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Appendix A Response to SA Scoping Report consultation and SA Scoping Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Respondent</strong></th>
<th><strong>Issue raised</strong></th>
<th><strong>Response</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldergate Properties (89170), agent (Signet Planning 331592).</td>
<td><strong>General</strong> - Draft Issues and Options document is not consistent with the principles of the Scoping Report. Scoping Report identifies that there are areas of relatively high deprivation in Keyworth and that provision of employment alongside new housing is important in helping to address this. Issues and Options propose to remove 5ha of employment away for site KEY1 and instead provide open space. Development of site KEY1 as outlined in the representation would be consistent with the objectives of the Scoping Report.</td>
<td>The SA Framework consulted on allows for any negative impact on the employment objective to be analysed at the point of appraisal on a site by site basis. Comment noted but <strong>no change required</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Leake Parish Council</td>
<td><strong>Baseline data</strong> - Stanford Hall should be included as an important employer alongside British Geological Survey and British Gypsum. <strong>Key sustainability issues</strong> – Older than average age of population should be given a greater</td>
<td><strong>Baseline data</strong> - The text refers to British Geological Survey and British Gypsum as ‘established employers’. As Stanford Rehabilitation Centre has not yet opened it cannot be described as ‘established’. <strong>No change required.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Issue raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impact than ‘minor/moderate’.</td>
<td>The impact of any of the identified issues is judged in relation to the influence that LP2 can have on that issue. As an ageing population is a national trend, it is not considered that the LP2 can have a significant impact on it, but acknowledge that can help lessen the impact locally, i.e. through the delivery of additional housing. This is the considered appropriate for the ‘minor/moderate’ assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Midlands Airport should be included as a key issue. A significant part of the borough falls under the airport safeguarding area and under the flight path. Measures to mitigate the future impact of aircraft noise and planning considerations related to safeguarding.</td>
<td><strong>No change required.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making criteria – flood risk. Risk of sewage in flood water is increased by having mixed drains. This could be highlighted as a specific issue.</td>
<td>Additional – agree that there is a copy and paste error with the description of the East Leake NP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional –</td>
<td><strong>Change required</strong> – remove current description and insert a more appropriate description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 97 (description of the East Leake Neighbourhood Plan – is inaccurate).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Agency</th>
<th>Plans, policies and programmes</th>
<th>Plans, policies and programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Flood risk</em> – concerned that the SFRA has not been updated. There are a number of key new pieces of flood risk information</td>
<td>An updated SFRA is currently being prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Issue raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that have not been incorporated into it, including the EA’s new climate change allowances (published February 2016).</td>
<td><strong>Change required</strong> – add the updated SFRA to the list of Plans, policies and programmes once it has been finalised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support inclusion of the Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunity Map (BOM) - would expect the outputs to help inform local plan policy, specifically relating to any proposed site allocations. (These mapping outputs should also be used to inform and contribute to the forthcoming Green Infrastructure Strategy).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support inclusion of The European Water Framework Directive (WFD).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List should include the recently published Humber River Basin Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Issue raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key sustainability issues**

Recommend that flood risk issues could be more appropriately addressed in combination with a policy requiring biodiversity opportunities. These should not be seen as separate issues.

Should include water efficiency and water resource implications as key issues. *E.g.*, the LAPP could promote water efficiency in all new developments and be used as a platform for the retrofitting of water efficiency measures in the existing housing stock.

**Site Specific Questions**

Objective 8 is to prudently manage natural resources, however there is mention of water efficiency. We recommend the decision making criteria include: “Will it promote water efficiency” and “Will the site help reduce water consumption”.

Recommend replacing “will it minimise flood risk?” with “will it mitigate flood risk”. Include an additional question – “Will it reduce flood risk to others?” Surface water also needs consideration and recommend inclusion of “Will the site reduce surface water run |

**Change required** – add the Humber River Basin Management Plan to list of Plans, Programmes and Policies

**Key sustainability issues**

**No changes required** –

Different policy approaches for flood risk will be explored through future SA appraisals. A policy approach that combines both issues can be one of the policy approaches that are appraised.

No change considered required to the list of key issues – one of the policy options considered through the Issues and Options |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Issue raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regulation 17 of the Water Environment (WFD) (E&amp;W) Regulations 2003 applies places a duty on decision makers to have regard to the River Basin Management Plans (RBMP's), in this instance the Humber RBMP. Therefore advise the following questions are incorporated into the decision making criteria:</td>
<td>the incorporation of higher standards for water efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Will it cause a deterioration of WFD status or potential of onsite watercourses?”, “Will it improve WFD status or potential of onsite watercourses?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Will it improve WFD status or potential of onsite watercourses through river restoration, riparian zone and water quality improvements?”</td>
<td>Site specific questions:-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For site specific questions we advise the following question is incorporated:</td>
<td>Agree:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Will it deteriorate river habitat in-stream and the riparian zone adjacent floodplain habitats?”</td>
<td>Change required – amend decision making criteria to Objective 8 to include: “Will it promote water efficiency?, “Will the site help reduce water consumption?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Replace “will it minimise flood risk?” with “will it mitigate flood risk?” and include new questions – “Will it reduce flood risk to others?” and Will the site reduce surface water run off?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include: “Will it cause a deterioration of WFD status or potential of onsite watercourses?”, “Will it improve WFD status or potential of onsite watercourses”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Issue raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>Appendix 1 – Table 2</td>
<td>Diasgree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Parking provision’ should be added, under this, “Traffic Management Act 2004, Operating Instructions for Local Authorities, Parking Policy and Enforcement” (March 2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- all new developments need to have adequate car parking in order to ensure they are sustainable. (alongside encouragement of alternative means of other travel other than motor vehicle).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladman</td>
<td>SA should be undertaken at each stage of plan preparation, assessing the effects of the Local Plan’s proposals on sustainable development when judged against all reasonable alternatives.</td>
<td>Noted. No change required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The LPA should ensure that the results of the SA process clearly justify the policy choices, including why options were rejected. A comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, in the same level of detail for both chosen and reasonable alternatives, the Council’s decision making and scoring should be ‘robust, justified and transparent’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Issue raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic England</td>
<td>Gladman remind the Council that there have now been a number of instances where the failure to undertake a satisfactory SA as resulted in Plans failing the test of legal compliance at examination (South Somerset) or being subjected to later legal challenge (Heard v Greater Norwich Development Plan).</td>
<td>Plans, Policies and Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England</td>
<td>In general, reference should be made to Strategic Environmental Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and The Historic Environment <a href="http://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/strategic-envirn-assessment-sustainability-appraisal-historic-environment/">http://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/strategic-envirn-assessment-sustainability-appraisal-historic-environment/</a></td>
<td><strong>Change required</strong> - agree to add those suggested by Historic England to the existing list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England</td>
<td>Plans, Policies and Programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England</td>
<td>Should also include:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England</td>
<td>- Historic England’s ‘Conservation Principles for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England</td>
<td>- ‘The Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe (Granada Convention)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Issue raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Baseline data:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- SA objective 3 (Heritage, incl page 119 of Appendix 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- more detail is required in relation to the Historic Environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Non-designated heritage assets should be included in the baseline data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Conservation Areas and conservation area management plans should be referred to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Parks and gardens should be classified as ‘Registered Parks and Gardens’, not ‘listed gardens’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reference needed to sources of data on archaeological assets, ideally including reference to the Historic Environment Record (HER) as this is the primary source for non-designated assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Baseline data:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Changes required</strong> – add non-designated heritage assets to the baseline data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- include reference to Conservation Areas and Conservation Area Management Plans in baseline data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Issue raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Collating numbers of heritage assets does not provide any means of measuring trends or assessing whether targets are being met. A more appropriate list of indicators is included in the EH Guidance mentioned above.</td>
<td>- Remove reference to ‘listed gardens’ and replace with ‘Registered Parks and Gardens’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Baseline indicators should include:</td>
<td>- Include reference to Historic Environment Record (HER) in the list of baseline data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>conservation areas</strong> – a list of those</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>historic parks and gardens</strong>: levels of public resources, levels of increased access and number and % of registered parks and gardens ‘at risk’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>local lists or local heritage assets</strong> – number and % at risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>heritage at risk</strong> – should be included in the baseline data (available from both HE’s at Risk Register and Nottinghamshire CC at Risk Register). Indicators could include numbers of historic buildings repaired and brought back into use and heritage assets removed from the registers. (Within Rushcliffe there are 4 Grade I listed buildings on the ‘at risk’ register, and 2 scheduled monuments, as well as 30 grade II listed buildings at risk.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>archaeology</strong> - % of planning applications where archaeological investigations were required prior to approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>historic environment</strong> – number and extent of street /public realm audits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>listed buildings</strong> – number of actions taken in response to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change required**

Amend baseline data indicators used to appraise the objective 3 as follows:

- remove number of listed buildings, SAMs and Registered Parks and Gardens and replace with number and percentage of listed buildings ‘at risk’, number and percentage of local heritage assets ‘at risk’ and number and percentage of registered parks and gardens ‘at risk’.

- include the number of Conservation Areas with a Management Appraisal as an indicator.

These amendments are considered to sufficiently respond to
Respondent
breaches of listed building control.

- Pages 69 – 70 – Implications for the SA related to the historic environment are underplayed. Additional objective should be: “to improve access to the cultural heritage of the district (including architectural, archaeological and artistic heritage) for enjoyment and educational purposes”. This is paraphrased in the Appraisal Framework (page 4) but not elsewhere. There are two distinct objectives and it should be reflected in the SA report as it is in the adopted Core Strategy.

Key Sustainability Issues:
- Under ‘Environmental’ consider that ‘heritage at risk’ is a key issue. It is addressed within the Core Strategy. In terms of the LAPP considered this will have a moderate influence.

Other issues already identified in the Core Strategy which can impact on the historic environment are: traffic congestion, air quality and noise pollution.

SA objectives

Objective 3 – Heritage
- replace ‘Heritage’ with ‘Historic Environment’. ‘Historic

Response
Historic England’s concerns. The Council consider it has taken a proportionate approach to referencing the historic environment, as the Local Plan will be assessed against the whole of the Sustainability Appraisal Framework, and therefore the number of indicators included under this objective cannot be exhaustive.

Change required:
Amend the decision making criteria of the objective 3 (Heritage) to include:
- Will it improve access to the cultural heritage of the district (including architectural and artistic heritage) for enjoyment and educational purposes?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Issue raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment’ is considered the best term to use as it encompasses all aspects of heritage, e.g. heritage assets and cultural heritage. - The objective makes no reference to conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Recommend that the objective is split into two statements – conserving the Borough’s heritage and promoting access to culture and heritage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Objective 7 – Landscape</strong> - the final phrase, “including Rushcliffe’s heritage and its setting” isn’t appropriate under this objective. This should be omitted. Remainder of the objective, which incorporates reference to the cultural and built environment, can be retained provided that the decision making criteria reflect these elements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Change required</strong> Include ‘heritage at risk’ as a key issue, reflective of the Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No change required</strong> Heritage is considered as suitable a header as historic environment and capable of incorporating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Issue raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- omission – no mention of the need/desire to enhance the vitality of town and village centres. – this is a key consideration for the historic environment. The viability of historic buildings and conservation areas, and redundancy or under use of upper floors can threaten many historic buildings and place heritage at risk. Important objectives should be: 1. To encourage the vitality of town and village centres and reduce risks that may threaten heritage. 2. To improve the quality of new development and the existing built environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision making criteria</strong></td>
<td>heritage assets and cultural heritage under this term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage.</strong> Need to be made more robust. ‘Heritage assets’ need to be referred to instead of ‘historic buildings’. The following should be included:</td>
<td><strong>Change required</strong> – change the description under the objective to: “to conserve the Borough’s heritage and provide better opportunities for people to enjoy culture and heritage”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it conserve and/ or enhance, designated heritage assets and/ or the historic environment?</td>
<td><strong>Change required</strong> – delete phrase “including Rushcliffe’s heritage and its setting” from the description of Objective 7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it respect, maintain and strengthen local character and distinctiveness?</td>
<td><strong>Change required</strong> – To add the following decision making criteria under the Economic structure objective: “will it encourage the vitality of town and village centres”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Issue raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape.</strong> Criteria does not relate sufficiently well to the SA Objective. ‘Cultural, built environmental and archaeological assets’ are distinct from ‘landscape character’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does it respect identified landscape character?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it maintain and/or enhance the local distinctiveness of the townscape or settlement character?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it preserve an historic landscape?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it conserve or enhance the interrelationship between the landscape and the historic environment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it protect and enhance open spaces of amenity and recreational value, identified within Characterisation Studies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggest additional criterion:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it involve the re-use of a redundant building or Heritage at Risk?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site specific questions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend that the following text should be used:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development harm the significance of an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decision making criteria:**

**Change required** – remove reference to ‘historic buildings’ and replace with ‘heritage assets’.

Agree to incorporate some of the suggestions but not all.

Add the following:

- Will it conserve and/or enhance designated heritage assets and/or the historic environment?
- Will it lead to the adaptive re-use of a heritage asset?
- Will it improve access to historic sites and/or enhance understanding of the Borough’s cultural assets?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Issue raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Changes required:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>individual or multiple heritage assets (including their setting)?</td>
<td>These are considered sufficient to incorporate the main issues of Historic England’s concern.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is there a cumulative effect on heritage assets?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development enhance or better reveal the significance of the heritage asset?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Where the development will cause harm, are there any methods of mitigation that can avoid adverse effects or overcome the negative effects, or even achieve positive effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the site accord with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Landscape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- should acknowledge that the main tools for assessing impact on landscape character are Landscape and Visual Appraisal or Landscape Visual Impact Assessment. Where landscape character affects historic places (e.g. conservation areas, archaeological sites, Registered Parks and Gardens) a more detailed site assessment may be required which would need to be informed by the specific contribution that heritage and the setting of heritage assets makes to landscape character.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend the following points should be added:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development affect an historic landscape, a designated or non-designated heritage asset?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Are there any appropriate methods of landscape mitigation which can be incorporated into the development to overcome or reduce harm to landscape character?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Changes required:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Landscape</strong> – add the following criteria:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it maintain and/or enhance the local distinctiveness of the townscape or settlement character?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it preserve an historic landscape?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Issue raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|            | SEA Directive – the Scoping Report does not meet the requirements of the SEA Directive. | **Energy**- add the following criterion:  
• Will it involve the reuse of a redundant building?  

The fact that this could involve a heritage at risk building not considered directly relevant to the energy objective.  

**Site specific questions:**  

**Changes required:**  

Heritage  
Delete the existing questions included and replace with those recommended:  
• Will the development harm the significance of an individual or multiple heritage assets (including their setting)?  
• Is there a cumulative effect on heritage assets?  
• Will the development enhance or better reveal the significance of the heritage asset?  
• Where the development will cause harm, are there any methods of mitigation that can avoid adverse effects or overcome the negative effects, or even achieve positive effects?  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Issue raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Changes required:**

Add the following criterion to objective 7:

- Are there any appropriate methods of landscape mitigation which can be incorporated into the development to overcome or reduce harm to the landscape character?
-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Issue raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>Generally welcome the Scoping Report.</td>
<td>Amendments as described above considered sufficient to address these concerns. Reference has been removed to the historic landscape in the landscape objective so that Heritage’ and Landscape are more clearly defined. Additional decision making criteria have been added for both the Heritage objective and landscape objectives, and the baseline data has been amended in line with some of the recommendations made by Historic England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plans, Policies and Programmes</td>
<td>Plan, Policies and Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadly welcomes the list but suggest including:</td>
<td>Change required:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reference to the National Character Areas (NCAs) which divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic aspects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent</td>
<td>Issue raised</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SA Framework               | • Broadly welcomes the SA Framework and considers that it covers our interests. Particularly welcome: objectives 6 (biodiversity and green infrastructure), 7 (landscape), 8 (natural resources and flooding). Also welcome the link made in the Health section between health and provision of recreational open space. Suggest that recreational open space could be broadened to GI. (NPPG definition: network of parks, open spaces, playing fields but also street trees, allotments, private gardens, rivers, streams etc). | • Include the National Character Areas in the list of Plans, Policies and Programmes.  
SA Framework  
Change required:  
Amend the site specific question under Objective 2. Delete “will the development result in a loss of recreational open space?” and replace with “Will the development result in a loss of accessible Green Infrastructure? (parks, open spaces, playing fields, allotments, watercourses)” |
| Parker                     | The Green Belt review should be undertaken as a priority in order for it to be used to inform the plans, policies and programmes.                                      | Noted. No change to Scoping Report required.                                 |
| Tollerton Parish Council   | Other sustainability issues not identified:  
Traffic and the impact of this on the village of Tollerton, including potential further impacts of future new housing developments in | Noted. No change to Scoping Report required. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Issue raised</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the vicinity. Traffic issues relating to Tollerton village will impact on the health and well-being of residents by the high density of carbon monoxide which is understood to be above permitted European limits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Scoping Appraisal

1. The Scoping Report comprises the first stage of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Land and Planning Policies Document (LAPP). The LAPP will form part of the Local Plan. Part 1 of the Local Plan, the Core Strategy, was adopted in December 2014.

2. The Sustainability Appraisal process comprises a number of stages. The Scoping Report covers stages A1 to A5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage A</th>
<th>Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Collecting baseline information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Identifying sustainability issues and problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Developing the Sustainability Appraisal Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Consulting on the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Scoping Report

3. The purpose of the Scoping Report is to decide the scope and level of detail in the Sustainability Appraisal. It sets out the information required to determine the scope of the appraisal, the key sustainability issues affecting the area, and sets out the framework against which the effects of the Land and Planning Policies DPD will be assessed.

