



www.landuse.co.uk

Sustainability Appraisal Findings for the Stroud Local Plan Review Policy Options

Prepared by LUC
August 2018

Project Title: Sustainability Appraisal of the Stroud Local Plan Review

Client: Stroud District Council

Version	Date	Version Details	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
1	16/08/18	SA summary note for the Stroud Local Plan Review policy options	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

SA findings for the policy options in the Issues and Options consultation

- 1.1 This note presents the SA findings for the policy options that have been considered for the Stroud Local Plan Review. These options were initially set out in the Issues and Options consultation paper (October 2017).
- 1.2 The appraisal work set out in this note is presented in the same order that the options appeared in the Issues and Options consultation paper. The SA findings for the site options have been presented separately.

Chapter 1: Key Issues

- 1.3 The first chapter of the Issues and Options consultation paper sets out the key issues facing Stroud District, in relation to economy, affordable housing, environment, health and wellbeing and delivery.
- 1.4 Alternative options are not included in this chapter; therefore no appraisal work in relation to the key issues has been undertaken. However, a review of the key issues was undertaken following preparation of the SA Scoping Report (April 2018) in order to ensure that there are no inconsistencies and that an appropriate range of key issues is identified in the Local Plan. This review did not result in the SA team recommending that any changes should be made to the key issues in the Local Plan.

Chapter 2: Needs

Local Economy and Jobs

- 1.5 This section of the Local Plan sets out a number of alternative options in relation to the need for economic growth and job creation in the District. While some of the questions posed in the consultation are open ended and do not comprise alternative options that can be appraised, a number of distinct options are identified and the sections below provide a commentary on their likely significant sustainability effects.

Question 2.1c

- Option 1: Locating growth adjacent to M5 junctions.
- Option 2: Continuing expansion of employment land at existing settlements/sites.

- 1.6 The specific nature of these options means that negligible effects would be likely in relation to many of the SA objectives. However, locating more employment development adjacent to the M5 junctions could have minor negative effects on **SA objectives 10 (air quality)** and **14 (climate change)** as this approach may result in higher levels of car use for employees commuting to and from the sites, as well as potentially attracting less sustainable, transport-based commercial activities such as logistics. Development adjacent to the M5 junctions would be some distance from the main settlements in the District including Stroud and Cam and Dursley. There may also be minor negative effects on **SA objective 16 (employment)** as employment opportunities adjacent to the M5 junctions may not be easily accessible for people without access to a car. A minor negative effect on **SA objective 2 (health)** could also result from there being more limited opportunities for people to walk or cycle to work.
- 1.7 Conversely, continuing to expand employment land at existing settlements and sites could have minor positive effects on the SA objectives described above, as more people may be able to make

use of existing sustainable transport links to access work opportunities without relying on private cars.

- 1.8 The effects of both options on the environmental objectives, including **SA objectives 7 (biodiversity), 8 (landscape), 9 (historic environment) and 12 (flood risk)**, would depend on the specific location of employment land allocations under either option, and so cannot be determined at this high level.

Question 2.1d

- Option 1: Increased flexibility to allow other job generating uses on all employment sites.
- Option 2: Increased flexibility allowed on some sites only.
- Option 3: Identify a percentage threshold for non B class employment uses.

- 1.9 Allowing for increased flexibility in terms of the uses permitted at employment sites (Options 1 and 2) could have a positive effect on **SA objective 6 (access to services)** for employees at those sites, as they would be able to make use of facilities such as retail outlets during breaks and after work. Depending on nature of the other uses, there could also be positive effects on **SA objective 2 (health)**, i.e. if gyms were located within employment sites alongside Class B uses. Although such effects would be particularly positive under Option 1, which would allow flexibility on all employment sites and not just some (as with Option 2), the positive effects are not likely to be significant under either option as they only relate to employees at the sites concerned, rather than a large number of residents across the District. The likely effects of Option 3 would depend on the percentage threshold for non B class employment uses that is eventually applied, with the potential positive effects on the above SA objectives being greater if the percentage threshold is higher.

- 1.10 However, under all options there is a potential for minor negative effects on **SA objective 16 (employment)** if allowing a greater mix of employment uses were to result in an overall lower number of jobs being created. Some of the non B class uses that could be located within employment sites, such as retail units and gyms, are not likely to generate significant numbers of well-paid jobs in comparison to other potential B class uses. However, the potential negative effects of this nature are uncertain for all three options depending on the other uses that may eventually come forward and the number of associated jobs. As previously, the potential for negative effects is greater under Option 1 which would allow flexibility for other job generating uses on all, rather than just some, sites.

Question 2.1e

- Option 1: Promote further home working, encourage development of live-work units and co-working facilities.

- 1.11 The option for the Local Plan Review to promote more home working and to encourage the development of live-work units and co-working facilities is likely to have minor positive effects on **SA objectives 10 (air quality) and 14 (climate change)** as it may lead to lower levels of car use for commuting. There is also likely to be a minor positive effect on **SA objective 16 (employment)** as this approach should mean that a wider range of job opportunities are available to more people, including those without cars or with restricted working hours. The creation of co-working facilities in particular may also have a minor positive effect on **SA objective 17 (economic growth)** as it would support business development.

- 1.12 The specific nature of this option means that negligible effects on the other SA objectives are expected.

Question 2.1f

- Option 1: Promote further farm diversification.
- Option 2: Control pattern of rural development more closely.

- 1.13 Promoting further farm diversification under Option 1 could have a minor positive effect on **SA objectives 16 (employment)** and **17 (economic growth)** as this approach could offer local employment opportunities and allow farming businesses to respond flexibly to changes in agriculture to ensure that their businesses remain viable. Depending on the nature of diversification that takes place, there may also be minor positive effects on **SA objectives 3 (health)** and **6 (access to services and facilities)** if the businesses provide opportunities for physical activity, or add to the range of community services and facilities available in the area. Conversely, Option 2 would involve more close control over rural development, which could have minor negative effects on those SA objectives.
- 1.14 However, Option 1 could have negative effects on some of the environmental SA objectives, in particular **SA objective 8 (landscape)**, although this is uncertain depending on the nature and location of diversification activities. Controlling rural development more closely under Option 2 could have a positive effect on that objective.

