everything or to monitor an effect indefinitely. Instead the focus of monitoring should be on significant sustainability effects that may give rise to irreversible damage and significant effects where there was uncertainty in the Sustainability Appraisal and where monitoring would enable preventative or mitigation measures to be taken.
- 6.5** The table below sets out the type of information that should be monitored and the associated indicators. A number of these indicators are also proposed to monitor the Local Plan. Monitoring of effects will be undertaken and reported as part of the Council's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).

What should be monitored (effect)	What sort of information is required (indicator)	Sources of information
Homes for local people in need	Percentage of affordable housing granted planning permission compared to the requirement.	Harrogate Borough Council
Access to services	Number of new community facilities/services granted planning permission. Number of community services/facilities lost.	Harrogate Borough Council Harrogate Borough Council
Reduce the need to travel and reliance on the private car; integration between different modes of transport	Levels of car ownership. Number of developments approved resulting in significant transport impacts where a Transport Assessment/Transport Statement and Travel Plan has been agreed by North Yorkshire County Council and Harrogate Borough Council.	Census Harrogate Borough Council
Anti-social behaviour / crime and the fear of crime	% of residents who feel safe outside. Domestic burglaries per 1000 population.	Harrogate Borough Council Harrogate Borough Council
Bio-diverse environment	Changes in the areas of sites of importance for natural heritage and biodiversity (no loss in area of international, national and local sites). Change in priority habitats and species. % of rivers of good or fair ecological condition. Loss of trees and woodland through development proposals. Area of green infrastructure created and lost through development.	Natural England Natural England Environment Agency Harrogate Borough Council Harrogate Borough Council
Quality built environment	Loss of appeals where developments were refused on amenity or design grounds.	Harrogate Borough Council
Prudent use of natural resources	Amount of waste arising per household. % of total household waste recycled. Number of developments meeting BREEAM very good standard. Loss of the best and most versatile land from development (Grade 1, 2 and 3a) unless justified by benefits of development.	North Yorkshire County Council Harrogate Borough Council Harrogate Borough Council Harrogate Borough Council

The measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental and sustainability effects of the implementation of the Harrogate District Local Plan 6

What should be monitored (effect)	What sort of information is required (indicator)	Sources of information
Landscape character	Loss of appeals where developments were refused on landscape character grounds.	Harrogate Borough Council
Historic Environment	Number and % of designated heritage assets at risk. Number of heritage statements submitted with all relevant applications. Loss of appeals where developments were refused on grounds of local distinctiveness /impact on designated or non designated heritage asset.	Historic England at Risk Register Harrogate Borough Council Harrogate Borough Council
Diverse and robust economy	% of individuals of working age in employment. Shop vacancy rates in market towns. Total tourist visitors to the district and spend. % of adults with NVQ level 3 and 4 (economically active).	Census Harrogate Borough Council (survey every other year) Harrogate Borough Council Census
Employment Land Provision	Employment land available by type. Loss of employment land to other uses.	Harrogate Borough Council Harrogate Borough Council

Table 3 Proposals for Monitoring