Plans, Policies and Programmes (Stage A1)


5. Section 3 of the Scoping Report contains the key messages from this document review.

Baseline information (Stage A2)

6. Section 4 of the Scoping Report describes the characteristics of Rushcliffe. The baseline data collected is set out in Appendix 2.
**Sustainability Issues (Stage A3)**

7. The sustainability issues identified through analysis of the baseline data is included in Section 5 of the report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Spatial issues</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The need to plan for a significant degree of new housing development in line with the Core Strategy spatial strategy, with a high proportion of this to be planned for adjacent to the main urban area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some of the rural settlements within the Borough are very isolated and suffer from poor transport links.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Several major transport infrastructure projects have recently been completed, improving accessibility (A453 widening, NET phase 2, A46 improvements)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Built and natural environment issues</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The need to protect existing environmental and heritage assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rushcliffe now has three air quality management areas all of which have been declared due to traffic pollution and in particular due to excessive levels of the annual Nitrogen Dioxide above the air quality objective (AQO) level in certain areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a need to improve energy efficiency and reduce contributions to climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The need to reduce dependency on the private motor car and encourage more sustainable forms of transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Economic issues</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The need to provide sites for new employment in line with the Core Strategy requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rushcliffe is an affluent borough but there are pockets of economic deprivation, notably in areas of Cotgrave, Keyworth, and Bingham.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Social issues</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ageing population, and the need to retain people of working age in villages to ensure future sustainability of these areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some areas in the Borough are seeing a declining population, e.g. Keyworth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Rushcliffe has a significantly lower proportion of affordable housing as part of...
overall housing stock compared to regional and national average.

**Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Stage A4)**

8. Stage A4 of the Sustainability Appraisal is to establish a Sustainability Appraisal Framework which is usually based on the review of the plans, policies and programmes, the analysis of the baseline data and the identification of sustainability issues.

9. A SA Framework has been established for the Core Strategy and as the issues have not changed significantly it has been decided to broadly use the same SA Framework to test the sustainability of the Land and Planning Policies Document. Some additional decision making criteria questions have been added to assist with site allocations and which reflect some changes to policy since the Core Strategy SA Framework was developed, e.g. introduction of neighbourhood plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA objectives</th>
<th>Decision making criteria</th>
<th>Site specific questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Housing** To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Rushcliffe | - Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?  
- Will it reduce homelessness?  
- Will it reduce the number of unfit homes? | - Is the site allocated for housing?  
- Is the site allocated for the type of housing needed in the area?  
- Will the site include provision for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople?  
- Does the site accord with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)? |
| **2. Health** To improve health and reduce health inequalities | - Will it reduce health inequalities?  
- Will it improve access to health facilities?  
- Will it improve the opportunities for recreational physical activity? | - Is the site within 10 minutes public transport time or 30 minutes walking time of a health facility?  
- Will the development result in a loss of recreational open space?  
- Does the site accord with |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA objectives</th>
<th>Decision making criteria</th>
<th>Site specific questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Heritage</td>
<td>• Will it protect historic sites?</td>
<td>• Will the development result in a loss of historic site or damage to the building or setting? e.g. Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Historic Parks and Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide better opportunities for people to value and enjoy Rushcliffe’s heritage</td>
<td>• Will it improve access to historic sites?</td>
<td>• Does the site accord with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it help people to increase their participation in cultural activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Crime</td>
<td>• Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime in Rushcliffe</td>
<td>• Will it contribute to a safe secure built environment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Social</td>
<td>• Will it protect and enhance existing cultural assets?</td>
<td>• Will the development result in the loss of a community facility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote and support the development and growth of social capital across Rushcliffe</td>
<td>• Will it improve access to and resident’s satisfaction with community facilities and services?</td>
<td>• Does the site accord with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase the number of facilities, e.g. shops, community centres, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>• Will it protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected sites</td>
<td>• Will the development result in a loss of all or part of a designated site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA objectives</td>
<td>Decision making criteria</td>
<td>Site specific questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance Green Infrastructure across Rushcliffe</td>
<td>species?</td>
<td>of nature conservation interest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it provide new green space?</td>
<td>• Is the site adjacent to a designated site of nature conservation interest?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve green infrastructure networks?</td>
<td>• Will the development involve the loss of existing habitats or trees/hedgerows/woodland?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management?</td>
<td>• Will the site include the provision on-site or off-site open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will it improve the quality of existing open space?</td>
<td>• Will the development involve the loss of existing open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development enhance the underused or undervalued open space?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Landscape</strong></td>
<td><strong>Does it respect identified landscape character?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Will the development conserve the features and characteristics of the landscape in the present form?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To protect and enhance the rich diversity of the natural, cultural and built environmental and archaeological/geological assets, and landscape character of Rushcliffe, including Rushcliffe’s heritage and its setting</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development enhance the features and characteristics of the landscape?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development restore the features and characteristics of the landscape?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA objectives</td>
<td>Decision making criteria</td>
<td>Site specific questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>landscape?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development create a new landscape character?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Natural resources and flooding

To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including water, air quality, soils and minerals whilst also minimising the risk of flooding

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve water quality?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it minimise flood risk?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it prevent the loss of high quality soils to development?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the site cause any harm to the water environment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the site cause additional harm to an AQMA?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is the site within EA flood zone 2 or 3?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is the site adjacent to EA flood zone 2 or 3?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is the site on high grade agricultural land?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is the site a brownfield site?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. Waste

To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce household and commercial waste per head?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it increase waste recovery and recycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA objectives</td>
<td>Decision making criteria</td>
<td>Site specific questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per head?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce hazardous waste?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it reduce waste in the construction industry?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10. Energy**
To minimise waste and increase the re-use and do develop the area’s renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources

|               | Will it improve energy efficiency of new buildings? |                        |
|               | Will it support the generation and use of renewable energies? |                        |
|               | Will it support the development of community energy systems? |                        |
|               | Will it ensure that buildings are able to deal with future changes in climate? |                        |

|               | Will the development include provision of renewable technology? |                        |
|               | Is the development for a specific renewable energy project? |                        |
|               | Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)? |                        |

**11. Transport**
To make efficient use of the existing transport infrastructure, help reduce the need to travel by car, improve accessibility to jobs and services for all and to ensure that all journeys are undertaken by the most sustainable mode available

|               | Will it use and enhance existing transport infrastructure? |                        |
|               | Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment? |                        |
|               | Will it reduce journeys undertaken by car by encouraging alternative modes of transport? |                        |
|               | Will it increase accessibility to services and facilities? |                        |

<p>|               | Is the site accessible by public transport? |                        |
|               | Is the site located within the main urban area? |                        |
|               | Is the site within 30 minutes public transport time of community facilities, schools, retail centres and employment areas? |                        |
|               | Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)? |                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SA objectives</strong></th>
<th><strong>Decision making criteria</strong></th>
<th><strong>Site specific questions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **12. Employment** | - Will it improve the diversity and quality of jobs?  
- Will it reduce unemployment?  
- Will it increase average income levels?  
- Will it improve rural productivity in terms of employment opportunities? | - Is the site allocated for mixed use employment/retail?  
- Will the development provide jobs for unemployed people?  
- Will the development involve the loss of employment land?  
- Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)? |
| To create high quality employment opportunities |  |  |
| **13. Innovation** | - Will it increase levels of qualification?  
- Will it create jobs in high knowledge sectors?  
- Will it encourage graduates to live and work within the plan areas? | - Does the proposal involve new high quality employment opportunities? E.g. centres of excellence?  
- Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)? |
| To develop a strong culture of enterprise and innovation |  |  |
| **14. Economic structure** | - Will it provide land and buildings of a type required by businesses?  
- Will it improve the diversity of jobs available?  
- Will it provide the required infrastructure? | - Is the site allocated for employment or mixed use?  
- Is the site allocated for mixed educational/employment?  
- Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)? |
<p>| To provide the physical conditions for a modern economic structure including infrastructure to support the use of new technologies |  |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA objectives</th>
<th>Decision making criteria</th>
<th>Site specific questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it provide business/university clusters</td>
<td>policies (if applicable)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equalities Impact Assessment**

10. Under the Equality Act 2010, the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Document, is required to be subject to an Equality Impact Assessment to ensure that it meets the needs of all members of the community. The Sustainability Appraisal incorporates the initial steps of the Equalities Impact Assessment through the identification of the key issues affecting the nine protected equalities characteristics. These are identified in Section 1 of this report.

**Consultation**

11. The Scoping Report is being consulted on alongside the Issues and Options consultation for the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Document. The consultation for both the Issues and Options and this Scoping Report will run until **5pm on Thursday 24 March 2016**.

12. Consultation questions for this Scoping Report are included in Section 7 to assist consultees with their responses. A separate response form with these questions included is available to download from [www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy](http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy) and can also be filled out online through the Council’s consultation portal at [http://rushcliffe.limehouse.co.uk/portal](http://rushcliffe.limehouse.co.uk/portal)

13. The response form can be submitted:

- By e-mail to: [localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk](mailto:localdevelopment@rushcliffe.gov.uk)

- By post to: Planning Policy Rushcliffe Borough Council Civic Centre Pavilion Road West Bridgford Nottingham NG2 5FE
What happens next?

14. The Sustainability Appraisal of the LAPP will take place over several stages (as identified in Section 2 of the Scoping Report). A draft Sustainability Appraisal Report will be published detailing the assessment of options. It will detail how the initial options were refined as part of the Sustainability Appraisal process.
1 Introduction

1.1 This report comprises the first stage of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the Land and Planning Policies (LAPP) document. The LAPP is the second part of the Rushcliffe Local Plan. The first part of the Local Plan, the Core Strategy, was adopted in December 2014. The Core Strategy provides the overall spatial vision, objectives and strategy for the Borough to 2028. This includes setting out the level and location of new housing and employment land as well as the identification of a number of strategic allocations and policies.

Purpose of the Scoping Report

1.2 The purpose of the Scoping Report is to decide on the scope and level of detail of the Sustainability Appraisal. It sets out the information required to determine the scope of the appraisal, suggests a list of sustainability issues and sets out the framework against which the effects of the Land and Planning Policies DPD will be assessed.

1.3 The purpose of the sustainability appraisal process is to assess the economic, social and environmental impacts of projects, strategies or plans, so that the preferred option promotes, rather than inhibits, sustainable development.

Land and Planning Policies Document (LAPP)

1.4 The Land and Planning Policies Document (LAPP) will form part of the Local Plan. The LAPP will include non-strategic land allocations and designations as well as more detailed policies for use in the determination of planning applications in respect of matters such as renewable and low carbon energy, rural diversification and householder development. The LAPP will run to 2028 to align with the plan period of the Core Strategy.

Timetable

1.5 Table 1 sets out the timescale for the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal of the LAPP.
Table 1: Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Consultation on Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and LAPP Issues and Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2016-June 2016</td>
<td>Predicting sustainability effects of the options for the LAPP and preparation of Preferred Options document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2016</td>
<td>Consultation on LAPP Preferred Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2016</td>
<td>Consideration of consultation responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2016 – December 2016</td>
<td>Predicting sustainability effects of draft policies for the LAPP and preparation of Publication document and final SA report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>Consultation on Publication document and final SA report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>Submission LAPP and the final Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report submitted to Planning Inspectorate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map of the area covered by the Scoping Report

1.6 Map 1 shows the area covered by the Scoping Report which relates to the whole of Rushcliffe Borough.

1.7 The baseline data collected for this Scoping Report has been split into either the wards of Rushcliffe (based on pre May 2015 boundaries for ease of analysis of data) or parish (based on pre May 2015 boundaries for ease of analysis of data and where data is available at this level) or at Borough level. These are shown on the map overleaf.
2 Sustainability Appraisal

2.1 This section explains the legal requirements for Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).

2.2 In addition to this process, authorities are also required to carry out an Equality Impact Assessment.

Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

2.3 Section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires a local planning authority to carry out a sustainability appraisal of each of the proposals in a Local Plan during its preparation. More generally, section 39 of the Act requires the authority preparing a Local Plan must do so “with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development”.

2.4 Paragraph 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework states: A sustainability appraisal which meets the requirements of the European Directive on strategic environmental assessment should be an integral part of the plan preparation process, and should consider all the likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors.

2.5 Identifying key sustainability issues and the ability to assess the likely effects through the sustainability appraisal during the early stages of plan preparation ensures the plan or strategy contributes towards the aim of sustainable development.

2.6 SA is an on-going process undertaken through the preparation of a plan or strategy. The aim of the appraisal process is to minimise adverse impacts and resolve as far as possible conflicting or contradictory outcomes of the plan or strategy.

2.7 The SA will help demonstrate the inter-relationships between social, economic and environmental issues.

2.8 The final SA report should be able to demonstrate how the adopted Local Planning Document has addressed the sustainability agenda and how the choices were made between alternative policies and proposals.

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

2.9 European Directive 2001/42/EC (commonly referred to as Strategic Environmental Assessment) which was translated into legislation in the UK in July 2004, requires that local planning authorities undertake an environmental...
assessment of any plans and programmes they prepare that they are likely to have a significant effect upon the environment.

2.10 The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive requires environmental appraisal to be undertaken on all plans and programmes likely to have a significant effect on the environment.

2.11 The objective of Strategic Environmental Assessment is stated in Article 1 of the Directive: “(to) provide for a high level of protection of the environment and contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of development plans…with a view to promoting sustainable development”.

2.12 SEA should consider the key likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architecture and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors.

**Relationship between SA and SEA**

2.13 SEA and SA are similar processes that involve a comparable series of tasks. The main difference is that SEA focuses on environmental effects, whereas SA covers environmental, social and economic matters. The National Planning Policy Framework states that a sustainability appraisal should meet the requirements of the European Directive on strategic environmental assessment.

2.14 **Table 2** below shows how the requirements of SEA are met in this report.

**Table 2: Requirements of the SEA Directive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (As referred to in Article 5 (1))</th>
<th>Where requirement is met in the SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes</td>
<td>Section 1 of Scoping Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without</td>
<td>Section 4 and Appendix 2 of Scoping Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (As referred to in Article 5 (1))</td>
<td>Where requirement is met in the SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation of the plan or programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected</td>
<td>Section 4 of Scoping Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC</td>
<td>Section 3 and Appendix 1 of Scoping Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) The environmental protection objectives established at international, community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation</td>
<td>Section 3 and Appendix 1 of Scoping Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) The key likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. (Footnote: These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects).</td>
<td>To be included in future SA report as the LAPP is developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme</td>
<td>To be included in future SA report as the LAPP is developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information</td>
<td>To be included in future SA report as the LAPP is developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) A description of measures envisaged concerning</td>
<td>To be included in future SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.15 The Government guidance identifies 5 stages of carrying out an SA (stages A – E). Table 3 shows the main stages of a Sustainability Appraisal.

2.16 This scoping report covers stage A of the process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Collecting baseline information</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Identifying sustainability issues and problems</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Developing the Sustainability Appraisal Framework</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Consulting on the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Developing and refining options and assessing effects</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>Testing the Development Plan Document objectives against the Sustainability Appraisal Framework</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Developing the Development Plan Document options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Predicting the effects of the Development Plan Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: SEA Requirements met through the Scoping Report
### What is required at the Scoping Stage?

2.17 Paragraph 014 of the Guidance (reference ID: 11-014-20140306) states that the scoping stage (Stage A) must identify the scope and the level of detail of the information to be included in the sustainability appraisal report. It should set out the context, objectives and approach of the assessment; and identify relevant environmental, economic and social issues and objectives.

2.18 A key aim of the scoping procedure is to help ensure the sustainability appraisal process is proportionate and relevant to the Local Plan being assessed.
What is baseline information?

2.19 Paragraph 016 of the Guidance (reference ID: 11-016-20140306) states that the term ‘baseline information’ refers to the existing environmental, economic and social characteristics of the area likely to be affected by (the plan) and their likely evolution without implementation of new policies. Baseline information provides the basis against which to assess the likely effects of alternative proposals in the plan.

Equality Impact Assessment

2.20 Under the Equality Act 2010, the Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2: Land and Planning Policies Document, is required to be subject to an Equality Impact Assessment to ensure that it meets the needs of all members of the community. There are nine protected characteristics:

- Age
- Disability
- Gender reassignment
- Marriage and civil partnership
- Pregnancy and maternity
- Race
- Religion and belief
- Sex (gender)
- Sexual orientation

2.21 After a review of the baseline data, the following issues have been identified:

Age

- A higher proportion of people over the age of 65 compared to the national average.
- Significantly lower proportion of younger people in Cranmer, Keyworth North, and Tollerton wards.
• Lower proportion of people of working age in the following wards, Oak, Neville, Wolds, Keyworth North, Edwalton Village.

Disability

• The Borough wide figures for limiting illness and disability reflect the national figures however the figures for Cotgrave are noticeably higher.

Race

• The population of the Borough is predominantly white, with 93.1% describing themselves as white (compared to the national average of 85.4%).

• There is a smaller proportion of groups from the minority ethnic groups compared to the national average.

Sex (gender)

• In terms of gender breakdown, the Borough and areas within it reflect the national ratio.

Religion and belief

• A higher proportion of people stating 'no religion' compared to the national average.

• Christianity is the most largest religious group by a significant degree (58.9%), which is similar to the national average of 59.4%. Muslims made up the next largest religious group (1.5%) which is less than the national average of 5%.