Our Town Centres

- 1.15 This section of the Issues and Options consultation document sets out a number of 'mix and match' options for improving the town centres of Stroud, Nailsworth, Dursley, Wotton-under-Edge and Stonehouse. As these options are generally aspirational, broadly positive effects on the SA objectives are expected to occur.
- 1.16 In general, improving the District's town centres will have positive effects on **SA objectives 5 (vibrant communities)** and **6 (access to services)**. There are also likely to be positive effects on **SA objectives 10 (air quality)** and **14 (climate change)** as improvements to the town centres may encourage more people to shop and spend time in those areas, which are generally more accessible via sustainable transport compared to out of town retail parks or other larger centres. Significant positive effects on **SA objective 17 (economic growth)** would also be expected as the overall purpose of the options are to maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the District's town centres. Several of the options for the town centres are associated with marketing the tourism potential of the towns, i.e. promoting the proximity of Stroud and Dursley and so would have positive effects on **SA objective 17 (economic growth)** for that reason as well.
- 1.17 Considering the specific options set out in the Issues and Options document, there is, however, potential for some of the options to have a negative effect on **SA objectives 10 (air quality)** and **14 (climate change)** where they could be seen to encourage car use. For example, one of the options that is included for both Stroud and Dursley is to improve signage to car parking for motorists – while this could benefit the street scene and reduce congestion, it could indirectly encourage car use. The other approach proposed for Dursley, to enhance signage in the town for pedestrians and cyclists, would have more positive effects on those SA objectives. Similarly, one of the options for Wotton-under-Edge is to find a solution for the lack of car and coach parking, including allocating a site – this could again have a negative effect on **SA objectives 10 (air quality)** and **14 (climate change)**, as could the option for Stroud to relax parking restrictions in the evening and two of the options for Stonehouse that refer to promoting the town's links with the strategic road network.
- 1.18 One of the proposals for Nailsworth, improving the town square, would have a positive effect on **SA objective 8 (landscape and townscape)**.
- 1.19 The option for Stroud to support new housing in the town centre for young professionals could have a minor positive effect on **SA objective 1: housing**.

A Local Need for Housing

- 1.20 This section of the Issues and Options consultation document poses a number of open ended consultation questions in relation to the need for housing development in the District, but does not identify alternative options that can be subject to SA. Therefore, no appraisal work has been

undertaken in relation to this section. Any potential development sites that have been put forward in response to question 2.3c have been subject to SA along with other site options.

Local Green Spaces and Community Facilities

- 1.21 This section of the Issues and Options consultation document poses a number of open ended consultation questions in relation to the need for local green spaces and community facilities in the District, but does not identify alternative options that can be subject to SA. Therefore, no appraisal work has been undertaken in relation to this section. A small number of potential open space site options have been subject to SA separately.

Chapter 3: Future Growth Strategy

Future Growth Strategy

- 1.1 In summary, the four strategic growth options being considered for the Stroud Local Plan Review comprise:
- Option 1: Concentrated development - 5,550 dwellings and 30ha B class employment.
 - Option 2: Wider distribution - 5,520 dwellings and 30ha B class employment.
 - Option 3: Dispersal -5,695 dwellings and 40ha B class employment.
 - Option 4: Growth Point -6,010 dwellings and 40ha B class employment.
- 1.2 The Council's paper "Local Plan Review: Developing a preferred strategy (revised March 2018)" describes the options in more detail (including how much housing would be delivered in the broad locations making up the option) and has been taken into account during the appraisal, along with four maps prepared by the Council illustrating the broad locations for growth under each option.

Summary of SA findings

- 1.3 **Table 1** at the end of this section summarises the sustainability effects identified for the four future growth strategy options being considered for the Stroud Local Plan. The justification for the sustainability effects identified is provided in the detailed SA matrix in **Appendix 1** at the end of this note.
- 1.4 It is expected that Option 1 would provide new housing and economic growth at locations to achieve the most positive effects as well as having the lowest number of outright significant negative effects. These effects are likely given that this approach would provide the majority of housing and employment development adjacent to the main towns in the district and would be concentrated at a few larger sites.
- 1.5 Option 1 would provide enough housing to ensure the housing stock meets the needs of local people, and the provision of much of this development at a smaller number of larger sites is likely to mean that high levels of affordable housing could be provided without significant impacts on viability. This approach may also provide more opportunities for the incorporation of new infrastructure to support low carbon and renewable energies as well as sustainable waste management practices. This option also provides a high level of new employment land in relatively accessible locations. The concentration of new development across a smaller number of larger sites is also likely to mean that transport connectivity issues which might otherwise adversely affect the accessibility of employment opportunities in the district might be addressed by securing government funding for new infrastructure provision.
- 1.6 It is expected that providing new housing by the larger towns of the district would mean that new residents would be located in close proximity to a range of existing services and facilities which would be to the benefit of promoting modal shift and health and well-being as well as social inclusion. Furthermore, it is likely that this approach would help to improve the vitality and viability of the town centres at the settlements in question, although it recognised that this approach would not directly support the growth of the more rural villages of the district.
- 1.7 Considering the high level of growth required over the plan period it is expected that all options would require development to proceed at large areas of greenfield land. Option 1 may however

present increased opportunities to make use of brownfield sites which are more likely to be available at the larger settlements in the district. Option 1 would also provide the majority of new growth away from the more sensitive biodiversity and geodiversity sites (particularly the Severn Estuary SPA, SAC and Ramsar site) and landscape designations (including the Cotswolds AONB) in the district. Providing development near the large settlements of the district will also help to avoid the areas at most risk of flooding and areas which have been designated as having potential to adversely impact water quality if development was to proceed.

1.8 Conversely Option 2 and Option 3 would result in a greater spread of development throughout the district at the smaller towns and more rural villages. These locations are currently less accessible and provide access to a lower number of key services and facilities. Furthermore the wider dispersal of development through the district would place a higher level of development in close proximity to potentially sensitivity biodiversity and geodiversity designations while also resulting in adverse impacts on the established character of the more rural villages and the AONB. Both of these options would make use of a higher number of smaller development sites meaning that issues relating to viability¹ may be more likely to result in relation to the delivery of affordable housing. It is also considered government funding which might otherwise be used to help to address connectivity issues in the district would be less likely to be secured at the smaller sites which these options would put forward.