Pregnancy and maternity, sexual orientation and gender reassignment

• There are no figures currently available

2.22 Following on from the Issues and Options stage, the draft policies will be subjected to an Equality Impact Assessment using a similar methodology to that used for the Equality Impact Assessment carried out on the Local Plan Part 1, Rushcliffe Core Strategy. Any changes that result from the Equality Impact Assessment will be incorporated into the next stage of the Local Planning Document and included in the public consultation.
3 Other relevant Plans, Policies and Programmes (Stage A1)

3.1 The first stage of Sustainability Appraisal involves relevant international, national and local policy guidance, plans and strategies to identify their key requirements, and assess their relationship to the LAPP.

3.2 Appendix 1 sets out the review of all documents and strategies considered relevant to the LAPP. It establishes the environmental, social and economic situation and allows opportunities and synergies between the plans and the LAPP to be identified, as well as any potential conflicts. It contains issues and objectives, targets, the implications for the LAPP and the implications for the Sustainability Appraisal.

3.3 There is no definitive list of plans that must be reviewed. Review of these plans that are deemed relevant to the LAPP have been included in Appendix 1. The list of relevant documents will be kept under review.

Issues identified from the review

3.4 The following list contains the key messages from the reviews of plans, policies and programmes included in Appendix 1.

Table 4: Key sustainability messages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key messages from review of relevant plans, policies and programmes</th>
<th>Source of message</th>
<th>Implications for the SA Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility and transport</strong></td>
<td>• Planning Act 2008</td>
<td>Requires objectives to enable the development of a sustainable transport infrastructure that reduces overall levels of travel and ensures accessibility to key services (e.g. health services, education, employment sites, and leisure facilities), the provision of safe walking and cycling routes, and safe accessible public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Embed accessibility in decisions affecting provision, location, design and delivery of services in both urban and rural areas</td>
<td>• National Planning Policy Framework (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve social inclusion by making services more accessible</td>
<td>• Accessible Settlements Study for Greater Nottingham (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tackle crime and fear of crime on public transport</td>
<td>• Nottinghamshire Local and Transport 2011-2026 (2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve the quality and safety of pedestrian and cycling networks</td>
<td>• Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve public transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key messages from review of relevant plans, policies and programmes</td>
<td>Source of message</td>
<td>Implications for the SA Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| networks  
- Encourage more people to walk and cycle  
- Reduce impact of travel on the environment  
- Maximise the use of existing roads infrastructure and avoid inappropriate development  
- Reduce traffic and in particular journeys made by car  
- Improve public transport  
- Reduce traffic noise, pollution and congestion  
- Improve the freight network to reduce amount of road freight  
- Promote sustainable transport | | |
| Air quality  
- Prevent and reduce the detrimental impact on human health, quality of life and the environment  
- Reduce pollution  
- Ensure that new development does not reduce air quality | • Air Quality Directive 2008/50/EC (2008)  
• National Planning Policy Framework (2012)  
• A Breath of Fresh Air for Nottinghamshire (2008)  
• Update of the Air Quality Action Plan 2007 Rushcliffe Borough Council February 2010 | Requires objectives to prevent pollution and protect air quality. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key messages from review of relevant plans, policies and programmes</th>
<th>Source of message</th>
<th>Implications for the SA Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and subsequent progress reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity and habitats</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires objectives to protect, enhance and improve biodiversity and habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that land uses (including agriculture) does not threaten biodiversity.</td>
<td>• EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 (2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protect, restore and improve habitats including woodland, and aquatic ecosystems.</td>
<td>• Biodiversity 2020 – a Strategy for England’s wildlife and ecosystem services (2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create and integrate habitats in urban spaces and in the built environment</td>
<td>• National Planning Policy Framework (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nottinghamshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan (1998)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trent River Park Vision and Action Plan (2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy 2016 – 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business development and the economy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires objectives to ensure there is sufficient land for business development; to ensure that businesses are located in the correct places and that local communities (especially deprived communities) benefit from them; to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider the location of new business with regard to accessibility and the local environment</td>
<td>• National Planning Policy Framework (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that the location of industry and commerce brings benefit and not harm</td>
<td>• Equality Act 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessible Settlements Study for Greater Nottingham (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key messages from review of relevant plans, policies and programmes</td>
<td>Source of message</td>
<td>Implications for the SA Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to local communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support efficient, competitive and innovative retail, leisure and other sectors</td>
<td>• Nottingham City Region Employment Land Study (2007)</td>
<td>ensure that businesses do not cause harm to the communities in which they are situated; and to encourage diversity and high value, high growth, knowledge intensive economic activities, including tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regenerate deprived areas through business development</td>
<td>• Employment Land Forecasting Study Nottingham Core HMA and Nottingham Outer HMA Final Report August 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure location of development makes efficient use of existing infrastructure</td>
<td>• Strategic Distribution of Employment Requirements Background Paper: Nottingham Core HMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understand future demands for business land</td>
<td>• Greater Nottingham Retail Study (2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop economic capacity and expertise</td>
<td>• Broxtowe, Gedling, Nottingham City &amp; Rushcliffe Retail Study 2015 Final Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase economic diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maximise economic benefit from tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage growth in high value, high growth, high knowledge economic activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that economic growth goes hand in hand with high quality environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop flourishing local economies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understand future demands for land including type of land and location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage inward investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote the vitality of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key messages from review of relevant plans, policies and programmes</td>
<td>Source of message</td>
<td>Implications for the SA Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>town centres by promoting and enhancing existing centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Climate Change**                                           | • Climate Change Act 2008  
• Planning Act 2008  
• Energy Act 2011  
• NPPF (2012)  
• Rushcliffe Climate Change Strategy 2009-2020, updated 2013  
• Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy | Requires objectives to reduce carbon dioxide emissions that contribute to climate change; and to ensure that new development is able to cope with the effects of climate change. |
| **Community safety**                                         | • National Planning Policy Framework (2012)  
• Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy | Requires objectives to reduce crime and the fear of crime, and change behaviour that is often linked with crime. |
| **Education**                                                 | • Accessible Settlements Study for Greater Nottingham (2010)  
• Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy | Requires objectives that will improve educational attainment. |
| **Employment**                                               | • National Planning Policy Framework (2012)  
• Nottingham City Region Employment | Requires objectives to improve employment skills and levels, and to ensure supply of employment land. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key messages from review of relevant plans, policies and programmes</th>
<th>Source of message</th>
<th>Implications for the SA Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| and deprivation  
• Ensure supply of employment land | Land Study (2007)  
• Accessible Settlements Study for Greater Nottingham (2010)  
• Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy | |
| Energy  
• Seek secure, clean affordable energy  
• Reduce amount of energy consumed  
• Generate energy at local levels  
• Increase energy efficiency of homes and businesses  
• Increase the amount of renewable energy produced  
• Invest in the energy infrastructure  
• Recover energy from waste | Climate Change Act 2008  
• Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy | Requires objectives to improve energy efficiency of new development and to encourage alternative ways of generating energy. |
| Flood risk  
• Safeguard land used to manage floodwater  
• Avoid inappropriate development on floodplains  
• Flood and Water Management Act 2010  
• National Planning Policy Framework (2012)  
• Water for Life and Livelihoods- River | Requires objectives to ensure that the housing stock is of a high quality and meets the requirements of all sectors of the community. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key messages from review of relevant plans, policies and programmes</th>
<th>Source of message</th>
<th>Implications for the SA Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basin Management Plan Humber River Basin District (2009)</td>
<td>Requires objectives to improve health by providing opportunities for walking, cycling, sport and leisure activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Trent River Park Vision and Action Plan (2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Greater Nottingham Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Greater Nottingham and Ashfield Outline Water Cycle Study (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Rushcliffe Community Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Nottingham Accessibility Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nottinghamshire Health and Well-being Strategy 2014-2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework (2012)</td>
<td>Requires objectives to ensure that the housing stock is of a high quality and meets the requirements of all sectors of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appraisal of Sustainable Urban Extensions (2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Relationship Between Household</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key messages from review of relevant plans, policies and programmes</td>
<td>Source of message</td>
<td>Implications for the SA Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase the supply of houses</td>
<td>Size and Dwelling Size in Future Housing Provision (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide a supply of high quality, well designed, energy efficient housing appropriate to needs of the community including family homes, homes to meet the needs of the ageing population and social housing</td>
<td>Greater Nottingham Sustainable Locations for Growth Study (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New homes to be energy efficient, zero carbon by 2016 and able to cope with the effects of climate change</td>
<td>Nottingham Core Affordable Housing Viability Study (2009) and update 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide adequate amount of land for gypsies and travellers</td>
<td>Nottingham Core Strategic Housing Market (2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nottingham Core Strategic Housing Market (Needs Update) (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment for the Nottinghamshire Local Authorities of Ashfield, Broxtowe, Gedling, Mansfield, Newark and Sherwood, Nottingham City, Rushcliffe (2007)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Strategic Approach to Older Persons’ Accommodation for Nottinghamshire and Erewash (2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key messages from review of relevant plans, policies and programmes</td>
<td>Source of message</td>
<td>Implications for the SA Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased density of housing</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework (2012)</td>
<td>Requires objectives to ensure that best use of land is made prioritising the re-use of land and buildings, and housing development at higher densities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maximise the use of brownfield land for housing, business and commercial development</td>
<td>Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment (2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prioritise the re-use of existing buildings</td>
<td>Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote good design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conserve and enhance the rural and built landscape</td>
<td>European Landscape Convention (2006)</td>
<td>Requires objectives to protect and enhance the natural and built environment; and to encourage people to enjoy their local heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open up access to the countryside</td>
<td>EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 (2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide opportunities to value our heritage</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bring improvements to the physical environment through quality design</td>
<td>Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment (2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protect historic buildings, Conservation Areas and the historic environment in general</td>
<td>Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protect our archaeological and geological heritage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mitigation against harm to the landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote development that minimises the use of resources</td>
<td>Waste Framework Directive 2006/12/EC (2006)</td>
<td>Requires objectives to promote development that minimises the use of resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protect and enhance the natural and built environment; and to encourage people to enjoy their local heritage.</td>
<td>National Planning Policy Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key messages from review of relevant plans, policies and programmes</td>
<td>Source of message</td>
<td>Implications for the SA Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prevent soil loss</td>
<td>(2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainable communities**
- Promote social cohesion and inclusion in both urban and rural communities
- Support vulnerable groups
- Reduce deprivation, focusing on most deprived areas
- Tackle poverty in urban and rural areas
- Increase social interaction
- Improve social development of children
- Improve quality of life
- Create clean, attractive, quality, safe urban spaces
- Access to quality health, education, housing, transport, shopping and leisure services
- Ensure equality of opportunity in housing, employment and access to services
- Recognise that different people have different needs

**Waste**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key messages from review of relevant plans, policies and programmes</th>
<th>Source of message</th>
<th>Implications for the SA Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reduce amount of municipal and commercial waste produced</td>
<td>• Waste Framework Directive 2006/12/EC (2006)</td>
<td>Requires objectives to reduce or re-use waste, and to prevent harm to human health and the environment from waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recycle, compost or re-use waste</td>
<td>• National Planning Policy Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimise harm to the environment and human health from waste treatment and handling</td>
<td>• National Planning Policy for Waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning Practice Guidance: Waste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Local Plan Part 1: Waste Core Strategy (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td><strong>EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 (2011)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flood and Water Management Act 2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Greater Nottingham and Ashfield Outline Water Cycle Study (2010)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Greater Nottingham</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key messages from review of relevant plans, policies and programmes</td>
<td>Source of message</td>
<td>Implications for the SA Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2010)  
• Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy |  |
|  |  |  |
4 Baseline Data and Characteristics (Stage A2)

4.1 The SEA Directive requires the collection of baseline information on social, economic and environmental characteristics of the area and in order to provide the basis for predicting and monitoring effects of the policies with Local Planning Document. The baseline information will also help to identify sustainability issues and potential ways of dealing with them.

4.2 The baseline data collected is set out in Appendix 2. It should be noted that not all information is currently available but the data will continue to be refined and updated as work on the Sustainability Appraisal report proceeds.

Spatial issues

4.3 Rushcliffe’s main centre of population is West Bridgford, a large suburb of Greater Nottingham where around 41,550 of the Borough’s 111,600 population live. The remainder of the Borough is largely rural, with the population divided between the six larger settlements (Bingham, Radcliffe on Trent, Cotgrave, Keyworth, Ruddington and East Leake, which range in population from around 10,000 to around 6,500 people) and the smaller rural villages. Approximately 40% of the Borough falls within the defined Nottingham-Derby Green Belt that encircles Greater Nottingham.

4.4 West Bridgford acts as a key service centre for a number of the surrounding smaller settlements, and contains the Borough’s largest retail centre that is relatively well performing. Outside of West Bridgford, the six towns and larger villages provide a range of facilities and services. Several of the medium sized villages such as East Bridgford, Gotham, Tollerton, Aslockton, Sutton Bonington and Cropwell Bishop have some local facilities to serve their population.

Population Trends

4.5 The population of Rushcliffe increased by 13% between 1991 and 2011. This has not occurred evenly across the Borough and while some settlements have seen increases in population, others have seen stagnation or declines.

4.6 The main differences between the Rushcliffe age profile and the profile nationally is that there are proportionally fewer people in early adulthood living within the Borough, but more in every age category from 40 years onwards. The number of people of pensionable age is also increasing at a faster rate than the national trend and there are certain settlements that have very high concentrations of people of pensionable age.
Connections

4.7 In terms of the highways network, a number of important trunk roads pass through the Borough. The A46 links Rushcliffe to Newark to the north and Leicester to the south, the A52 links to Grantham to the east and the A453 is a major route linking Nottingham and Rushcliffe to East Midlands Airport and the M1. Both the A46 and the A453 have recently been widened, with widening of the A453 in particular seen by many as vital for the future economic growth of the Borough and the City of Nottingham.

4.8 The NET tram extension to Clifton passes through the Borough at Wilford and Compton Acres, with the aim of improving accessibility to the City Centre. The rural parts of the Borough suffer more acutely from accessibility issues due to poorer transport links in these more isolated areas.

Built and natural environment

4.9 Rushcliffe's landscape is largely rural and generally comprises rolling lowland farmland. Variation in character is provided through the higher land of the Nottinghamshire Wolds, the edges of the Vale of Belvoir and parts of the Trent Valley. Rushcliffe has a rich heritage with 29 Conservation Areas, 4 Registered Parks and Gardens, 26 Scheduled Ancient Monuments, over 650 Listed Buildings and Structures and numerous other non-designated assets including those listed on the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record. Some of these listed structures are, however, at "risk". English Heritage’s national Heritage at Risk Register listed, at May 2012, four listed buildings and two scheduled monuments within Rushcliffe. In relation to the natural environment, the Borough has, at December 2015, 8 Sites of Special Scientific Interest, 212 Local Wildlife Sites, 8 Local Nature Reserves and 3 Country Parks.

Economic Issues

4.10 Rushcliffe is the most affluent local authority area in the county, with full time workers earning 30% more than the regional average. It ranks only 319 of 326 local authorities on a national deprivation scale (Index of Multiple Deprivation), with 1 being most deprived (as at 2015). However, there are pockets of relative deprivation, for example in the Keyworth North, Bingham East and Cotgrave wards.

4.11 Rushcliffe acts, to an extent, as a residential area serving the Greater Nottingham employment area, with a lot more workers in the Borough than there are jobs. A certain level of imbalance is not surprising given the proximity of West Bridgford to Nottingham City, where around a third of Rushcliffe’s residents work. In terms of employment within the Borough, there is a strong
dominance towards the service sector with 88% of jobs concentrated in this sector (ONS, 2008). Established employers include the British Geological Survey and British Gypsum.

Social/Community Issues

4.12 The predominant tenure in Rushcliffe is owner-occupation. 77% of households own their own homes, either outright or with a mortgage. This is significantly above the national average for owner occupation of 64%.

4.13 Property prices are relatively high, with an average house price of £235,125 compared with the Nottinghamshire average of £161,155 (Land Registry, April-June 2013). Housing affordability is a significant issue within the Borough, with average house prices around eight times average incomes.

4.14 The problem of affordability can be particularly significant in the rural parts of the Borough where house prices tend to be higher. Poor access to essential services in rural areas can lead to significant deprivation, with people without access to a car especially vulnerable.

4.15 There are a rich variety of listed buildings (e.g. Stamford Hall), conservation areas, scheduled ancient monuments and registered historic parks and gardens, which all contribute to its quality of life, local distinctiveness and sense of place. The area is also the home of several nationally important sports facilities, including Trent Bridge Cricket Ground, the Nottingham Forest football ground, and the National Watersports Centre.
5 Identifying key sustainability issues (Stage A3)

5.1 Through the analysis of the baseline data and officer knowledge, a number of sustainability issues have been identified.

5.2 The SEA Directive requires that consideration is given to the likely evolution of each of the issues without the implementation of the Land and Planning Policies Document. This will be explored in more detail at later stages of the sustainability appraisal.

Table 5: Key sustainability issues affecting the Borough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issue</th>
<th>Potential influence of LAPP document</th>
<th>Possible role of LAPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High degree of new housing development in line with the Core Strategy targets</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocating sites in accordance with the spatial strategy identified in the Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Core Strategy sets a spatial strategy of urban concentration and regeneration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Around 58% of new dwellings will be provided adjacent to the main area with the remaining built beyond the main urban area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the rural settlements within the Borough are very isolated and suffer from poor transport links.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocating sites in accordance with the spatial strategy in the Core Strategy which promotes more significant growth around key settlements identified within it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older than average age profile and an ageing population</td>
<td>Minor/Moderate</td>
<td>Provision of adequate infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Issue</td>
<td>Potential influence of LAPP document</td>
<td>Possible role of LAPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High population growth in the Borough</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Allocation of sites in accordance with spatial strategy hierarchy to ensure that housing is developed in the more sustainable locations with greater access to a larger range of services and facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House prices are high within the Borough and there is a significant need for affordable housing provision.</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Allocation of new housing sites and facilitating the provision of affordable housing in line with Core Strategy targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower level of affordable housing as a percentage of overall housing stock compared to regional and national averages</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Allocation of new sites in line with the affordable housing thresholds established under the Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Economic**

| Localised areas of relatively high deprivation within Rushcliffe in Keyworth, Cotgrave and Bingham. | Moderate/major                       | The provision of employment and housing with improved linkages to existing communities alongside improvements to facilities and the local environment can help to address deprivation |
| The proportion of Rushcliffe’s workforce employed in the service sector is large – proportionally higher than the regional and national averages | Minor/moderate                       | Review of existing employment allocations to ensure suitable employment opportunities remain. |

**Environmental**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issue</th>
<th>Potential influence of LAPP document</th>
<th>Possible role of LAPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are areas of flood risk in the Borough</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>The LAPP could ensure that sites at risk from flooding are protected from development within the context of the relevant policies of the Core Strategy, and that sites are allocated in accordance with, where relevant, the sequential and exception tests as set out in national policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are a large number of sites which are important in terms of biodiversity which should be conserved and enhanced where possible.</td>
<td>Moderate/major</td>
<td>The LAPP may contain policies and proposals that look at how best to protect and enhance biodiversity. It will also maximise the role of green infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe now has three air quality management areas all of which have been declared due to traffic pollution and in particular due to excessive levels of the annual Nitrogen Dioxide above the air quality objective (AQO) level in certain areas.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Further detail on dealing with planning applications in AQMAs could be provided in the LAPP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need to improve energy efficiency and reduce contributions to climate change.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Ensuring that allocations are made in accordance with the Core Strategy spatial hierarchy which establishes the more sustainable settlements and areas adjacent to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Issue</td>
<td>Potential influence of LAPP document</td>
<td>Possible role of LAPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] There is a need to conserve and enhance Rushcliffe’s distinctive character and contribute towards creating a sense of place within new developments</td>
<td>Minor/Moderate</td>
<td>The LAPP may set out an approach on the design of new developments within the context of the relevant policies of the Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 The Sustainability Appraisal Framework (Stage A4)

6.1 The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Framework has developed as an output of the review of plans, policies and programmes, the analysis of the baseline data and the identification of sustainability issues.

6.2 A SA Framework has been established for the Core Strategy and as the issues have not changed significantly it has been decided to broadly use the same SA Framework to test the sustainability of the Land and Planning Policies Document. Some additional decision making criteria questions have been added to assist with site allocations and which reflect some changes to policy since the Core Strategy SA Framework was developed, e.g. introduction of neighbourhood plans.

6.3 Each of the SA objectives has been matched with decision making criteria as shown in Table 6. These criteria comprise the key questions that will be asked to ascertain whether or not a proposal or option works towards the SA objective.

Table 6: The SA Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA objectives</th>
<th>Decision making criteria</th>
<th>Site specific questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Housing** | • Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?  
• Will it reduce homelessness?  
• Will it reduce the number of unfit homes? | • Is the site allocated for housing?  
• Is the site allocated for the type of housing needed in the area?  
• Will the site include provision for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople?  
• Does the site accord with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)? | |
| **To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Rushcliffe** | | |
| **2. Health** | • Will it reduce health inequalities?  
• Will it improve access to health facilities?  
• Will it improve the | • Is the site within 10 minutes public transport time or 30 minutes walking time of a health facility? | |
<p>| <strong>To improve health and reduce health inequalities</strong> | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA objectives</th>
<th>Decision making criteria</th>
<th>Site specific questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opportunities for</td>
<td>• Will the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recreational physical</td>
<td>result in a loss of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activity?</td>
<td>recreational open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the site accord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with Neighbourhood Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>policies (if applicable)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Heritage
To provide better opportunities for people to value and enjoy Rushcliffe’s heritage

|               | Will it protect historic sites? | • Will the development result in a loss of historic site or damage to the building or setting? |
|               | Will it improve access to historic sites? | e.g. Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and Historic Parks and Gardens |
|               | Will it help people to increase their participation in cultural activities? | • Does the site accord with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)? |

4. Crime
To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime in Rushcliffe

|               | Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime? | n/a |
|               | Will it contribute to a safe secure built environment? | |

5. Social
To promote and support the development and growth of social capital across Rushcliffe

<p>|               | Will it protect and enhance existing cultural assets? | • Will the development result in the loss of a community facility? |
|               | Will it improve access to and resident’s satisfaction with community facilities and services? | • Does the site accord with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)? |
|               | Will it increase the number of facilities, e.g. shops, community | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA objectives</th>
<th>Decision making criteria</th>
<th>Site specific questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>centres, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>• Will it protect and improve biodiversity and avoid harm to protected species?</td>
<td>• Will the development result in a loss of all or part of a designated site of nature conservation interest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it provide new green space?</td>
<td>• Is the site adjacent to a designated site of nature conservation interest?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve green infrastructure networks?</td>
<td>• Will the development involve the loss of existing habitats or trees/hedgerows/woodland?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover and management?</td>
<td>• Will the site include the provision on-site or off-site open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve the quality of existing open space?</td>
<td>• Will the development involve the loss of existing open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development improve the underused or undervalued open space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Landscape</td>
<td>• Does it respect identified landscape character?</td>
<td>• Will the development conserve the features and characteristics of the landscape in the present form?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development enhance the features and characteristics of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA objectives</td>
<td>Decision making criteria</td>
<td>Site specific questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including Rushcliffe’s heritage and its setting</td>
<td></td>
<td>landscape?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development restore the features and characteristics of the landscape?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development create a new landscape character?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Natural resources and flooding</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To prudently manage the natural resources of the area including water, air quality, soils and minerals whilst also minimising the risk of flooding</td>
<td>• Will it improve water quality?</td>
<td>Will the site cause any harm to the water environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve air quality?</td>
<td>• Will the site cause additional harm to an AQMA?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it lead to reduced consumption of raw materials?</td>
<td>• Is the site within EA flood zone 2 or 3?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it promote the use of sustainable design, materials and construction techniques?</td>
<td>• Is the site adjacent to EA flood zone 2 or 3?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it minimise flood risk?</td>
<td>• Is the site on high grade agricultural land?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it prevent the loss of high quality soils to development?</td>
<td>• Is the site a brownfield site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 9. Waste | | n/a |
| To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste | • Will it reduce household and commercial waste per head? | |
| | • Will it increase waste | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA objectives</th>
<th>Decision making criteria</th>
<th>Site specific questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| materials     | recovery and recycling per head? | • Will it reduce hazardous waste?  
• Will it reduce waste in the construction industry? |
|               |                          |                         |
| 10. Energy    | • Will it improve energy efficiency of new buildings? | • Will the development include provision of renewable technology?  
• Will it support the generation and use of renewable energies?  
• Will it support the development of community energy systems?  
• Will it ensure that buildings are able to deal with future changes in climate? |
|               | • Will it use and enhance existing transport infrastructure? | • Is the site accessible by public transport?  
• Will it help to develop a transport network that minimises the impact on the environment?  
• Will it reduce journeys undertaken by car by encouraging alternative modes of transport?  
• Will it increase accessibility to services |
|               |                         | • Is the site located within the main urban area?  
• Is the site within 30 minutes public transport time of community facilities, schools, retail centres and employment areas?  
• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA objectives</th>
<th>Decision making criteria</th>
<th>Site specific questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Employment</td>
<td>• Will it improve the diversity and quality of jobs?</td>
<td>• Is the site allocated for mixed use employment/retail?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To create high quality</td>
<td>• Will it reduce unemployment?</td>
<td>• Will the development provide jobs for unemployed people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment opportunities</td>
<td>• Will it increase average income levels?</td>
<td>• Will the development involve the loss of employment land?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it improve rural productivity in terms of employment opportunities?</td>
<td>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is the site allocated for mixed use employment/retail?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Innovation</td>
<td>• Will it increase levels of qualification?</td>
<td>• Does the proposal involve new high quality employment opportunities? E.g. centres of excellence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop a strong culture of</td>
<td>• Will it create jobs in high knowledge sectors?</td>
<td>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enterprise and innovation</td>
<td>• Will it encourage graduates to live and work within the plan areas?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Is the site allocated for mixed educational/employment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Economic structure</td>
<td>• Will it provide land and buildings of a type required by businesses?</td>
<td>• Is the site allocated for employment or mixed use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide the physical conditions</td>
<td>• Will it improve the diversity of jobs available?</td>
<td>• Is the site allocated for mixed educational/employment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for a modern economic structure</td>
<td>• Will it provide the</td>
<td>• Will the development conflict with Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including infrastructure to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support the use of new technologies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA objectives</td>
<td>Decision making criteria</td>
<td>Site specific questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>required infrastructure?</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Plan policies (if applicable)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will it provide business/university clusters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Consultation

7.1 In accordance with the SEA Directive, copies of this Scoping Report have been sent to the three statutory consultation bodies for England (Environment Agency, Heritage England, and Natural England).

7.2 An electronic copy of this Scoping Report can be viewed on the Council’s website at http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy

7.3 The consultation questions on the Scoping Report are below. These questions are also reproduced in a separate consultation response form for consultees to use. Comments can also be submitted online at http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy

7.4 All comments received during the consultation period will be considered by the Borough Council. The responses received will help to shape the Sustainability Report.

Consultation questions

1. Plans, policies and programmes

1a. Have all plans, policies and programmes that affect the Local Planning Document been included in Section 3 and Appendix 1 of the Scoping Report?

1b. Please provide any comments regarding the plans, policies and programmes included in the Scoping Report.

2. Baseline data

2a. Does Appendix 2 of the Scoping Report identify an appropriate and accurate range of relevant baseline data?

2b. Please provide any comments regarding the baseline data used in the Scoping Report

3. Key sustainability issues

3a. Are the key sustainability issues identified in Section 5 of the Scoping Report correct for Rushcliffe?

3b. Please identify any other sustainability issues that should be included and how these are likely to impact upon the Land and Planning Policies Document?

4. SA objectives

4a. Do the SA objectives in Section 6 of the Scoping Report adequately cover the
key sustainability issues facing Rushcliffe Borough?

4b. Please identify how the objectives should be amended, bearing in mind that the number of objectives should be manageable.

5. Decision Making Criteria in SA Framework

5a. Are the Decision Making Criteria in the SA Framework in Section 6 of the Scoping Report appropriate?

5b. Please identify how the Decision Making Criteria should be amended.

6. Site Specific Questions in SA Framework

6a. Are the Site Specific Questions in the SA Framework in Section 6 of the Scoping Report appropriate?

7. SEA Directive requirements

7a. Do the Scoping Report and the SA Framework meet the requirements of the SEA Directive?

7b. Please identify why the SA Framework does not meet the requirements of the SEA Directive and how this can be rectified.

8. Equality Impact Assessment

8a. Have all sources of information regarding the protected equality characteristics been identified in Appendix 2 of the Scoping Report?

8b. Do you agree with the issues that have been identified in Section 2 of the Scoping Report?

8c. Please identify how Planning Policy can assist in addressing the issues identified in Section 2 of the Scoping Report. Please provide any other comments in support of your responses to questions 8a and 8b.

9. Other comments

9. Do you have any other comments about the Scoping Report?
## Appendix 1 – Review of plans, programmes and policies

### Table 1 International/European

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **SEA Directive, 2001**  
Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment  
Provide for a high level of protection of the environment and contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans and programmes with a view of promoting sustainable development. | The Directive must be applied to plans or programmes whose formal preparation begins after 21 July 2004 and to those already in preparation by that date. | Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive at a national level | The requirements of the Directive must be met in Sustainability Appraisals. |

*This Directive has been amended by Directive 2009/147/EC*  
The Council of European Communities  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Directive ensures far-reaching protection for all of Europe's wild birds, identifying 194 species and sub-species among them as particularly threatened and in need of special conservation measures. There are a number of components to this scheme:</td>
<td>No targets or indicators</td>
<td>Policies should make sure that the upkeep of recognised habitats is maintained and not damaged from development.</td>
<td>Incorporate protection of birds into an appropriate SA indicator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member States are required to designate Special Protection Areas (SPAs) for 194 particularly threatened species and all migratory bird species. SPAs are scientifically identified areas critical for the survival of the targeted species, such as wetlands. They are part of the Natura 2000 ecological network set up under the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC. A second component bans activities that directly threaten birds, such as the deliberate killing or capture of birds, the destruction of their nests and taking of their eggs, and associated activities such as trading in live or dead birds (with a few exceptions). A third component establishes rules that limit the number of bird species that can be hunted (82 species and sub-species) and the periods during which they can be hunted. It also defines hunting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>methods which are permitted (e.g. non-selective hunting is banned).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Habitats Directive (1992)


The Council of European Communities


The Habitats Directive addresses the preservation, protection and improvement of the quality of the environment, including the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. Objectives:

- Implementation of measures required to maintain or restore the natural habitats and the populations of species of wild fauna and flora.
- Implementation of measures to conserve threatened species, and to ensure and promote the maintenance of biodiversity.
- Designation of special areas of conservation to create a coherent European ecological network under the Directive.

Requirements to take legislative and administration measures to maintain and restore natural habitats and wild species. An assessment of the impact and implications of any plan or project that is likely to have a significant impact on a designated site is required.

Allocate sites and develop policies that take into account the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF. The Plan must be subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment in line with the Directive.

The SA Framework takes into account the conservation status of areas within the Borough and seeks to identify measures to further maintain and restore natural habitats.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Floods Directive, 2007</td>
<td>Preliminary Flood Risk Assessments to be completed by December 2011.</td>
<td>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</td>
<td>Include sustainability objectives that relate to flood management and reduction of risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes a framework for the assessment and management of flood risks, aiming at the reduction of the adverse consequences for human health, the environment, cultural heritage and economic activity associated with floods.</td>
<td>Reduce the amount of biodegradable waste sent to landfill by 75% of the 1995 level by 2010.</td>
<td>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</td>
<td>Include sustainability objectives to increase recycling and reduce the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Landfill Directive, 1999</td>
<td>Reduce the amount of biodegradable waste sent to landfill by 75% of the 1995 level by 2010.</td>
<td>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</td>
<td>Include sustainability objectives to increase recycling and reduce the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive 99/31/EC on the landfill of waste</td>
<td>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</td>
<td>Include sustainability objectives that relate to flood management and reduction of risk.</td>
<td>Include sustainability objectives to increase recycling and reduce the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:31999L0031">http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:31999L0031</a></td>
<td>Include sustainability objectives to increase recycling and reduce the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The objective of the Directive is to prevent or reduce as far as possible negative effects on the environment, in particular on surface water, groundwater, soil, air, and on human health from</td>
<td>Reduce the amount of biodegradable waste sent to landfill by 75% of the 1995 level by 2010.</td>
<td>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</td>
<td>Include sustainability objectives to increase recycling and reduce the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the landfilling of waste by introducing stringent technical requirements for waste and landfills.</td>
<td>Reduce this to 50% in 2013 and 35% by 2020.</td>
<td>detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</td>
<td>amount of waste.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Revision of the 1985 Granada Convention


Protection of the archaeological heritage, including any physical evidence of the human past that can be investigated archaeologically both on land and underwater. | No indicators or targets | Ensure that site allocations and policies take account of the Convention. | Include sustainability objectives to protect archaeological heritage. |


The Council of European Communities


The Water Framework Directive deals with the management of large bodies of water i.e. inland surface waters, transitional waters, coastal waters and ground water. Objectives:

- Enhance the status and prevent further deterioration of aquatic ecosystems and associated wetlands – there is a

| Inland water bodies to achieve ‘good ecological status’ by 2015 | Ensure that development does not have a detrimental impact on large bodies of water. | The SA Framework includes objectives relating to water. |
requirement for nearly all inland and coastal waters to achieve ‘good status’ by 2015.

- Promote the sustainable use of water.
- Reduce pollution of water, especially by ‘priority’ and ‘priority hazardous’ substances.
- Lessen the effects of floods and droughts.
- Rationalise and update existing water legislation and introduce a co-ordinated approach to water management based on the concept of river basin planning.