Table 1: Summary of sustainability effects for the Future Growth Strategy Options for Stroud Local Plan

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point
SA 1: Housing	++	++/-	++/-	++
SA 2: Health	++/-	+/-	+/--	++/--?
SA 3: Social inclusion	++/-	+/-	+/--	++/--?
SA 4: Crime	0	0	0	0
SA 5: Vibrant communities	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
SA 6: Services and facilities	++/-	++/-	+/--	++/-
SA 7: Biodiversity/geodiversity	-?	--?	--?	--?
SA 8: Landscapes/townscapes	-?	--?	--?	--?
SA 9: Historic environment	+?/--?	+?/--?	+?/--?	+/--?
SA 10: Air quality	+	+/-	-	+/-
SA 11: Water quality	-	--	--	0
SA 12: Flooding	+/-	-	--	-
SA 13: Efficient land use	+/--	--	--	--
SA 14: Climate change	+	+/-?	-	+/-?
SA 15: Waste	+?	0	0	+?
SA 16: Employment	++/-	++/-	+/--	++?/-
SA 17: Economic growth	+/-	+/-	+/-	++?/-

1.9 Option 4 would provide the majority of new development at large scale sites at just three locations in the district; including at the new growth point to the south of Sharpness. It is expected that the new growth point at Sharpness in particular would not provide immediate access to existing services and facilities, meaning that new residents may be required to travel longer distances on a day to day basis. However, the large scale of development concentrated at

¹ National Planning Practice Guidance (paragraph 031 Reference ID: 23b-031-20161116) refers to the fact that contributions for affordable housing should not be sought from some smaller-scale developments.

only three locations is likely to support the incorporation of new services and facilities at these growth points as well as supporting higher levels of affordable housing and the securing of government funding for infrastructure improvements. The latter in particular could be of particular benefit in terms of securing future inward economic investment.

- 1.10 However, large scale development at the three growth point locations in Option 4 is likely to result in the loss of a large amount of greenfield land with reduced focus on the use of brownfield sites. The development to be provided at the Sharpness growth point would be provided at a location which could adversely impact upon the integrity of the Severn Estuary SPA, SAC and Ramsar site in particular. This location by the Severn Estuary also contains areas of Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3 although it is noted that flood defences are in place which would help mitigate the potential for adverse flood risk.

Conclusion

- 1.11 Option 1 performs slightly better overall in terms of potential positive effects and slightly fewer negative effects. However, there are elements of the other three options that also perform well. In particular, concentrating all the new growth at the three potential growth points could have fewer negative environmental impacts than Options 2 and 3, and would have most of the same significant positive effects as Option 1 for provision of housing, employment opportunities, access to services, health and social inclusion due to the creation of new, mixed-use communities. Option 2 with a slightly wider distribution than Option 1 could have benefits in terms of access to services and employment opportunities for some of the other larger towns and villages in the District. Therefore, it may be worth considering a hybrid option which most resembles Option 1: Concentrated development, but perhaps including growth at one or two growth points and/or one or two of the smaller towns and larger villages as well (although this would need to avoid settlements where negative environmental effects on biodiversity/geodiversity, landscape/townscape, historic environment, water quality and flooding are more likely).

Gloucester's Fringe

- 1.12 This section of the Issues and Options consultation document identifies a number of broad locations for growth on the fringe of Gloucester. These locations have been subject to SA along with the other site options.

South of the District

- 1.13 This section of the Issues and Options consultation document considers whether there are broad locations that could be considered for growth in the South of the District. Potential development locations in that area have been subject to SA along with the other site options.

Settlement Hierarchy

- 1.14 This section of the Issues and Options consultation document presents the settlement hierarchy as it is set out in the adopted Local Plan and asks for comment on that. No alternative options are set out and therefore no appraisal work has been undertaken in relation to the settlement hierarchy.

Settlement Boundaries

- 1.15 This section of the Issues and Options consultation document identifies three alternative approaches to managing development proposals on the edges of towns and villages:

Question 3.5a

- Option 1: Continue with existing settlement development limits, amended as necessary.
- Option 2: Assess proposals on a case by case basis using broader criteria (e.g. landscape impact; form of settlement, proximity to services, etc.).
- Option 3: Continue with settlement development limits but expand the types of development that are allowed beyond them in the countryside.

- 1.16 A fourth option also asks consultees whether there are any other approaches that should be considered, which cannot be appraised as no other approaches are identified.

- 1.17 The appraisal of these options has been informed by the discussion paper that was prepared by Council officers for the Planning Review Panel, entitled 'Review of Settlement Development Limits'.
- 1.18 Continuing with the current approach of defining stringent settlement development limits (Option 1) is likely to have broadly positive effects on the environmental SA objectives as development outside of settlement limits is strictly controlled. The protection resulting from this approach would have minor positive effects on **SA objectives 7: biodiversity, 8: landscape and 13: land use and soils**. There may also be minor positive effects on **SA objective 10: air quality** as focussing development within existing settlement limits, as opposed to permitting more dispersed development, could result in lower levels of car use. In addition, there could be a minor positive effect in relation to **SA objective 6: access to services**. However, the lack of flexibility associated with this approach could have minor negative effects on **SA objectives 1: housing and 16: economy** if proposals for development outside of settlement limits that would otherwise benefit these SA objectives are prevented from coming forward. It is possible that this less flexible approach could result in development proposals being refused in locations where there would not actually be adverse impacts on the environment, but the opportunity to consider and assess this on a case-by-case basis is lost.
- 1.19 Option 2 (assessing proposals on a case by case basis using criteria) would allow for more flexibility, which may benefit **SA objectives 1: housing and 16: economy** if residential and commercial developments are able to come forward in wider locations where it can be established that there would not be harm as a result. This more flexible approach would not necessarily result in adverse effects in relation to the environmental SA objectives, as there would be criteria that proposals would still be required to meet; however there may be an increased chance of negative effects on **SA objectives 7: biodiversity and 8: landscape** in particular if there is less stringent protection compared to Option 1. Effects would depend largely on the criteria that are applied and how stringently they are enforced, as well as whether the Council has available the evidence needed to thoroughly assess proposals, such as Conservation Area appraisals and up to date landscape sensitivity assessments. There may also be minor negative effects on **SA objectives 6: access to services and SA objective 10: air quality** if this approach were to result in more dispersed development which is likely to be associated with higher levels of car use.
- 1.20 The third option would involve continuing with the current settlement development limits but expanding the types of development that are allowed beyond them in the countryside. This approach would provide the environmental protection of option 1, although not as strongly because certain types of development would not be as tightly controlled in terms of their location and may therefore be more likely to have adverse impacts. As with option 2 however, there could be benefits for **SA objectives 1: housing and 16: economy** assuming that the types of developments that might be allowed would be things like live work units and exemplar carbon neutral schemes. There may also be minor negative effects on **SA objective 10: air quality** if more dispersed development under this option were to result in higher levels of car use. In addition, dispersed development could have a negative effect in relation to **SA objective 6: access to services**.
- 1.21 A number of hybrid options are also identified in the discussion paper referred to above and the effects of these would be a mixture of the positives and negatives described above for the three options in the Issues and Options document. For example, one hybrid option could be a combination of Options 1 and 2 – removing settlement development limits for large settlements but retaining them for small villages with few facilities in sensitive locations. This approach would have some of the more positive social and economic effects described above for Option 2, while still providing some of the environmental protection associated with Option 1.