The Council of European Communities


This sets out to ensure that waste management provisions secure the protection of human health and the environment against harmful effects caused by the collection, transport, treatment, and disposal of waste. The plan will need to address waste and encourage developments that enhance sustainable use of materials and resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>storage and tipping of waste. Objectives:</td>
<td></td>
<td>minimise and recycle waste within the Borough.</td>
<td>composting waste and waste reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effective and consistent rules on waste disposal and recovery that prohibit the abandonment, dumping or uncontrolled disposal of waste.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The recovery of waste and the use of recovered materials as raw materials in order to conserve natural resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementation of measures to restrict the production of waste particularly by promoting clean technologies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Drinking Water Directive (1998)

Directive 98/83/EC on the quality of water intended for human consumption


Protect human health from the adverse effects of any contamination of water intended for human consumption by ensuring that it is wholesome and clean.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member States must set values for water intended for human consumption.</td>
<td>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</td>
<td>Include sustainability objectives to protect and enhance water quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>European Landscape Convention (2006)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/176.htm">http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/en/Treaties/Html/176.htm</a></td>
<td>It provides a basis for recognising the importance of landscapes and sharing experience across Europe. The convention recognises the need for landscape management and protection across the member states to be situated in law. It also recognises the importance of stakeholder involvement in landscape management, protection and development. Landscape is defined as 'an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors'.</td>
<td>No set targets.</td>
<td>Encourages adoption of policies and measures at local level for protecting, managing and planning landscapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive 2010 /75/EU on industrial emissions (integrated pollution prevention and control)</td>
<td>This Directive lays down rules on integrated prevention and control of pollution arising from industrial activities. It also lays down rules designed to prevent or, where that is not practicable, to reduce emissions into air, water</td>
<td>The Directive sets emission limit values for substances that are harmful to air or water.</td>
<td>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and land and to prevent the generation of waste, in order to achieve a high level of protection of the environment taken as a whole.</td>
<td>No set targets</td>
<td>from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive 91/676/EEC on nitrates from agricultural sources</td>
<td>Reduce water pollution caused or induced by nitrates from agricultural sources and prevent further such pollution. The Nitrates Directive forms an integral part of the Water Framework Directive and is one of the key instruments in the protection of waters against agricultural pressures</td>
<td>No set targets</td>
<td>Allocate sites and develop policies that take account of the Directive as well as more detailed policies derived from the Directive contained in the NPPF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe Landscape Convention (Florence, 1992)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It provides a basis for recognising the importance of landscapes and sharing experience across Europe. The convention recognises the need for landscape management and protection across the member states to be situated in law. It also recognises the importance of stakeholder involvement in landscape management,</td>
<td>No set targets</td>
<td>Encourages adoption of policies and measures at local level for protecting, managing and planning landscapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protection and development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape is defined as 'an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Air Quality Directive seeks to establish a common approach to the assessment of ambient air quality and the implementation of the necessary measures to reduce emissions at source in order to maintain or improve ambient air quality. Objectives:

- Protect human health and the environment as a whole
- Combat emissions of pollutants at source and identify and implement the most effective emission reduction measures at all levels.
- Air quality status should be maintained where it is already good, or improved.

The plan will need to address air quality and encourage developments that minimise emissions. The SA Framework includes objectives for reducing emissions and improving air quality.
- Minimise the risk posed by air pollution to vegetation and natural ecosystems away from urban areas.

Although there is no identifiable threshold below which PM2.5 would not pose a risk, there should be a general reduction of concentrations of fine particulate matter (PM2.5).

### EU Biodiversity Strategy to 2020 (2011)

http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/comm2006/pdf/2020/1_EN_ACT_part1_v7%5b1%5d.pdf

In 2011, the European Commission adopted a new strategy to halt the loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services in the EU by 2020, in line with two commitments made by EU leaders in March 2010 - halting the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystem services in the EU by 2020, and restoring them in so far as feasible, while stepping up the EU contribution to averting global biodiversity loss - and a vision for 2050: by 2050, European Union biodiversity and the ecosystem services it provides - its natural capital - are protected, valued and appropriately restored for biodiversity's intrinsic value and for their essential contribution to human wellbeing and economic prosperity, and so that catastrophic

The six targets cover:
- Full implementation of EU nature legislation to protect biodiversity
- Better protection for ecosystems, and more use of green infrastructure

More sustainable agriculture and forestry
- Better management of

The plan will need to ensure that biodiversity is retained and enhanced in the area.

The SA Framework includes objectives relating to biodiversity, seeking to increase biodiversity levels and protect and enhance green infrastructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Minimise the risk posed by air pollution to vegetation and natural ecosystems away from urban areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there is no identifiable threshold below which PM2.5 would not pose a risk, there should be a general reduction of concentrations of fine particulate matter (PM2.5). | | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| changes caused by the loss of biodiversity are avoided. The strategy is also in line with the global commitments made in Nagoya in October 2010, in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity, where world leaders adopted of a package of measures to address global biodiversity loss over the coming decade. | fish stocks  
- Tighter controls on invasive alien species  
- A bigger EU contribution to averting global biodiversity loss. |                      |                     |
Table 2 National

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (Volume 1) (2007)</td>
<td>No set targets</td>
<td>The plan will need to ensure that air quality is considered</td>
<td>The SA Framework includes objectives relating to air quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Air Quality Strategy sets out a way forward for work and planning on air quality issues by setting out the air quality standards and objectives to be achieved. It introduces a new policy framework for tackling fine particles, and identifies potential new national policy measures which modelling indicates could give further health benefits and move closer towards meeting the Strategy's objectives. Objectives:

• Further improve air quality in the UK from today and long term.

• Provide benefits to health, quality of life and the environment.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change Act 2008</td>
<td>Reduce carbon dioxide emissions by at least 80 per cent by 2050, and 26% by 2020.</td>
<td>The Plan will have to ensure that it makes a positive contribution in meeting the climate change challenge.</td>
<td>The SA Framework includes objectives to ensure that climate change has been taken account of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water for life and livelihoods - River Basin Management Plan Humber River Basin District 2009</td>
<td>By 2015: - 14 per cent of surface waters are going to improve for at least one biological, chemical or physical element</td>
<td>The plan should reflect the principles and policies of this initiative</td>
<td>The SA Framework includes objectives relating to natural resources (including water quality and flooding).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|             | - 19 per cent of surface waters will be at good or better ecological status / potential.  
- 32 per cent of groundwater bodies will be at good status.  
- At least 29 per cent of assessed surface waters will be at good or better biological status. | | |

**Flood and Water Management Act 2010**

DEFRA


The Act aims to provide better, more comprehensive management of flood risk for people, homes and businesses. It will also help tackle bad debt in the water industry, improve the affordability of water bills for certain groups and individuals, and help ensure continuity of water supplies to the consumer. Objectives:

- The development of, and compliance with, a National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk

No set targets

The plan should ensure that has due regard to the flood and water management regulations.

The SA Framework includes objectives relating to natural resources (including water quality and flooding).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The development of local flood risk management strategies by local flood authorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enable the Environment Agency and local authorities to more easily carry out flood risk management works.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A more risk based approach to reservoir management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enables water companies to more easily control non-essential uses of water and to offer concessions to community groups for surface water drainage charges.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To require the use of SuDs in certain new developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The introduction of a mandatory building standard for sewers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Natural Environment White Paper, 2011**

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs


Sets out the Government's strategy for valuing 90 commitments to Policies for the natural Include a sustainability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nature in our society and ensuring that it is available for use by future generations. This outlines four ambitions aimed at mainstreaming the value of nature across society: • Protecting and improving the natural environment • Growing a greener economy • Reconnecting people and nature • International and EU Leadership</td>
<td>improving natural environment.</td>
<td>environment to be developed in accordance with the objectives of the White Paper</td>
<td>objective relating to the enhancement of the natural environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*England Natural Environment Indicators is a separate document that tracks progress of ambitions of the White Paper.*

**Self Build and Custom House Building Act, 2015**

HM Government


This sets out the requirement for local councils to establish a register for those interested in developing a self or custom built house in the area.

| | No set targets | Consideration of requirements to allocate sites for self-built plots | Include SA objective in the Framework that relates to securing a range of housing options – mix and choice. |

**Nationally Described Space Standard, March 2015**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HM Government</td>
<td>No set targets but option of a minimum space standard for new dwellings.</td>
<td>Consideration of whether any space standards could be included for Rushcliffe in the LAPP.</td>
<td>Consideration of good quality housing as an SA indicator which would include accessibility/size as a factor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The National Described Space Standard deals with internal space within new dwellings for use across all tenures. The Nationally Described Space Standard can be applied if Local Planning Authorities have the evidence to justify its application and had tested its viability. The Nationally Described Space Standard needs to be delivered through a relevant Local Plan Policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Act 2008</th>
<th>No set targets</th>
<th>The plan should ensure that the implications arising from the Planning Act have been considered throughout the process.</th>
<th>The SA Framework takes account of the Planning Act 2008.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HM Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Act puts plans in place for the creation of an independent Infrastructure Planning Commission. The Commission will be responsible for making decisions on major infrastructure of national significance. The Act also brings in the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which will allow local authorities to charge developers for infrastructure. Changes to existing local planning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>policy mean that Development Plan Documents will need to contribute to climate change policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Localism Act 2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Localism Act is designed to devolve power back to local authorities and communities. The Localism Act includes five key measures that underpin the Government’s approach to decentralisation: 1. Community rights. 2. Neighbourhood planning. 3. Housing. 4. General power of competence. 5. Empowering cities and other local areas.</td>
<td>No set targets</td>
<td>Policies compatible with the provisions including duty to co-operate, neighbourhood plans.</td>
<td>The SA Framework takes account of the Localism Act 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Communities and Local Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Planning Policy Framework provides a framework within which local people and their accountable councils can produce their</td>
<td>This includes the following objectives:</td>
<td>The plan should promote and help achieve</td>
<td>The SA Framework encompasses the principles and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own distinctive local and neighbourhood plans, which reflect the needs and</td>
<td>1. Building a strong, competitive economy</td>
<td>sustainable development</td>
<td>set out in the NPPF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priorities of their communities. Planning law requires that applications</td>
<td>2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Include a SA indicator relating to strengthening the economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the</td>
<td>3. Supporting a prosperous rural economy</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Include a SA indicator relating to the vitality of town centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</td>
<td>4. Promoting sustainable transport</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Include a SA indicator relating to supporting the rural economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Supporting high quality communications infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Include a sustainability objective relating to the sustainable transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Include a sustainability objective relating to improving communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Requiring good design</td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Include a sustainability objective relating to housing availability and quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Promoting healthy communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Protecting Green Belt land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Meeting the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change</td>
<td>1. Include a sustainability objective relating to good design.</td>
<td>7. Include a sustainability objective relating to the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment</td>
<td>8. Include a sustainability objective relating to improving health and social cohesion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment</td>
<td>9. Include a sustainability objective relating to coalescence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals</td>
<td>10. Include a sustainability objective relating to climate change mitigation and adaption, including flooding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Include a sustainability objective relating to the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Act 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Include a sustainability objective relating to the conservation of historic features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5 makes provision about nationally significant infrastructure projects, deemed discharge of planning conditions and about the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) and other bodies.</td>
<td>No set targets</td>
<td>Plan policies should not conflict with objectives of the Act.</td>
<td>No direct influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Communities and Local Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This document sets out the Government’s planning policy for traveller sites and should be read in conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework.</td>
<td>LPAs should set pitch targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling</td>
<td>This policy will inform development of the Gypsy and Travelling Showpeople evidence</td>
<td>Include relevant sustainability objectives relating to social inclusion and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Planning Policy for Waste, 2014</td>
<td>showpeople.</td>
<td>base</td>
<td>environmental protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCLG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets out the Government’s ambition to work towards a more sustainable and</td>
<td>Ensuring waste management is considered alongside with spatial planning</td>
<td>All local planning authorities should have regard to its policies when discharging</td>
<td>Include an SA objective in relation to increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient approach to resource use and management. It should be read in</td>
<td>concerns.</td>
<td>their responsibilities to the extent that they are appropriate to waste management.</td>
<td>recycling opportunities and reducing waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework, the Waste</td>
<td>Ensuring the design and layout of new residential and commercial</td>
<td>Ensure compatibility with Waste Core Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Plan for England and National Policy Statements for Waste Water</td>
<td>development and other infrastructure (such as safe and reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Hazardous Waste, or any successor documents.</td>
<td>transport links)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complements sustainable waste management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards a one nation economy: A 10-point plan for boosting rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>productivity, August 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
<td>No set targets</td>
<td>Consideration of announced amendment of planning rules to allow Starter Homes to be built on Exception Sites. If planning rules are amended this will be a consideration in future SA stages.</td>
<td>Include rural productivity in the SA Framework under the employment objective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets out measures to boost the rural economy by investing in education and skills, increasing wages, improving infrastructure and connectivity, and simplifying planning laws for rural businesses and communities.</td>
<td>Rural areas fully connected to the wider economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive, fast and reliable broadband services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High quality, widely available mobile communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern transport connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A highly skilled rural workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to high quality education and training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expanded apprenticeships in rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong conditions for rural business growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enterprise Zones in rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better regulation and improved planning for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rural businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier to live and work in rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. More housing – e.g. starter homes on exception sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Increased affordability of affordable childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater local control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Devolution of power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

Greater Nottingham and Nottinghamshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan, 1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Action Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.nottsbag.org.uk/index.htm">http://www.nottsbag.org.uk/index.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Action Plan seeks to conserve, protect and enhance wildlife and their habitats. It</td>
<td>Targets are set for a range of habitats and species:</td>
<td>The plan should assist in the conservation and</td>
<td>The SA Framework should take account of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A95
recognises and provides guidance for those that are unique to Nottinghamshire. The aims of the plan are 1. To conserve and where appropriate enhance Nottinghamshire's unique variety of wild species and natural habitats; 2. To increase public awareness of, and involvement in conserving biodiversity; and 3. To contribute to biodiversity conservation on a national, European and global scale.

Objectives:

- Through planning control, allow no further loss of habitats and seek opportunities to create new areas through approved development.
- Through planning control, ensure that the potential effects on wildlife of changes of land use are properly assessed, and adverse effects prevented.
- Implement appropriate protection measures such as the designation of Local Nature Reserves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Habitat Action Plans</td>
<td>enhancement of biodiversity within the area.</td>
<td>these needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Eutrophic and Mesotrophic Standing Waters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lowland Calcareous Grassland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lowland Dry Acid Grassland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lowland heathland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lowland Wet Grassland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mixed Ash-dominated Woodland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Oak-Birch Woodland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reedbed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rivers and streams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unimproved Neutral Grassland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Urban and Post-industrial Habitats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Nottingham and Derby Green Belt Review, 2006

Nottinghamshire County Council and Derbyshire County Council


The purpose of this study was to provide a broad strategic review of the Green Belt. It was produced to underpin the 3 cities sub-regional strategy that is contained within the outgoing East Midlands Regional Plan. The scope of the study is limited to the principles of including land within the Green Belt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Wet Broadleaved Woodland Species Action Plans – - Barn Owl - Bats - Grizzled Skipper and Dingy Skipper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment for the Nottinghamshire Local Authorities of Ashfield, Broxtowe,
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gedling, Mansfield, Newark and Sherwood, Nottingham City and Rushcliffe (2007) and 2010 update</td>
<td>Ashfield DC, Broxtowe BC, Gedling BC, Mansfield DC, Newark &amp; Sherwood DC, Nottingham City, Rushcliffe BC</td>
<td>9 pitch requirement for Rushcliffe</td>
<td>Provision of unmet need has been met in large part through the SUEs included as strategic allocations in Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion of SA objective in relation to supply of a mix of housing, including provision for gypsies and travellers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 225 of the Housing Act 2004 introduced a specific requirement for Local Authorities to assess the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers within their area. In response to this requirement, the authorities across Nottinghamshire County (excluding Bassetlaw) jointly commissioned a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment. The aim of this assessment is to understand the accommodation needs, and related support needs, of the Gypsy and Traveller community within Nottinghamshire.

**Nottingham Core Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2007) and 2010 and 2012 Needs Updates**

B Line Housing and Three Dragons

http://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/D22AB022-A294-4A9C-8336-66152603A0B7/FinalDownload/DownloadId-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An assessment reviewing housing market need within the Nottingham Core Housing Market Area. The report outlines conditions, identifies and defines distinct sub-market areas, and highlights key housing issues for Greater Nottingham. The SHMA recommends that affordable housing policy targets should be developed by each local authority. Further needs updates to the assessment were also prepared in 2009 and 2012 to reflect up to date cost and revenue figures. The 2012 study recommended that the Borough. An assessment reviewing housing market need within the Nottingham Core Housing Market Area. The report outlines conditions, identifies and defines distinct sub-market areas, and highlights key housing issues for Greater Nottingham. The SHMA recommends that affordable housing policy targets should be developed.</td>
<td>Need for 463 new affordable units a year to meet backlog and future affordable housing need. New residential developments should provide for affordable housing on sites of 5 dwellings or more 0.2 hectares or more. The following proportion should be sought: 30% - on strategic sites and the following submarkets: West Bridgford, Rushcliffe Rural, Radcliffe, Gamston, Ruddington and Compton Acres.</td>
<td>Findings of the SHMA informed development of the Core Strategy. The thresholds referred to be will be applied for future allocations in Part 2.</td>
<td>SA housing objective in the SA Framework includes reference to securing appropriate levels of affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by each local authority.</td>
<td>20% - ‘Leake’, Keyworth, and Bingham 10% - Cotgrave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nottingham City Region Employment Study, 2007 and 2009 update**

Roger Tym Partners on behalf of the Greater Nottingham authorities


This study provides an assessment of the quantity and quality of employment land in Nottingham City Region (Nottingham City, Broxtowe, Erewash, Gedling and Rushcliffe - plus the Hucknall wards in Ashfield district) and the likely requirements up to 2026.