Broad Locations and Potential Sites

- 1.22 Reasonable alternative locations for development have been subject to SA and the findings are presented separately. This includes the site options set out in the Issues and Options consultation document as well as other reasonable alternative options that have been considered previously by the Council or that have come forward since the Issues and Options consultation.

Chapter 4: Background Studies

- 1.23 This final section of the Issues and Options consultation document describes the background studies that are being prepared to inform the Local Plan Review and asks consultees whether any others are considered necessary. No alternative options suitable for appraisal are included in this section.

Appendix 1: SA matrix for the Future Growth Strategy Options for Stroud Local Plan

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
SA 1: To provide affordable, sustainable and decent housing to meet local needs.	++	++/-	++/-	++	<p>The effects of the distribution of new development within the district on ensuring that the housing stock meets the needs of local people will be mainly determined by the amount and type of housing that is developed and the proportion that is affordable. The housing requirement for Stroud District is assumed to be the government figure of 12,700 dwellings for the 20 year period 2016-2036 with a residual requirement set at approximately 5,500 dwellings taking completions, commitments (i.e. sites with planning permission and under construction or sites subject to resolutions to grant permission) and allocations into consideration. Duty to cooperate means that there may be a requirement for development in Stroud (particularly towards the Gloucester fringe) to meet Gloucester’s future need, however some sites which were originally considered for inclusion to meet Stroud’s need, which could more appropriately meet Gloucester’s future need have been removed from the four options, as this consideration is a separate process from deciding upon the strategy for growth to meet Stroud’s need.</p> <p>Option 1: This option would provide 5,550 new homes over the plan period mainly at Tier 1 settlements thereby meeting the housing requirement for Stroud up to 2036. Housing development focussed mainly at a smaller number of concentrated locations will allow for a large proportion of this development to proceed at larger sites. It is expected that this approach would help to support the delivery of affordable housing at such sites given that viability would be less likely to be a significant obstacle particularly when compared to development which might be spread across a higher number of smaller sites at rural locations. A significant positive effect is therefore expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 2: This option would provide 5,520 new homes over the plan period mainly at Tier 1 and 2 settlements thereby meeting the housing requirement for Stroud up to 2036. This approach would result in a wider distribution of housing development mainly between small and medium sites with some sites to provide up to a maximum of approximately 800 homes. It is expected that this approach may result in some obstacles relating to viability emerging with regard to the provision of affordable housing particularly at smaller housing sites. It should, however, be noted that the inclusion of a higher number of small and medium housing sites through this option may facilitate the more rapid building-out of sites to maintain local housing supply. A mixed overall effect (significant positive/ minor negative) is therefore expected on this SA objective.</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>Option 3: This option would provide 5,695 new homes over the plan period mainly across Tier 1, 2 and 3 settlements with further development dispersed across Tier 4 and 5 settlements thereby meeting the housing requirement for Stroud up to 2036. The lack of suitable sites at smaller villages means that this approach requires the shortfall to be met through approximately 2,000 new homes being delivered at a new growth point to the south of Sharpness however beyond this the approach allows for a greater dispersal of development with medium and smaller sites being of increased importance in terms of delivering growth. As such this option may present obstacles in terms of viability of affordable housing particularly considering the emphasis the approach places on housing at smaller sites. It should, however, be noted that the inclusion of a higher number of small and medium housing sites through this option may facilitate the more rapid building-out of sites to maintain local housing supply. A mixed overall effect (significant positive/ minor negative) is therefore expected on this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 4: This option would provide 6,010 new homes over the plan period mainly at new growth points in the district thereby meeting the housing requirement for Stroud up to 2036. This approach would result in very large sites accommodating the vast majority of new housing development. It is expected that this approach would help to support the delivery of affordable housing at such sites given that viability would be less likely to be a significant obstacle particularly when compared to development which might be spread across a higher number of smaller sites at rural locations. A significant positive effect is therefore expected in relation to this SA objective</p>
SA 2: To maintain and improve the community's health with accessible healthcare for residents, including increasing levels of physical activity, especially among	++/-	+/-	+/-	++/- -?	<p>Option 1: By providing new residential development mainly at Tier 1 settlements in the district it is likely that this approach would result in new residents having a good level of access to existing health care facilities and other facilities such as sports facilities and open spaces which could help to improve public health. The provision of the majority of new development in and around the edges of the district's large settlements which allow for access to existing services and facilities may also encourage new residents to undertake journeys by more active modes of transport. Furthermore concentrating a high level of development at larger sites would likely help to support the funding of new infrastructure through S106/CIL to the benefit of health. However, directing a high level of development to the large settlements would also compound access issues for people in rural areas, and would mean that potential opportunities to stimulate the provision of new facilities (including healthcare</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
the young.					<p>facilities) in those areas are lost. Overall a mixed effect (significant positive/ minor negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 2: Allowing for a more widely distributed pattern of development at the towns and villages of the district across smaller and some medium sized sites is less likely to provide a majority of new residents with a good level of access to larger, existing district-level health care facilities and other facilities such as sports facilities and open spaces which could help to improve public health. A more distributed pattern of development is also expected to be less likely to encourage journeys to be undertaken by more active modes of transport given the longer distances which are likely to be involved for daily journeys to employment sites and services and facilities. Smaller and medium sized sites would also be less likely to support the provision of new facilities through S106/CIL which might otherwise be provided to the benefit of health. This approach may however help to support the stimulation of existing and provision of new facilities (including healthcare facilities) in rural areas of the district to the benefit of residents at these locations. Overall a mixed effect (minor positive/ minor negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 3: By providing a more dispersed pattern of development across Tier 1, 2 and 3 settlements with further development across Tier 4 and 5 settlements and a significant level of development also to be provided at a new growth point to the south of Sharpness it is expected that many new residents would not be provided with immediate access to existing healthcare facilities. Furthermore new residents at rural villages would not be located within close proximity of other essential services and facilities and therefore would be unlikely to undertake journeys by more active modes of transport. The delivery of much of the development across a number of smaller sites is less likely to result in S106/CIL coming forward to deliver significant levels of new infrastructure which might support health and well-being in the district. It is expected that the large site required to deliver the higher level of development at the new growth point by Sharpness would however be capable of supporting