The purpose of the 2009 update was to assess how many additional jobs would be needed to meet the higher housing target established under the Regional Plan which was a higher figure than that included in the

No set targets | The plan should give consideration to this study | The SA objectives seek to ensure that the employment provision meets the needs of the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>original study.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Land Forecasting Study, August 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of the Nottingham Core and Nottingham Outer HMAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/media/rushcliffe/media/documents/pdf/planningandbuilding/planningpolicy/evidencebase/50406_02%20Nottingham%20Core%20&amp;%20Outer%20HMA%20ELFS%20ISSUE%20140815.PDF">http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/media/rushcliffe/media/documents/pdf/planningandbuilding/planningpolicy/evidencebase/50406_02%20Nottingham%20Core%20&amp;%20Outer%20HMA%20ELFS%20ISSUE%20140815.PDF</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This study, prepared by Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners, helps to identify future employment land needs and guiding economic development over the period to 2033 for the commissioning authorities. On this basis, the study considers future quantitative land and floorspace requirements and any related qualitative factors for individual sectors or employment uses.</td>
<td>Includes estimates for future floorspace needs for LPAs and the HMA.</td>
<td>Follow the recommendations of the report in allocating sites and developing employment policies in the LAPP</td>
<td>Inclusion of relevant employment indicators in the SA Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Breath of Fresh Air for Nottinghamshire, 2009</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nottinghamshire Environmental Protection Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This document aims to help local authorities</td>
<td>No set targets.</td>
<td>Policies should develop in line</td>
<td>The SA Framework includes objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and partner organisations manage and improve ambient air quality and to protect the health and wellbeing of the public.

Objectives:

- Minimise air pollution and the impact of global warming and climate change.
- Encourage sustainable development in Nottinghamshire to protect the health and wellbeing of the population.
- To work with businesses, stakeholders and the residents of Nottinghamshire to encourage sustainable improvements in air quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and partner organisations manage and improve ambient air quality and to protect the health and wellbeing of the public. Objectives:</td>
<td>with the objectives stated in the air quality improvement strategy.</td>
<td>relating to air quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greater Nottingham Retail Study (2008) and 2012 background paper

Greater Nottingham,

http://www.nottingham.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=781&p=0

http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/media/rushcliffe/media/documents/pdf/planningandbuilding/GN%20Retail%20Background%20Paper%
The study assesses the need and capacity (quantitative and qualitative) for additional comparison and convenience retail floorspace in Greater Nottingham to 2016 and projected the figures to 2026. The Study advises how best to accommodate any growth, taking into account existing commitments. It also identifies the hierarchy of centres in the Districts and provides information on the vitality and viability of each town centre. It utilises a forecasting model to predict future retailing trends. The report also reviews national trends in retailing and retail development and the implications for the town centres in the study area.

The 2012 update looked at impacts of recent trends on Nottingham City Centre. These include the recession; a continuing shift towards internet shopping; changes in retailers’ sales densities; growth in other, competing major centres and out-of-centre shopping destinations; the continued decline of the Broadmarsh Centre in terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The study assesses the need and capacity for additional comparison and convenience retail floorspace in Greater Nottingham to 2016 and projected the figures to 2026. The Study advises how best to accommodate any growth, taking into account existing commitments. It also identifies the hierarchy of centres in the Districts and provides information on the vitality and viability of each town centre. It utilises a forecasting model to predict future retailing trends. The report also reviews national trends in retailing and retail development and the implications for the town centres in the study area.</td>
<td>No set targets</td>
<td>Policies should follow the recommendations of the study.</td>
<td>The SA Framework includes objectives relating to retail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of retail attractiveness; and the evolving approach to the expansion and/or refurbishment of the Broadmarsh Centre, the Victoria Centre, or both.</td>
<td>No set targets</td>
<td>Consider recommendations set out for Rushcliffe in development of LAPP policies.</td>
<td>Inclusions of indicators relating to the health of retail centres in the SA Framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greater Nottingham Retail Study 2015**

Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough, Nottingham City, and Rushcliffe Borough Councils


It updates the retail evidence base (i.e. the 2008 Retail Study) to help inform both plan-making and decision-taking across the Study Area. For Rushcliffe, this includes an audit of the district and local centres (Bingham, West Bridgford, Cotgrave, East Leake, Keyworth, Radcliffe and Ruddington). | No set targets | Consider recommendations set out for Rushcliffe in development of LAPP policies. | Inclusions of indicators relating to the health of retail centres in the SA Framework. |

**6 Cs Green Infrastructure Strategy**

http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/media/rushcliffe/media/documents/pdf/planningandbuilding/planningpolicy/evidencebase/6Cs_GI_Strategy_Executive_Summary_2010.pdf;  
http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/media/rushcliffe/media/documents/pdf/planningandbuilding/planningpolicy/evidencebase/11109009R_Volume%201_Final_06-10.pdf;  
http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/media/rushcliffe/media/documents/pdf/planningandbuilding/planningpolicy/evidencebase/11109009R_
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 6 Cs Growth Point

The 6Cs Green Infrastructure Strategy was created by a partnership of local authorities and environmental organisations who commissioned consultants to develop a Green Infrastructure Strategy for the 6Cs Growth Point in the East Midlands. The Strategy was launched in July 2010.

Although the regional planning context has now changed, the Strategy contains vast amounts of evidence and information invaluable for producing Core Planning Strategies and GI Strategies.

### Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire County Council</td>
<td>No set targets</td>
<td>The plan should support the objectives of the Local Transport Plan.</td>
<td>The SA Framework should reflect the priorities of the Local Transport Plan as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan Strategy forms the long term transport strategy for Nottinghamshire County Council's administrative area (excluding Nottingham City) up to 2026. It has been developed with a view to achieving economic, environmental and health benefits to local citizens and businesses. Transport's role in supporting the economy and enabling enterprise, reducing carbon emissions from transport, maintaining the current transport assets and providing and enhancing an integrated transport system are core themes of this strategy.</td>
<td>No set targets</td>
<td>The plan should support the objectives of the Local Transport Plan.</td>
<td>The SA Framework should reflect the priorities of the Local Transport Plan as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Strategic Approach to Older Persons’ Accommodation for Nottinghamshire and Erewash, 2011</td>
<td>No set targets</td>
<td>The plan should support the objectives of the study where appropriate</td>
<td>Include housing objective that includes catering to a range of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On behalf of the Nottinghamshire authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which include Erewash. The study outlines the need and demand for types and tenures of homes, and issues to be addressed to best meet the range of housing needs of older people.</td>
<td>No set targets</td>
<td>The plan should encourage development in those more sustainable locations to reduce journey times to waste facilities.</td>
<td>housing mix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Replacement Local Plan Part 1: Waste Core Strategy (2013)**

Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire County Council


The Waste Core Strategy is a strategic document which sets out overall planning policy towards existing and future waste management facilities within Nottinghamshire and Nottingham. It will be the basis for determining planning applications for all future waste management development and gives guidance on the broad location and type of waste management facilities that we want to encourage. It also provides the context for the later policy documents that will follow.

**Minerals Local Plan Submission draft consultation, January 2016**
The new Minerals Local Plan will set out the County Council's overall approach to future minerals provision in Nottinghamshire up to 2030 and replace the Minerals Local Plan adopted in 2005. Key issues it will cover include:

- the amount of minerals we will need to produce to meet demand
- the location of future sites
- the social and environmental impacts of mineral working.

No set targets

Draft minerals allocations should be referred to when allocating sites for development through LAPP.

Draft minerals allocations should be referred to when allocating sites for development through LAPP.

**Rushcliffe BC publications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy</td>
<td>No set targets</td>
<td>Draft minerals allocations should be referred to when allocating sites for development through LAPP.</td>
<td>Draft minerals allocations should be referred to when allocating sites for development through LAPP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rushcliffe Borough Council

http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/media/rushcliffe/media/documents/pdf/planningandbuilding/planningpolicy/corestrategyexamination/9%
This out the broad planning policy direction for Rushcliffe and allocates strategic sites for development. It provides the strategic policies for key areas in relation to housing, the economy, the environment, transport, renewable energy and supporting infrastructure. It:

- Sets out a housing target of 13,150 between 2011-2028, with the following spatial hierarchy established:
  - Strategic allocations for mixed use development and housing at – (1) Melton Rd, Edwalton, (2) South of Clifton, (3) North of Bingham, (4) RAF Newton, (5) Cotgrave Colliery, (6) East of Gamston/North of Tollerton

- Commitment to a review of the Green Belt (outside of the main urban area) as part of the LAPP

- Establishes the retail hierarchy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This out the broad planning policy direction for Rushcliffe and allocates strategic sites for development. It provides the strategic policies for key areas in relation to housing, the economy, the environment, transport, renewable energy and supporting infrastructure. It:</td>
<td>Sets out a housing target of 13,150 between 2011-2028, Minimum housing targets for key settlements – (1) East Leake – minimum of 400 homes, (2) Keyworth – minimum of 450 homes, (3) Radcliffe on Trent – minimum of 400 homes, (4) Ruddington – minimum of 250 homes. Identification of a minimum of 67,900 square metres of new floorspace for B1 (a) and (b) and a minimum of 20 hectares of employment land.</td>
<td>LAPP must be developed in accordance with Core Strategy strategic policies</td>
<td>SA Framework to include indicators reflective of the Core Strategy in terms of Social, Economic and Environmental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District centres – West Bridgford and Bingham, Local centres – Cotgrave, East Leake, Keyworth (The Square and also Wolds Drive), Radcliffe on Trent and Ruddington.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affordable housing policy (thresholds and mix) based on housing submarkets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifies transport infrastructure priorities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* NET 2 (now complete)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* A453 widening (now complete)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* A46 improvements (now complete)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Nottingham Ring Road improvement scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Improvements to A52 junctions between A6005 (QMC) and A46 (Bingham)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* bus priority measures to serve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land East of Gamston</td>
<td>No targets</td>
<td>Potential suitable sites to inform site allocations issues and options</td>
<td>Sites included in the SHLAA will need to be appraised as part of the SA process, either as draft allocations or as reasonable alternatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rushcliffe Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)**

Rushcliffe Borough Council

http://www.rushcliffe.gov.uk/planningpolicy/localplan/supportingstudies/strategiclandavailabilityassessment/

An annual review of potential housing sites. The assessment includes land that has come forward from a range of sources, including sites that have already been granted planning permission and sites that have been put forward by landowners and developers.

**Rushcliffe Housing Implementation Strategy (HIS), 2014**

Rushcliffe Borough Council


The HIS was prepared for the Core Strategy and sets out the Council's approach to managing the delivery of new

No targets                                               Monitoring of housing delivery – updates to the HIS will monitor how
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>housing up to 2028. An annual review of potential housing sites. The assessment includes land that has come forward from a range of sources, including sites that have already been granted planning permission and sites that have been put forward by landowners and developers.</td>
<td>delivery has progressed and whether intervention is required to bring sites forward.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rushcliffe Green Belt Review (Parts 1 and 2a), 2013**

Rushcliffe Borough Council


The Rushcliffe Green Belt review is being introduced in two parts. The first part is an overall strategic appraisal of the Green Belt within Rushcliffe together with a more detailed review around the Nottingham built-up area.

| No targets | Proposed to inset the following villages from the Green Belt: Gotham, Bradmore, Bunny, Plumtree, Cropwell Butler, Upper Saxondale, Shelford, Newton. | |

**Melton and Rushcliffe Landscape Sensitivity Study: Wind Energy Development, 2014**

Rushcliffe and Melton Councils

The study examines the sensitivity of landscape in Rushcliffe and Melton to wind turbine development. It will assist by identifying areas of greater and lesser sensitivity and providing guidance as to how development can be accommodated in the landscape of the boroughs.

Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2012 (with revisions from the purposes of Rushcliffe Borough Council, dated February 2014)

The 2012 study considers infrastructure requirements related to the Core Strategies of Broxtowe, Erewash, Gedling, Nottingham and Rushcliffe Councils. It seeks to ascertain what additional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The study examines the sensitivity of landscape in Rushcliffe and Melton to wind turbine development. It will assist by identifying areas of greater and lesser sensitivity and providing guidance as to how development can be accommodated in the landscape of the boroughs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2012 (with revisions from the purposes of Rushcliffe Borough Council, dated February 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Nottingham authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study was updated in 2014 to support the increased level of growth included in the Rushcliffe Core Strategy.

The 2012 study considers infrastructure requirements related to the Core Strategies of Broxtowe, Erewash, Gedling, Nottingham and Rushcliffe Councils. It seeks to ascertain what additional infrastructure is needed to support the level of growth, when it is required and the resources needed to deliver it. The report also considers the viability of strategic sites.

The IDP will be updated as the Local Plan progresses.

The 2012 study considers infrastructure requirements related to the Core Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure is needed to support the level of growth, when it is required and the resources needed to deliver it. The report also considers the viability of strategic sites. The study was updated in 2014 to support the increased level of growth included in the Rushcliffe Core Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2012 study considers infrastructure requirements related to the Core Strategies of Broxtowe, Erewash, Gedling, Nottingham and Rushcliffe Councils. It seeks to ascertain what additional infrastructure is needed to support the level of growth, when it is required and the resources needed to deliver it. The report also considers the viability of strategic sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The IDP will be updated as the Local Plan progresses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2012 study considers infrastructure requirements related to the Core Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy 2016-2020</td>
<td>No set targets.</td>
<td>The LAPP should reflect the strategy's objectives where appropriate.</td>
<td>Incorporation of nature conservation objectives in the SA Framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rushcliffe Borough Council


The principle objectives are:
1) Promote landscape scale conservation to create a more resilient natural environment
2) Promote the maintenance and enhancement of nature reserves
3) Promote sympathetic land management for wildlife in rural and urban areas
4) Support continuing surveying, monitoring and reporting of Rushcliffe’s biodiversity
5) Raise awareness of nature conservation issues
6) Seek to influence the impact of development on wildlife
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rushcliffe Climate Change Strategy, 2009-2020 (updated 2013)</strong></td>
<td>The emissions reduction target is to reduce the total direct GHG significant emissions by 15% by 2015 and a further 15% by 2020. To date the council has achieved 9.7% reductions in emissions.</td>
<td>Policies designed to minimise energy use</td>
<td>SA Framework includes decision making questions relating to reducing carbon emissions with one indicator designed for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This sets out the Borough Council’s approach to tackling climate change. This sets out the key actions which include reducing the Borough Council’s carbon footprint (from its estate and business operations), offering guidance and support, and seeking funding opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Rushcliffe Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Report, July 2015</strong></td>
<td>No set targets.</td>
<td>Data included in the mapping work could be used to develop nature conservation policies in the LAPP</td>
<td>Contains environmental baseline information for the SA Scoping Report. Include relevant nature conservation indicators in the SA Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe Borough Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This report helps to underpin the wider work of the Nottinghamshire Biodiversity Action Group, the Local Biodiversity Action Group partnership for Nottinghamshire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The report includes habitat network maps that can be used to establish baseline data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report provides an update with respect to the progress of implementation of the measures outlined in the Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) initially published in May 2007 and updated in 2009.

The AQAP contains a set of measures aimed at working toward ensuring the air quality in Rushcliffe meets the Air Quality Objectives set out in the National Air Quality Strategy due to excessive levels of nitrogen dioxide in air quality management areas (AQMAs) within the Borough.