new facilities and services and as such could help to promote health and well-being at this location. Travel by active modes of transport may also be encouraged at this location given that it will be a mixed-use development offering employment opportunities in close proximity to residential areas. Overall a mixed effect (minor positive/ significant negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 4: By providing development at new growth points in the district this approach would result in very large</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>sites being used to accommodate the vast majority of new development in the district. New development at Hardwicke would be located within the South Gloucester Fringe and a significant portion of the new development would be in close proximity to the north of Cam. As such new residents would be provided with a good level of access to existing health care facilities and other facilities such as sports facilities and open spaces at these locations, which could help to improve public health. It is however noted that the high level of development to be concentrated at either location may result in current services and facilities at the settlements' edge being overwhelmed. However, the potential pressure on existing services and facilities in the Gloucester Fringe and at Cam will be dependent on how and at what stage these new services and facilities are provided at the new growth points near these settlements. Those new residents at the new growth point to the south of Sharpness would not be provided with immediate access to a high level of existing services and facilities, however it is expected that the size of each growth point and the level of development to be delivered would support the delivery of the new services and facilities in these locations. Furthermore the level of growth supported through this option is likely to allow for funding for new infrastructure to be secured through S016/CIL and for the delivery of mixed-use developments. As such new residents at the growth point locations are likely to be located in close proximity to employment opportunities and new services and facilities which may help to encourage journeys to be undertaken by more active modes of transport. However, directing a high level of development to just three areas in the district would compound access issues for people in rural areas, and would mean that potential opportunities to stimulate the provision of new facilities (including healthcare facilities) in those areas are lost. Overall a mixed effect (significant positive/ uncertain significant negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p>
SA 3: To encourage social inclusion, equity, the promotion of equality and a respect for diversity and meet the challenge of a	++/-	+/-	+/-	++/- -?	<p>Option 1: By providing new residential development mainly by Tier 1 settlements in the district it is likely that this approach would result in all new residents (including older people and people with accessibility issues) having a good level of access to existing community services. Furthermore concentrating a high level of development at larger sites would likely help to support the funding of new infrastructure including community facilities and service to the benefit the wider population through S106/CIL. However, directing a high level of development to the large settlements would also compound access issues for people in rural areas, and would mean that potential opportunities to stimulate the provision of new facilities (including community services) in those areas are lost. Overall a mixed effect (significant positive/ minor negative) is expected in relation to this</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
growing and ageing population					<p>SA objective.</p> <p>Option 2: Allowing for a more widely distributed pattern of development at the towns and villages of the district across smaller and some medium sized sites is less likely to provide a majority of new residents with access to the larger, existing district-level community services. Smaller and medium sized sites would also be less likely to support the provision of new facilities through S016/CIL which might otherwise be to the benefit of social inclusion. This approach may however help to support the provision of new and stimulation of existing community services in more rural areas of the district to the benefit of residents at these locations. Overall a mixed effect (minor positive/ minor negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 3: By providing a more dispersed pattern of development across Tier 1, 2 and 3 settlements with further development across Tier 4 and 5 settlements and a significant level of development also to be provided at a new growth point to the south of Sharpness it is expected that many new residents would not be provided with immediate access to existing community services. The delivery of much of the development across a number of smaller sites is also less likely to result in S106/CIL coming forward to deliver significant levels of new infrastructure which might include new community services. It is expected that the large site required to deliver the higher level of development at the new growth point by Sharpness would however be capable of supporting new community services and facilities which is likely to be of particular benefit at this location to older people and people who might otherwise have problems travelling to access these types of facilities. Overall a mixed effect (minor positive/ significant negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 4: By providing development at new growth points this approach would result in very large sites being used to accommodate the majority of new development in the district. New development at Hardwicke would be located within the South Gloucester Fringe and a significant portion of the new development would be in close proximity to the north of Cam. As such, new residents would be provided with a good level of access to existing community services which would be of particular benefit to older people and people who might have issues travelling to access facilities and services. It is however noted that the high level of development to be concentrated at either location may result in current services and facilities at the settlements' edge being overwhelmed. However, the potential pressure on existing services and facilities in the Gloucester Fringe and at Cam will be dependent on how and at what stage these new services and facilities are provided at the new</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>growth points by these settlements. New residents at the new growth point to the south of Sharpness would not be provided with immediate access to a high level of existing community services, however it is expected that the size of each growth point and the level of development to be delivered would support the delivery of the new community facilities at these locations. Overall, the level of growth supported by this option is likely to allow for funding to be secured through S106/CIL and for the delivery of mixed-use development, including new community facilities and services at the growth point locations. However, directing a high level of development to just three areas in the district would compound access issues for people (including older people) in rural areas, and would mean that potential opportunities to stimulate the provision of new facilities (including community facilities) in those areas are lost. Overall a mixed effect (significant positive/ uncertain significant negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p>
SA 4: To reduce crime, anti-social behaviour and disorder and the fear of crime.	0	0	0	0	<p>The distribution of development within Stroud District will not have a direct effect on this SA objective. Effects will be determined by the design of new development rather than the overall quantum and spatial distribution of growth over the plan period.</p>
SA 5: To create and sustain vibrant communities.	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	<p>Option 1: By providing new development mainly by Tier 1 settlements in the district it is likely that this approach will help to enhance the vitality and viability of such centres, to regenerate these areas and improve their liveability. Delivering a high level of development at larger sites in the district may also help to incorporate a higher level of new infrastructure, services and facilities (including for cultural activities) given the increased potential to secure funding through S106/CIL. Amenity issues relating to noise and light pollution associated with construction of new development would be concentrated near the Tier 1 settlements and limited in rural locations. While this approach may help to safeguard the identity of rural communities as less development will take place at the rural villages, it would not help to enhance them as regeneration opportunities would be less likely to come forward at these locations. Overall a mixed effect (minor positive/ minor negative) is therefore expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 2: Allowing for a more widely distributed pattern of development at the Tier 1 and 2 settlements of the</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>district will help to enhance the vitality and viability of a larger number of smaller centres in the district and also will help to regenerate these areas and improve their liveability. It is however expected that spreading development across smaller and some medium sized sites would present fewer opportunities for the delivery of new infrastructure, services and facilities (including for cultural activities) through S106/CIL and this may hinder the progress of regeneration at larger settlements. Delivering a higher level of development at the more rural Tier 2 settlements of the district is likely to result in amenity issues relating to noise and light pollution associated with construction of new development in these locations. While this option may help to safeguard the identity of rural communities as less development will take place at the rural villages, it would not help to enhance them as regeneration opportunities would be less likely to come forward at these locations. Overall a mixed effect (minor positive/ minor negative) is therefore expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 3: This option would provide a more dispersed pattern of development across Tier 1, 2 and 3 settlements with further development across Tier 4 and 5 settlements and a significant level of development also to be provided at a new growth point to the south of Sharpness. This approach could be of benefit to the vitality and viability, liveability of the more rural villages in the district as new development could help to promote regeneration and enhancement of community identity in these villages. The delivery of much of the development across a number of smaller sites is however less likely to result in S106/CIL funding coming forward to deliver significant levels of new infrastructure, services and facilities (including for cultural activities) which may impede the regeneration of the wider district. Furthermore delivering a significant proportion of development across the more rural villages of the district could affect the identity of rural communities and is more likely to result in amenity issues relating to noise and light pollution associated with construction of new development in these locations. Overall a mixed effect (minor positive/ minor negative) is therefore expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 4: By providing development at new growth points this approach would result in very large sites at three new growth points being used to accommodate the vast majority of new development in the district. Therefore any benefits to the vitality and viability, liveability of existing settlements in the district would be limited to those in proximity to the north of Cam and Sharpness growth points, and would not help to serve regeneration targets at rural villages or other large settlements in the district. The high level of new development to be provided at each location is however likely to support the delivery of new infrastructure, services and facilities (including for</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					cultural activities) through S106/CIL funding and will also help to provide a sense of community at the large sites at these locations. Amenity issues relating to noise and light pollution associated with construction of new development would be concentrated at the new locations and therefore less likely to affect existing settlements within the district. While this option may help to safeguard the identity of rural communities as less development will take place at the rural villages, it would not help to enhance them as regeneration opportunities would be less likely to come forward at these locations. Overall a mixed effect (minor positive/ minor negative) is therefore expected in relation to this SA objective.
SA 6: To maintain and improve access to all services and facilities.	++/-	++/-	+/--	++/-	<p>Option 1: By providing new residential development mainly by Tier 1 settlements in the district it is likely that this approach would result in all new residents having a good level of access to existing services and facilities. It would also likely encourage travel to the larger town centres of the district thereby helping to ensure their vitality and viability. Furthermore concentrating a high level of development at larger sites would likely help to support the funding of new infrastructure including services and facilities to the benefit the wider population through S106/CIL. However, directing a high level of development to the large settlements would also compound access issues for people in rural areas, and would mean that potential opportunities to stimulate the provision of new services and facilities in those areas are lost. Overall a mixed effect (significant positive/ minor negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 2: Allowing for a more widely distributed pattern of development at the towns and villages of the district across smaller and some medium sized sites is less likely to provide a majority of new residents with access to the larger, existing district-level services and facilities. Smaller and medium sites would also be less likely to support the provision of new services and facilities through S106/CIL. This approach is expected to be of particular benefit in terms of protecting the vitality and viability the existing centres in the district including such as Minchinhampton, Wotton under Edge and Berkeley which are beyond the Tier 1 settlements. It is expected that this approach would also help support the provision of new and stimulation of existing services and facilities in some of the settlements in more rural areas of the district to the benefit of residents at these locations. Overall a mixed effect (significant positive/ minor negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 3: By providing a more dispersed pattern of development across Tier 1, 2 and 3 settlements with further development across Tier 4 and 5 settlements and a significant level of development also to be provided at a new</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>growth point to the south of Sharpness it is expected that many new residents would not be provided with immediate access to existing services and facilities. It is also expected that providing for a more dispersed pattern of development would not help to support the vitality and viability of town centres in the district. The spread of new development at the smaller villages of the district is unlikely to result in the creation of critical mass to draw in footfall on a regular basis. The delivery of much of the development across a number of smaller sites is also less likely to result in S106/CIL coming forward to deliver significant levels of new infrastructure which might include new services and facilities. It is however expected that the large site required to deliver the higher level of development at the new growth point by Sharpness would be capable of supporting new services and facilities. Depending on how the development came forward at this location it might allow for a new viable town or district centre. Overall a mixed effect (minor positive/ significant negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 4: By providing development at new growth points in the district this approach would result in very large sites being used to accommodate the vast majority of new development in the district. New development at Hardwicke would be located within the South Gloucester Fringe and a significant portion of new development would also be in close proximity to the north of Cam. As such new residents would be provided with a good level of access to existing services and facilities. It is however noted that the high level of development to be concentrated at either location may result in current services and facilities at the settlements' edge being overwhelmed. The potential pressure on existing services and facilities in the Gloucester Fringe and at Cam will be dependent on how and at what stage these new services and facilities are provided at the new growth points by these settlements. Those new residents at the new growth point to the south of Sharpness would not be provided with immediate access to a high level of existing services and facilities. However, it is expected that the level of development at each growth point to be delivered would support compact, mixed-use development and the delivery of new services and facilities through S106/CIL funding. The manner in which the new development is provided at the new growth point by Sharpness may also allow for a new viable town or district centre in the district. However, directing all development to three new growth points would compound access issues for people in rural areas, and would mean that potential opportunities to stimulate the provision of new services and facilities in those areas are lost. Overall a mixed effect (significant positive/ minor negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