Parish/lower level geography publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implication for plan</th>
<th>Implication for SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Implication for plan</td>
<td>Implication for SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Leake Neighbourhood Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>No targets</strong></td>
<td>Strategic policies of the Neighbourhood Plan should not conflict with Local Plan policies.</td>
<td>SA decision making criteria includes reference to the East Leake Neighbourhood Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Leake Neighbourhood Plan on behalf of East Leake Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An annual review of potential housing sites. The assessment includes land that has come forward from a range of sources, including sites that have already been granted planning permission and sites that have been put forward by landowners and developers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 – Baseline data  
SA Objective 1: Social

Housing tenure: 2011 Census (QS405EW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Abbey</th>
<th>Bingham East</th>
<th>Bingham West</th>
<th>Compton Acres</th>
<th>Cotgrave</th>
<th>Cranmer</th>
<th>Edwalton Village</th>
<th>Gotham</th>
<th>Keyworth North</th>
<th>Keyworth South</th>
<th>Lady Bay</th>
<th>Leake</th>
<th>Lutterell</th>
<th>Manvers</th>
<th>Melton</th>
<th>Musters</th>
<th>Neville</th>
<th>Oak</th>
<th>Ruddington</th>
<th>Soar Valley</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>Thoroton</th>
<th>Tollerton</th>
<th>Trent</th>
<th>Trent Bridge</th>
<th>Wiverton</th>
<th>Wolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned (either outright or mortgage)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire: 72%</td>
<td>East Midlands: 67%</td>
<td>England and Wales: 64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared ownership</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire: 0.5%</td>
<td>East Midlands: 0.7%</td>
<td>England and Wales: 0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Rented</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire: 13.5%</td>
<td>East Midlands: 15.9%</td>
<td>England and Wales: 17.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Rented</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire: 13.1%</td>
<td>East Midlands: 14.9%</td>
<td>England and Wales: 16.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Rent Free</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire: 1.3%</td>
<td>East Midlands: 1.3%</td>
<td>England and Wales: 1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A119
Dwellings, Household Spaces and Accommodation Type: 2011 Census (KS401EW)

|                          | Abbey | Bingham East | Bingham West | Compton Acres | Colgrave | Cranmer | Edwalton Village | Gamston | Gotham | Keyworth North | Keyworth South | Lady Bay | Leake | Lutterell | Manvers | Melton | Musters | Nevile | Oak | Ruddington | Soar Valley | Stanford | Thoroton | Tollerton | Trent | Trent Bridge | Wiverton | Wolds |
|--------------------------|-------|--------------|--------------|---------------|----------|---------|------------------|---------|--------|----------------|---------------|---------|-------|-----------|---------|--------|---------|--------|-----|------------|-----------|---------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|---------|
| Whole House or Bungalow; Detached | 33.1  | 57.4         | 43.2         | 89.4          | 28.3     | 57.6    | 4.8              | 53.9    | 47.7   | 85.1          | 39.6          | 18.2    | 58.3  | 59.5      | 5.4     | 29.4   | 59.4    | 76.5   | 63.9 | 30.1       | 52.7     | 6.5    | 53.6     | 74.6    | 36.5  | 7.5           | 48.9    | 74.9  |
| Whole House or Bungalow; Semi-Detached | 47.7  | 23.4         | 3.0          | 15.8          | 48.1     | 35.9    | 29.8             | 15.7    | 40.9   | 1.2           | 4.0           | 58.8   | 31.8  | 16.4      | 27.6    | 28.3   | 22.8    | 15.9   | 18.8 | 37.4       | 31.7     | 25.5   | 37.8     | 19.4    | 33.8  | 27.5         | 31.1    | 14.7  |
| Whole House or Bungalow; Terraced       | 1.3   | 8.6          | 19.8         | 2.6           | 1.8      | 5.2     | 2.9              | 15.3    | 8.5    | 1.3           | 16.4          | 4.3    | 4.6   | 9.9       | 10.1    | 22.4   | 4.9     | 6.5    | 9.6  | 22.4       | 10.1     | 8.3    | 7.2      | 1       | 14.7  | 9.6          | 14.3    | 7.1   |

Rushcliffe: 46.2%, Nottinghamshire: 35.6%, East Midlands: 32.2%, England and Wales: 22.6%,

Whole House or Bungalow; Semi-Detached

Rushcliffe: 31%, Nottinghamshire: 37.9%, East Midlands: 35.1 %, England and Wales: 30.7%,

Whole House or Bungalow; Terraced

Rushcliffe: 11.4%, Nottinghamshire: 16.6%, East Midlands: 20.6%, England and Wales: 24.7%

Flat, Maisonette or Apartment; Purpose-Built Block of Flats or Tenement

<p>|                          | Abbey | Bingham East | Bingham West | Compton Acres | Colgrave | Cranmer | Edwalton Village | Gamston | Gotham | Keyworth North | Keyworth South | Lady Bay | Leake | Lutterell | Manvers | Melton | Musters | Nevile | Oak | Ruddington | Soar Valley | Stanford | Thoroton | Tollerton | Trent | Trent Bridge | Wiverton | Wolds |
|--------------------------|-------|--------------|--------------|---------------|----------|---------|------------------|---------|--------|----------------|---------------|---------|-------|-----------|---------|--------|---------|--------|-----|------------|-----------|---------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|---------|
| Flat, Maisonette or Apartment; Purpose-Built Block of Flats or Tenement | 4.2   | 9.1          | 6.3           | 10.9          | 4.6      | 0.6     | 17.5             | 8       | 1.8    | 0.7           | 2.9           | 11.2    | 4.4   | 13.6      | 7.1     | 7.5    | 0.1     | 6.1    | 8.1  | 1.6        | 0.4      | 0.1    | 0.2      | 9.2     | 25.6  | 1.7          | 0.9     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Abbey</th>
<th>Bingham East</th>
<th>Bingham West</th>
<th>Compton Acres</th>
<th>Colgrave</th>
<th>Cranmer</th>
<th>Edwalton Village</th>
<th>Gamston</th>
<th>Gotham</th>
<th>Keyworth North</th>
<th>Keyworth South</th>
<th>Lady Bay</th>
<th>Leake</th>
<th>Lutterell</th>
<th>Manvers</th>
<th>Melton</th>
<th>Musters</th>
<th>Neville</th>
<th>Oak</th>
<th>Ruddington</th>
<th>Soar Valley</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>Thordon</th>
<th>Tollerton</th>
<th>Trent</th>
<th>Trent Bridge</th>
<th>Wiverton</th>
<th>Wolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe: 7.7 %</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire: 7.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands: 9.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales: 16.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rushcliffe: 2.3 %, Nottinghamshire: 1.2%, East Midlands: 1.6%, England and Wales: 4.2%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Abbey</th>
<th>Bingham East</th>
<th>Bingham West</th>
<th>Compton Acres</th>
<th>Colgrave</th>
<th>Cranmer</th>
<th>Edwalton Village</th>
<th>Gamston</th>
<th>Gotham</th>
<th>Keyworth North</th>
<th>Keyworth South</th>
<th>Lady Bay</th>
<th>Leake</th>
<th>Lutterell</th>
<th>Manvers</th>
<th>Melton</th>
<th>Musters</th>
<th>Neville</th>
<th>Oak</th>
<th>Ruddington</th>
<th>Soar Valley</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>Thordon</th>
<th>Tollerton</th>
<th>Trent</th>
<th>Trent Bridge</th>
<th>Wiverton</th>
<th>Wolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe: 0.7 %</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire: 0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands: 0.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales: 1.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rushcliffe: 0.7 %, Nottinghamshire: 0.8%, East Midlands: 0.9%, England and Wales: 1.1%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Abbey</th>
<th>Bingham East</th>
<th>Bingham West</th>
<th>Compton Acres</th>
<th>Colgrave</th>
<th>Cranmer</th>
<th>Edwalton Village</th>
<th>Gamston</th>
<th>Gotham</th>
<th>Keyworth North</th>
<th>Keyworth South</th>
<th>Lady Bay</th>
<th>Leake</th>
<th>Lutterell</th>
<th>Manvers</th>
<th>Melton</th>
<th>Musters</th>
<th>Neville</th>
<th>Oak</th>
<th>Ruddington</th>
<th>Soar Valley</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>Thordon</th>
<th>Tollerton</th>
<th>Trent</th>
<th>Trent Bridge</th>
<th>Wiverton</th>
<th>Wolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caravan or Other Mobile or Temporary Structure</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe: 0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire: 0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands: 0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales: 0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of dwellings, including change between 2001 and 2011: 2001 and 2011 Census'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of dwellings (2001 Census)</th>
<th>Abbey</th>
<th>Bingham East</th>
<th>Bingham West</th>
<th>Compton Acres</th>
<th>Cotgrave</th>
<th>Cranmer</th>
<th>Edwalton Village</th>
<th>Gotham</th>
<th>Keyworth North</th>
<th>Keyworth South</th>
<th>Lady Bay</th>
<th>Leake</th>
<th>Lutterell</th>
<th>Manvers</th>
<th>Melton</th>
<th>Musters</th>
<th>Neville</th>
<th>Oak</th>
<th>Ruddington</th>
<th>Soar Valley</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>Thoroton</th>
<th>Trent</th>
<th>Tollerton</th>
<th>Trent Bridge</th>
<th>Wiverton</th>
<th>Wolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe: 44,769, Nottinghamshire: 324,397, East Midlands: 1,792,703, England and Wales: 22,387,923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of dwellings (2011 Census)</th>
<th>Abbey</th>
<th>Bingham East</th>
<th>Bingham West</th>
<th>Compton Acres</th>
<th>Cotgrave</th>
<th>Cranmer</th>
<th>Edwalton Village</th>
<th>Gotham</th>
<th>Keyworth North</th>
<th>Keyworth South</th>
<th>Lady Bay</th>
<th>Leake</th>
<th>Lutterell</th>
<th>Manvers</th>
<th>Melton</th>
<th>Musters</th>
<th>Neville</th>
<th>Oak</th>
<th>Ruddington</th>
<th>Soar Valley</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>Thoroton</th>
<th>Trent</th>
<th>Tollerton</th>
<th>Trent Bridge</th>
<th>Wiverton</th>
<th>Wolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in number of dwellings between 2001 and 2011</th>
<th>Abbey</th>
<th>Bingham East</th>
<th>Bingham West</th>
<th>Compton Acres</th>
<th>Cotgrave</th>
<th>Cranmer</th>
<th>Edwalton Village</th>
<th>Gotham</th>
<th>Keyworth North</th>
<th>Keyworth South</th>
<th>Lady Bay</th>
<th>Leake</th>
<th>Lutterell</th>
<th>Manvers</th>
<th>Melton</th>
<th>Musters</th>
<th>Neville</th>
<th>Oak</th>
<th>Ruddington</th>
<th>Soar Valley</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>Thoroton</th>
<th>Trent</th>
<th>Tollerton</th>
<th>Trent Bridge</th>
<th>Wiverton</th>
<th>Wolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe: +2,580, Nottinghamshire: +22,474, East Midlands: +178,811, England and Wales: +1,971,957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A122
| % change | Abbey | Bingham East | Bingham West | Compton Acres | Cotgrave | Cranmer | Edwalton Village | Gamston | Gotham | Keyworth North | Keyworth South | Lady Bay | Leake | Lutterell | Manvers | Melton | Musters | Neville | Oak | Ruddington | Soar Valley | Stanford | Thoroton | Tolerton | Trent | Trent Bridge | Wiverton | Wolds |
|----------|-------|--------------|------------|---------------|----------|---------|-----------------|--------|--------|----------------|---------------|---------|------|----------|--------|--------|---------|--------|-----|----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|-------|----------------|---------|
| 0.7      | 7.1   | 8.2          | 2.6        | 2.9           | 4.6      | 3.2     | 10.5            | 4.6    | 2      | 1.9           | 1.6           | 7.5     | 3     | 7.9      | 11     | 1.3    | 5.7     | 4      | 12.5| 10       | 14.9    | 9.5    | 6.7     | 8.6    | -2.3 | 5          | 13.4    |

Rushcliffe: 5.8%, Nottinghamshire: 6.9%, East Midlands: 10%, England and Wales: 8.8%
## Household composition: 2011 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>One Person Household; Total</th>
<th>One Person Household; %</th>
<th>One Family Only; Total</th>
<th>One Family, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham East</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>1344</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham West</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton Acres</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotgrave</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>2041</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranmer</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwalton</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamston</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotham</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyworth North</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyworth</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Bay</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leake</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutterell</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manvers</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musters</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neville</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruddington</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soar Valley</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>1387</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroton</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollerston</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent Bridge</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiverton</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Rushcliffe: 27.2%, Nottinghamshire: East Midlands: England and Wales: 30.2%

Rushcliffe: 30,875, Nottinghamshire: 222,339, East Midlands: 1,220,743, England and Wales: 14,448,646


### Rushcliffe: 27.2%, Nottinghamshire: East Midlands: England and Wales: 30.2%

### Rushcliffe: 30,875, Nottinghamshire: 222,339, East Midlands: 1,220,743, England and Wales: 14,448,646

### Rushcliffe: 27.2%, Nottinghamshire: East Midlands: England and Wales: 30.2%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Abbey</th>
<th>Bingham East</th>
<th>Bingham West</th>
<th>Compton Acres</th>
<th>Cotgrave</th>
<th>Cranmer</th>
<th>Edwalton</th>
<th>Gamston</th>
<th>Gotham</th>
<th>Keyworth North</th>
<th>Keyworth</th>
<th>Lady Bay</th>
<th>Leake</th>
<th>Lutterell</th>
<th>Manvers</th>
<th>Melton</th>
<th>Musters</th>
<th>Neville</th>
<th>Oak</th>
<th>Ruddington</th>
<th>Soar Valley</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>Thoroton</th>
<th>Tollerton</th>
<th>Trent</th>
<th>Trent Bridge</th>
<th>Wolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe: %</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Household Types; Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe:</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>17,191</td>
<td>125,872</td>
<td>1,850,137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe: %</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Household Types: %</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe:</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A125
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aslockton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton in Fabis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradmore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunny</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Colston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clipston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colston Bassett</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costock</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotgrave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropwell Bishop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropwell Butler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bridgford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Leake</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flawborough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawksworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holme Pierrepont</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyworth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston on Soar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinoulton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kneeton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanton on Soar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanton on Wolds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orston</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owthorpe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumtree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radcliffe on Trent</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annual Completions 2010-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratcliffe on Soar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rempstone</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruddington</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxondale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarrington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screveton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelford and Newton</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibthorpe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford on Soar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton on the Wolds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Bonington</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe in the Glebe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrumpton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tithby and Wiverton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollerton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Broughton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bridgford</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Leake</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widmerpool</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby on Wolds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wysall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>216</strong></td>
<td><strong>294</strong></td>
<td><strong>209</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>226</strong></td>
<td><strong>1069</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highest number of completions in West Bridgford, Bingham, East Leake and the former Shelford and Newton Parish (within current Newton parish). Comparatively fewer completions in the remaining of our larger villages, e.g. Keyworth and Radcliffe.
Average house price data, 2006-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rushcliffe</th>
<th>Nottinghamshire</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>£185,000</td>
<td>£131,000</td>
<td>£168,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>£197,313</td>
<td>£136,000</td>
<td>£178,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>£184,973</td>
<td>£128,500</td>
<td>£174,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>£180,000</td>
<td>£132,000</td>
<td>£170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
<td>£135,000</td>
<td>£185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>£190,000</td>
<td>£131,000</td>
<td>£180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>£192,500</td>
<td>£130,000</td>
<td>£183,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>£190,000</td>
<td>£190,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
<td>£212,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Baseline data for Sustainability Appraisal**

**Indices of Multiple Deprivation – score and rank (Nottinghamshire authorities)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Average score</th>
<th>Rank of average score</th>
<th>Ranking (out of 326)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nottingham</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashfield</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassetlaw</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broxtowe</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedling</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark and Sherwood</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2015 is the official measure of relative deprivation for small areas (or neighbourhoods) in England. The IMD ranks every small area (Lower Super Output Area) in England from 1 (most deprived area) to 32,844 (least deprived area). LSOAs are designed to be of a similar population size with an average of 1,500 residents each and are a standard way of dividing up the country.

The Index of Multiple Deprivation is designed primarily to be a small area measure of deprivation. But the Indices are commonly used to describe deprivation for higher level geographies including local authority districts. A local authority district is ranked between 1 (the most deprived district in England) and 326 (the least deprived district in England). Based on the average IMD score Rushcliffe is the eighth least deprived district in England. Conversely Nottingham City is the eighth most deprived district. After Rushcliffe, Broxtowe has the second lowest level of overall deprivation in the county, ranking 109th of the 326 districts.

The Index of Multiple Deprivation is part of the Indices of Deprivation and it is the most widely used of these indices. It combines information from seven domain indices (which measure different types or dimensions of deprivation) to produce an overall relative measure of deprivation.

The seven domains of deprivation are as follows:
The **Income Deprivation Domain** measures the proportion of the population experiencing deprivation relating to low income. The definition of low income used includes both those people that are out-of-work, and those that are in work but who have low earnings (and who satisfy the respective means tests).

The **Employment Deprivation Domain** measures the proportion of the working-age population in an area involuntarily excluded from the labour market. This includes people who would like to work but are unable to do so due to unemployment, sickness or disability, or caring responsibilities.

The **Education, Skills and Training Deprivation Domain** measures the lack of attainment and skills in the local population. The indicators fall into two sub-domains: one relating to children and young people and one relating to adult skills.

The **Health Deprivation and Disability Domain** measures the risk of premature death and the impairment of quality of life through poor physical or mental health. The domain measures morbidity, disability and premature mortality but not aspects of behaviour or environment that may be predictive of future health deprivation.

The **Crime Domain** measures the risk of personal and material victimisation at local level.

The **Barriers to Housing and Services Domain** measures the physical and financial accessibility of housing and local services. The indicators fall into two sub-domains: ‘geographical barriers’, which relate to the physical proximity of local services, and ‘wider barriers’ which includes issues relating to access to housing such as affordability.