SA 7: To create, protect, enhance, restore and connect habitats, species and/or sites of biodiversity or geological interest.	-?	--?	--?	--?	<p>The effects of development on this SA objective will depend more on the specific location of the new development in relation to areas of biodiversity and geodiversity value with respect to sites of known biodiversity value, whereas these options include broad locations for growth rather than specific sites. Therefore, proximity to specific biodiversity/geodiversity sites has been considered in the region of the broad locations, but all effects are uncertain as they will depend on the final specific locations for new development, as well as the design of new development which may have opportunities for positive effects if it includes retention or creation of green infrastructure. The effects on ecological networks, including supporting and connecting habitats, and non-designated sites and species, are difficult to predict at the strategic level.</p> <p>Option 1: By providing new growth in the district mainly by Tier 1 settlements and focussing much of the development by the main transport links towards the west this approach would limit the level of development delivered in close proximity to the Severn Estuary SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. The provision of approximately 400 new homes by Stroud could however result in environmental pressures resulting on Rodborough Common which has been designated as a SSSI and SAC and also contains Rodborough Common Local Geological Site to the south of the settlement. There is also potential for adverse effects to result at Cotswold Commons and Beechwoods National Nature Reserve (parts of which have been designated as a SAC) due to the provision of new development by Brockworth although this is noted to be a low level of growth. Furthermore while focussing new development in and around the larger settlements might encourage the use of brownfield land, the high level of new development required in the district over the plan period is likely to result in the loss of large areas of greenfield land which otherwise may provide habitats and support habitat connectivity in the district. Overall a minor negative effect is expected in relation to this SA objective. The effect is currently uncertain, depending on the design and specific location of development.</p> <p>Option 2: Allowing for a more widely distributed pattern of development at the towns and villages of the district across smaller and some medium sized sites would involve the delivery of new development in proximity to a number of sensitive sites. The provision of a higher level of development by the settlements of Minchinhampton and Nailsworth may result in further adverse impacts on Rodborough Common which has been designated as a SSSI and SAC and also contains Rodborough Common Local Geological Site as well as Woodchester Park SSSI and Minchinhampton Common SSSI. The relatively high level of development at Wotton under Edge may also</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>result in detrimental impacts on Wotton Hill and Coombe Hill SSSI. There is also potential for adverse effects to result at Cotswold Commons and Beechwoods National Nature Reserve (parts of which have been designated as a SAC) due to the provision of new development by Brockworth although this is noted to be a low level of growth. This approach would allow for growth in close proximity to the Severn Estuary SPA, SAC and Ramsar site at Berkeley and Frampton respectively, however this is also a low level of growth. Furthermore while focussing a portion of new development in and around some of the larger towns and villages might encourage the use of brownfield land, the high level of new development required in the district over the plan period is likely to result in the loss of large areas of greenfield land which otherwise may provide habitats and support habitat connectivity in the district. Overall a significant negative effect is expected in relation to this SA objective. The effect is currently uncertain, depending on the design and specific location of development.</p> <p>Option 3: This option would provide for a more dispersed pattern of development across Tier 1, 2 and 3 settlements with further development across Tier 4 and 5 settlements and a significant level of development also to be provided at a new growth point to the south of Sharpness. Dispersal of development could result in adverse impacts on a number of designated sites: Rodborough Common SSSI and SAC; Rodborough Common Local Geological Site; Woodchester Park SSSI; and Minchinhampton Common SSSI. While development at Wotton under Edge would occur through this option it is noted to be small scale and therefore the potential for detrimental impacts on Wotton Hill and Coombe Hill SSSI is likely to be reduced. There is also potential for adverse effects to result at Cotswold Commons and Beechwoods National Nature Reserve (parts of which have been designated as a SAC) due to the provision of new development by Brockworth although this is also small scale. This option would allow for a dispersal of growth in close proximity to the sensitive Severn Estuary SPA, SAC and Ramsar site, most notably at the new growth point by Sharpness, where a high level of development is proposed. In addition to potential effects on designated sites, the greater dispersal of development and the new development to be provided at a new growth point is likely to result in the loss of large areas of greenfield land which otherwise may provide habitats and support habitat connectivity in the district. Overall a significant negative effect is expected in relation to this SA objective. The effect is currently uncertain, depending on the design and specific location of development.</p> <p>Option 4: This option would provide development mostly at new growth points in the district incorporating the use of three very large sites to accommodate the vast majority of new development. As such the option would</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>prevent the vast majority of new development having adverse impacts on important environmentally designated sites in the east of the district such as Rodborough Common SSSI and SAC and Cotswold Commons and Beechwoods National Nature Reserve (parts of which have been designated as a SAC). The approach would however deliver a high level of new growth to the south of Sharpness which is located within close proximity to the sensitive Severn Estuary SPA, SAC and Ramsar site. Therefore, there could be some adverse impacts on these internationally designated sites. Furthermore it is expected that the new development to be provided at new growth points is likely to result in the loss of large areas of greenfield land which otherwise may provide habitats and support habitat connectivity in the district. Overall a significant negative effect is expected in relation to this SA objective. The effect is currently uncertain, depending on the design and specific location of development.</p>
<p>SA 8: To conserve and enhance the local character and distinctiveness of landscapes and townscapes and provide sustainable access to countryside in the District.</p>	-?	--?	--?	--?	<p>Option 1: Providing new growth in the district mainly by Tier 1 settlements and minimising the extent of development in rural areas may help to preserve the character of villages and the quality of rural landscapes in the district. It would also help to minimise the potential for development to occur at locations which would impact upon the setting of the Cotswolds AONB. Furthermore this option would result in a high proportion of the new development occurring by settlements (Stonehouse, Hardwicke and Cam) which have been identified through the landscape sensitivity assessment undertaken to support the Council's SALA as having lower sensitivity to development. However, this approach would still result in a high level of new development being delivered at large greenfield sites. Therefore, a minor negative effect is identified for this SA objective, although this is uncertain depending on the specific location of development in relation to the areas of highest landscape sensitivity. Effects will also depend on the design of the development and the incorporation of mitigation measures.