The **Living Environment Deprivation Domain** measures the quality of the local environment. The indicators fall into two sub-domains. The ‘indoors’ living environment measures the quality of housing; while the ‘outdoors’ living environment contains measures of air quality and road traffic accidents.
### SA Objective 2: Health

Health (Census 2011, KS301EW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Very good health</th>
<th>Good health</th>
<th>Fair health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham East</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham West</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton Acres</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colgrave</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramner</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwalton Village</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamston</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotham</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyworth North</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyworth South</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Bay</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leake</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutterell</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansers</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musters</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neville</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruddington</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soar Valley</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoroton</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollerton</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent Bridge</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiverton</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rushcliffe: 51.9%; Nottinghamshire: 44.8%, East Midlands: 45.3%, England and Wales: 47.1%

Rushcliffe: 32.6%; Nottinghamshire: 34.4%, East Midlands: 35.1%, England and Wales: 34.1%

Rushcliffe: 11.5%; Nottinghamshire: 14.8%, East Midlands: 14%, England and Wales: 13.2%
## Incapacity benefits

Percentage of people claiming incapacity benefits (as a proportion of the working age population).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Disability Living Allowance Claimants
*(source: Department for Work and Pensions, August 2012)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total claimant</th>
<th>Abbey</th>
<th>Bingham East</th>
<th>Bingham West</th>
<th>Compton Acres</th>
<th>Cotgrave</th>
<th>Cranmer</th>
<th>Edwalton Village</th>
<th>Gamston</th>
<th>Gotham</th>
<th>Keyworth North</th>
<th>Keyworth South</th>
<th>Lady Bay</th>
<th>Leake</th>
<th>Lutterell</th>
<th>Manvers</th>
<th>Melton</th>
<th>Musters</th>
<th>Neville</th>
<th>Oak</th>
<th>Ruddington</th>
<th>Soar Valley</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>Thoroton</th>
<th>Tollerton</th>
<th>Trent</th>
<th>Trent Bridge</th>
<th>Wiverton</th>
<th>Wolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 12 months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe: 200</td>
<td>East Midlands: 13,750</td>
<td>England: 159,590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year and up to 2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years and up to 5 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe: 610</td>
<td>East Midlands: 38,650</td>
<td>England: 442,660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years and over</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>177,790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>1,947,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of health facilities (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rushcliffe Wide</th>
<th>West Bridgford</th>
<th>Bingham</th>
<th>Cotgrave</th>
<th>East Leake</th>
<th>Keyworth</th>
<th>Radcliffe</th>
<th>Ruddington</th>
<th>East Bridgford</th>
<th>Cropwell Bishop</th>
<th>Gotham</th>
<th>Sutton Bonington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of health facilities</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NHS Choices, 2015

**SA Objective 3: Heritage**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listed Buildings</strong></td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scheduled Ancient Monuments</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listed gardens</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Historic England, 2015
SA Objective 4: Crime

Lower Super Output Areas (2015)

Crime
- 10% least deprived (nationally)
- 20% least deprived
- 30% least deprived
- 40% least deprived
- 50% least deprived
- 50% most deprived
- 40% most deprived

Crime IMD Score

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey Map.
With the Permission of Her Majesty's Stationary Office (c) Crown Copyright.
OS License No 100019419.
Rushcliffe Borough Council
## Recorded Crime Offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Description</th>
<th>Rushcliffe</th>
<th>Nottinghamshire</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence against the person, notifiable offences recorded by the police (rate per 1,000 people) (2013)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common assault, notifiable offences recorded by the police (rate per 1,000 people) (2011)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wounding or other act endangering life, notifiable offences recorded by the police (rate per 1,000 people) (2011)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other wounding, notifiable offences recorded by police (rate per 1,000 ) (2011)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary other than a dwelling, notifiable offences recorded by the police (rate per 1,000) (2013)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary, in a dwelling, notifiable offences recorded by the police (rate per 1,000) (2013)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery, notifiable offenses recorded by the police (rate per 1,000 households) (2013)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from the person, notifiable offences</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rushcliffe</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recorded by the police (rate per 1,000 people) (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft from a motor vehicle, notifiable offences recorded by the police (rate per 1,000 people) (2011)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of a motor vehicle, notifiable offences recorded by the police (rate per 1,000 people) (2011)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage including arson, notifiable offences recorded by the police (rate per 1,000 people) (2013)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment including penalty notices for disorder, notifiable offences recorded by the police (rate per 1,000 people) (2011)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Police recorded crime and outcomes open data tables, Home Office, 2015
### SA Objective 5: Social

#### Number of local facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leisure centres</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rushcliffe Borough Council and Nottinghamshire County Council

#### Religion (Census 2011, QS208EW)

|          | Abbey | Bingham East | Bingham West | Compton Acres | Cotgrave | Cranmer | Edwalton Village | Gotham | Keyworth North | Keyworth South | Lady Bay | Leake | Lutterell | Manvers | Melton | Musters | Neville | Oak | Ruddington | Soar Valley | Stanford | Thoroton | Tollerton | Trent | Trent Bridge | Wiverton | Wolds |
|----------|-------|--------------|--------------|---------------|------------|---------|------------------|--------|----------------|---------------|---------|------|----------|---------|--------|---------|---------|-----|------------|-----------|--------|---------|-----------|-------|-------------|----------|
| Christian| 53.2% | 6.2%         | 59.1%        | 51.8%         | 60.8%      | 63.2%   | 58.2%           | 55.2%  | 65.6%          | 62.6%         | 42.8%   | 64.6%| 55.9%    | 62.5%   | 52.2%  | 51.3%   | 68.3%   | 67.6%| 58.7%      | 5.9%     | 67.7%  | 67.2%   | 67.3%   | 61.7%  | 47.8%   | 65.8%   | 68.8% |
| Buddhist  | 0.4%  | 0.3%         | 0.2%         | 0.3%          | 0.1%       | 1.4%    | 0.4%            | 0.3%   | 0.1%           | 0.1%          | 0.3%   | 0.2%| 0.4%     | 0.2%    | 0.4%   | 0.1%    | 0.3%    | 0.6%| 0.1%       | 0.2%     | 0.1%   | 0.1%    | 0.3%    | 0.4%   | 0.1%    |
| Hindu     | 1.6%  | 0.1%         | 0.2%         | 4.8%          | 0.2%       | 0.2%    | 2.9%            | 3.2%   | 0.1%           | 0.2%          | 0.7%   | 0.2%| 3.1%     | 0.8%    | 1.5%   | 1.6%    | 0.1%    | 0.5%| 1.1%       | 0.5%     | 0.1%   | 0.6%    | 0.2%    | 1.8%   | 0.2%    | 0.4%    |
| Jewish    | 0.2%  | 0.1%         | 0.3%         | 0.2%          | 0.2%       | 0.1%    | 0.7%            | 0.5%   | 0.1%           | 0.1%          | 0.4%   | 0.2%| 0.4%     | 0.1%    | 0.5%   | 0.6%    | 0.1%    | 0.4%| 0.3%       | 0.2%     | 0.4%   | 0.1%    | 0.6%    | 0.1%   | 0.8%    |

Rushcliffe: 58.9%, England: 59.4%

Rushcliffe: 0.3%, England: 0.5%

Rushcliffe: 1%, England: 1.5%

Rushcliffe: 0.3%, England: 0.5%
| Muslim          | 2.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 6.8 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 5.3 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 4.2 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
|-----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Rushcliffe: 1.5%, England: 5% |
| Sikh            | 1.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 2.9 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 0.1 | 0.6 |
| Rushcliffe: 0.8%, England: 0.8% |
| Other           | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 |
| Rushcliffe: 0.4%, England: 0.4% |
| No religion     | 32.4| 29.1| 32.4| 26.4| 31.7| 25.9| 23.9| 29.1| 25.9| 2 1 | 29.3| 43.8| 27.7| 24.9| 28.5| 35.4| 31.6| 22.4| 22.8| 31.6| 31.4| 24.1| 2 3 | 21.9| 30.1| 4 0 | 25.4| 21.5|
| Rushcliffe: 29.6%, England: 24.7% |
| Not stated      | 8   | 7.8 | 6.9 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 7.2 | 7.4 | 6.6 | 7.4 | 8.7 | 6.2 | 7.4 | 7   | 6.7 | 7.8 | 8.4 | 8.2 | 7.2 | 6.7 | 6.4 | 8.3 | 8.5 | 6.6 | 5.7 | 7.6 | 7.4 |
| Rushcliffe: 7.1%, England: 7% |

**Ethnic Group (Census 2011, QS201EW)**

<p>| White          | 89.8| 97.5| 96.3| 78.9| 97.5| 95.8| 85.8| 86.3| 97.1| 97.5| 97.8| 91.9| 97.5| 83.7| 96.2| 90.9| 8    | 7   | 98.6| 97.2| 94.7| 92.5| 96.8| 98.5| 97.1| 96.2| 88.7| 98.2| 96.8|
|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Rushcliffe: 93.1%, England: 85.4% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rushcliffe</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/multiple ethnic groups</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian British</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African/Caribbean/Black British</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ethnic group</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SA Objective 6: Environment, Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

SA Objective 7: Landscape
### LBAP Habitats found in Rushcliffe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LBAP Habitat</th>
<th>Example sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arable field margins</td>
<td>Many sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canals</td>
<td>Grantham Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditches</td>
<td>Many sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutrophic and mesotrophic standing waters (including ponds)</td>
<td>Wilford Claypits, Skylarks Nature Reserve, Kinoulton Marsh, Gresham Marsh,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnstone Pits, Holme Pierrepont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedgerows</td>
<td>Many sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowland calcareous grassland</td>
<td>Gotham Hill Pastures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowland fen</td>
<td>Kinoulton Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowland neutral grassland</td>
<td>Wilwell Cutting, Wilford Claypits, Gresham Marsh, Keyworth Meadow, Normanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pastures, Bingham Linear Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowland wet grassland</td>
<td>Wilwell Cutting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh and Swamp</td>
<td>Gresham Marsh, Kinoulton Marsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed ash dominated woodland</td>
<td>Bunny Wood, Sharphill Wood, Meadow Covert, Wilford Hill Wood, West Leake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hills, Cotgrave Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reedbed</td>
<td>Skylarks Nature Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers and streams</td>
<td>Trent, Soar, Smite, Devon, Fairham Brook, Kingston Brook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**LBAP Habitat** | **Example sites**
--- | ---
Traditional orchards | Many sites
Wet woodland | Skylarks Nature Reserve
Wood pasture and parkland | Flintham Hall, Stamford Hall

Source: Rushcliffe Conservation Strategy, 2015

**Designated Wildlife Sites:**

In Rushcliffe in 2015 there are 8 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), 214 Local Wildlife Sites (LWS – previously known as SINCs) and eight designated Local Nature Reserves (LNR).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of habitat</th>
<th>Number of sites</th>
<th>Total Area (ha)</th>
<th>Average size (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grassland</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponds and lakes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streams, rivers, canals and ditches</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Industrial including quarries</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fen and Marshland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedgerow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruderal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>214</strong></td>
<td><strong>1903</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rushcliffe Conservation Strategy, 2015
Source: Natural England (magic map), 2015
**SA Objective 8 – Natural Resources and Flooding**

Number of planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on water quality grounds and flood defence grounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood grounds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water quality grounds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood and quality grounds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rushcliffe Local Plan Monitoring Reports 2007/08-2013/14

**SA Objective 9 – Waste**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe household waste</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rushcliffe Borough Council (LINS 18)
SA Objective 10 – Energy and Climate Change

Per capita CO2 emission estimates; industry sector (kt CO2)

Per capita CO2 emission estimates; domestic sector (kt CO2)

Per capita CO2 emission estimates; transport sector (kt CO2)

Per capita CO2 emission estimates; total sector (kt CO2)

# SA Objective 11 – Transport

## Accessibility of households in the Borough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to a leisure centre within 15 minutes by public transport</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to a leisure centre within 30 minutes by public transport</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of households - to a GP within 15 minutes by public transport</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of households - to a GP within 30 minutes by public transport</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of households - to a hospital within 15 minutes by public transport</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of households - to a hospital within 30 minutes by public transport</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of households - to a primary school within 15 minutes by public transport</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of households - to a primary school within 30 minutes by public transport</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of households – to a secondary school within 15 minutes by public transport</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of households – to a secondary school within 30 minutes by public transport</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Nottinghamshire County Council, 2009
SA Objective 12 – To create high quality employment opportunities

SA Objective 13 – Innovation

SA Objective 14 – Economic Structure
## Employment by occupation (2011 Census, QS606EW)

(All usual residents aged 16 to 74 in employment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managers, directors and senior officials</th>
<th>Abbey</th>
<th>Bingham East</th>
<th>Bingham West</th>
<th>Compton Acres</th>
<th>Cotgrave</th>
<th>Cranmer</th>
<th>Edwalton Village</th>
<th>Garston</th>
<th>Gotham</th>
<th>Keyworth North</th>
<th>Keyworth South</th>
<th>Lady Bay</th>
<th>Leake</th>
<th>Lutterell</th>
<th>Manvers</th>
<th>Melton</th>
<th>Musters</th>
<th>Nevile</th>
<th>Oak</th>
<th>Ruddington</th>
<th>Soar Valley</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>Thoroton</th>
<th>Tollerton</th>
<th>Trent</th>
<th>Trent Bridge</th>
<th>Wiverton</th>
<th>Wolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe: 14.2%, East Midlands: 10.6%, England: 10.9%</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Professional occupations | 34.4 | 21.7 | 18.9 | 31.4 | 12.9 | 17.1 | 28.4 | 30.7 | 20.7 | 30.8 | 21.7 | 36.5 | 22.5 | 28.4 | 23.8 | 37.5 | 37.3 | 27.1 | 27.2 | 24.4 | 24.4 | 26.5 | 2.2 | 25.5 | 23.1 | 31.4 | 21.7 | 27.2 |

Rushcliffe: 26.3%, East Midlands: 15.2%, England: 17.5%

| Associate professional and technical | 14.8 | 16.5 | 14.9 | 1.4 | 10.7 | 12.4 | 13.3 | 15.5 | 1.2 | 14.5 | 11.7 | 16.8 | 14.1 | 14.4 | 16.6 | 17.5 | 14.6 | 1.2 | 13.8 | 1.3 | 12.7 | 11.7 | 1.5 | 15.2 | 14.8 | 17.9 | 12.8 | 12.1 |

Rushcliffe: 14.3%, East Midlands: 11.3%, England: 12.8%

<p>| Administrative and | 9.7 | 1.3 | 13.6 | 12.5 | 11.5 | 8.2 | 1.1 | 11.1 | 9.3 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 8 | 12.4 | 1.3 | 12.6 | 10.4 | 9.7 | 11.7 | 1.1 | 11.4 | 1.2 | 10.6 | 12.1 | 14.7 | 10.5 | 7.2 | 11.1 | 8.9 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secretarial</th>
<th>Abbey</th>
<th>Bingham East</th>
<th>Bingham West</th>
<th>Compton Acres</th>
<th>Cotgrave</th>
<th>Crammer</th>
<th>Edwalton Village</th>
<th>Gamston</th>
<th>Gotham</th>
<th>Keyworth North</th>
<th>Keyworth South</th>
<th>Lady Bay</th>
<th>Leake</th>
<th>Lutterell</th>
<th>Manvers</th>
<th>Melton</th>
<th>Musters</th>
<th>Nevile</th>
<th>Oak</th>
<th>Ruddington</th>
<th>Soar Valley</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>Thoroton</th>
<th>Tollerton</th>
<th>Trent</th>
<th>Trent Bridge</th>
<th>Wiverton</th>
<th>Wolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rushcliffe: 11.1%, East Midlands: 10.9%, England: 11.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Skilled trades occupations | 5.9 | 9.9 | 10.2 | 5.5 | 11.7 | 15.7 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 14.6 | 6.9 | 115 | 5.6 | 10.1 | 6.5 | 8.3 | 3.7 | 5.1 | 105 | 105 | 19 | 10.6 | 11.4 | 9 | 9.6 | 4.6 | 128 | 112 |
| Rushcliffe: 8.8%, East Midlands: 12.1%, England: 11.3% |

| Caring, leisure and other service occupations | 5.7 | 7.9 | 10.1 | 5.7 | 10.2 | 5.3 | 6.7 | 5.9 | 8.2 | 4.1 | 8.4 | 4.8 | 6.9 | 6.5 | 7.3 | 4.9 | 5 | 5.4 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 10 | 10.6 | 11.4 | 9 | 9.6 | 4.6 | 128 | 112 |
| Rushcliffe: 6.9%, East Midlands: 9.5%, England: 9.3% |

<p>| Sales and customer service occupations | 6.9 | 7 | 7.3 | 6.7 | 9.7 | 2.9 | 6.3 | 7.2 | 6.7 | 6.2 | 9.1 | 5.9 | 6.3 | 8.7 | 6.3 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 2.6 | 3.4 | 6.6 | 5.6 | 4.9 | 4.1 | 6 | 6.8 | 9.4 | 4.5 | 3.7 |
| Rushcliffe: 6.6%, East Midlands: 8.4%, England: 8.4% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Abbey</th>
<th>Bingham East</th>
<th>Bingham West</th>
<th>Compton Acres</th>
<th>Cotgrave</th>
<th>Cranmer</th>
<th>Edwalton Village</th>
<th>Gotham</th>
<th>Keyworth North</th>
<th>Keyworth South</th>
<th>Lady Bay</th>
<th>Leake</th>
<th>Lutterell</th>
<th>Manvers</th>
<th>Melton</th>
<th>Musters</th>
<th>Neville</th>
<th>Oak</th>
<th>Ruddington</th>
<th>Soar Valley</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>Thoroton</th>
<th>Tollerton</th>
<th>Trent</th>
<th>Trent Bridge</th>
<th>Wiverton</th>
<th>Wolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process plant and machine operatives</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rushcliffe: 4.3%, East Midlands: 9.3%, England: 7.1%

| Elementary occupation s | 5.5 | 6.4 | 8.4 | 5.9 | 11.6 | 19.1 | 6.3 | 4.4 | 7.5 | 6.4 | 8.7 | 5.9 | 9.4 | 7.5 | 5.8 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 5.9 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 9.1 | 5 | 7.4 | 5.6 | 7.5 | 8.9 | 9.2 | 5.2 |

Rushcliffe: 7.4%, East Midlands: 12.7%, England: 11%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New employment floorspace created (square metres)</th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New floorspace for B1</td>
<td>4425</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>421</td>
<td></td>
<td>1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New floorspace for B1a offices</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>421</td>
<td></td>
<td>1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New floorspace – for B1b research and development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New floorspace – for B1c light industry</td>
<td>3669</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New floorspace – for B2 general industry</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New floorspace – for B8 storage or distribution centres</td>
<td>5255</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New floorspace – for mixed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New floorspace – total</td>
<td>10140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rushcliffe Local Plan Monitoring Reports 2009/10 – 2013/14

**Employment land lost to other uses (square metres)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009/10</th>
<th>2010/11</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1a offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1b research and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1c light industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1321</td>
<td>-490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 general industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1321</td>
<td></td>
<td>-490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8 storage or distribution centres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lost floorspace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,321</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2,882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rushcliffe Local Plan Monitoring Reports 2009/10 – 2013/14