</p> <p>Option 2: Allowing for a more widely distributed pattern of development at the larger towns and villages of the district across smaller and some medium sized sites is less likely to help preserve the character of villages in particular. This approach would still result in a significant proportion of new development occurring by the larger towns (notably Stonehouse, Hardwicke and Cam) towards the west of the district where adverse impacts in terms of landscape sensitivity would be less likely to occur. However, it would also allow for development to the east of the district at villages which lie within or in close proximity to the Cotswolds AONB including</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>Minchinhampton, Nailsworth and Wotton under Edge. As such there is potential for greater impacts to result on the existing character of rural villages in the district as well as on the setting of the AONB. This approach would also result in a high level of new development being delivered at greenfield sites. Therefore, a significant negative effect is identified for this SA objective, although this is uncertain depending on the specific location of development in relation to the areas of highest landscape sensitivity. Effects will also depend on the design of the development and the incorporation of mitigation measures.</p> <p>Option 3: Allowing for a dispersed pattern of development at the towns and villages of the district may allow for a more 'organic' pattern of growth which the District has historically experienced. However, this approach, which would result in most villages accommodating at least one small to medium site, is considered to be out of line with a plan-led approach which otherwise would help preserve the character of villages as well as that of the wider countryside. This approach might also lead to the merging of some smaller settlements depending on specific development locations. While this option would deliver some development by the larger settlements, significant levels of development would be spread throughout the rest of the district including a high number of locations towards the east which lie within the Cotswolds AONB. This option would also incorporate a new growth point to the south of Sharpness which would result in the development of large area of greenfield land. As such this option would result in a significantly lower level of development taking place at settlements identified as having lower sensitivity to development dispersing development to more sensitive locations such as the AONB as well as resulting in the loss of large areas of greenfield land particularly at the growth point by Sharpness. Therefore, a significant negative effect is identified for this SA objective, although this is uncertain depending on the specific location of development in relation to the areas of highest landscape sensitivity. Effects will also depend on the design of the development and the incorporation of mitigation measures.</p> <p>Option 4: Delivering high levels of new development at very large sites at three growth points in the district is likely to help prevent the adverse impacts from occurring on the character of existing settlements and quality of rural landscapes. There is also limited potential for development to occur at locations which would impact upon the setting of the Cotswolds AONB. This approach would provide a high proportion of the new development by settlements (Stonehouse, Hardwicke and Cam) which have been identified through the landscape sensitivity assessment undertaken to support the Council's SALA as having lower sensitivity to development. However, the high level of development which would occur by these settlements may result in adverse impacts on the current</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>character and townscapes of these settlements dependent on how this development is delivered considering the high level of growth required. Furthermore the incorporation of a new growth point to the south of Sharpness as part of this option would result in the development of large area of greenfield land. Overall a significant negative effect is identified for this SA objective, although this is uncertain depending on the specific location of development in relation to the areas of highest landscape sensitivity. Effects will also depend on the design of the development and the incorporation of mitigation measures.</p>
<p>SA 9: To conserve and/or enhance the significant qualities, fabric, setting and accessibility of the District's historic environment.</p>	<p>+?/-- ?</p>	<p>+?/-- ?</p>	<p>+?/- ?</p>	<p>+/-?</p>	<p>Option 1: Providing the majority of new development at Tier 1 settlements focussed mostly at a smaller number of concentrated locations will allow for a large proportion of this development to proceed at larger sites. This approach could help to preserve the historic character of the rural villages in the district. However, the effects of development will depend mainly on the specific location, rather than the broad distribution, in particularly the proximity of development to sensitive heritage features. There is a particularly high number of listed buildings within the settlements of Stroud, Stonehouse and Dursley in particular and this option would allow for high levels of development within and adjacent to these settlements. The Industrial Heritage Conservation Area also runs from west to east through the settlements of Stonehouse and Stroud and there is also potential for adverse impacts to occur on the setting of this heritage asset dependent upon the precise location of development and the design of any development which comes forward. This option would also allow for a high level of development by Hardwicke within the south Gloucester Fringe which has a lower concentration of heritage assets in the vicinity of the M5. The loss of greenfield land generally may have adverse impacts on undesignated archaeological features but may also offer opportunities to preserve and record them. It is also recognised that high quality new development may offer the opportunity to enhance the setting of nearby heritage features. Therefore, an overall mixed effect (minor positive/ significant negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective although this is uncertain depending on the design of development and its specific location.</p> <p>Option 2: Providing the majority of new development at Tier 1 and 2 settlements but allowing for a wider distribution of housing development mainly between small and medium sites would be of less benefit in terms of preserving the historic character of the rural villages in the district. However, the effects of development will depend mainly on the specific location, rather than the broad distribution, in particularly the proximity of development to sensitive heritage features. There is a high number of listed buildings within the settlements of</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>Stroud, Stonehouse and Dursley in particular as well as at the Tier 2 settlements of Minchinhampton, Berkeley, Wotton-under-Edge, Nailsworth and Frampton and this option would allow for medium to high levels of development within an adjacent to these settlements. The Industrial Heritage Conservation Area also runs from west to east through the settlements of Stonehouse and Stroud and there is also potential for adverse impacts to occur on the setting of this heritage asset dependent upon the precise location of development and the design of any development which comes forward. This option would provide a reduced level of growth by Hardwicke within the south Gloucester Fringe which has a lower concentration of heritage assets towards the path of the M5. The loss of greenfield land generally may have adverse impacts on undesignated archaeological features but may also offer opportunities to preserve and record them. It is also recognised that high quality new development may offer the opportunity to enhance the setting of nearby heritage features. Therefore, an overall mixed effect (minor positive/ significant negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective although this is uncertain depending on the design of development and its specific location.</p> <p>Option 3: This approach would provide new growth mainly across Tier 1, 2 and 3 settlements with further development spread between Tier 4 and 5 settlements as well as at a new growth point to the south of Sharpness. As such it would result in a much more dispersed pattern of new development, meaning that smaller settlements at Tier 4 and Tier 5 would be required to accommodate higher levels of new development which may result in adverse effects on existing settlement patterns and the established rural setting of these locations. Significantly less development would be provided by Cam, Stonehouse and within the south Gloucester Fringe by Hardwicke. A large amount of the dispersed development would still result at locations which may have a relationship with the Industrial Heritage Conservation Area at the west-east corridor towards the central portion of the district. Tier 2 settlements of Minchinhampton, Berkeley, Wotton-under-Edge, Nailsworth and Frampton would however see lower levels of development due to the dispersal of development meaning that there would be greater potential for such development to be integrated at these smaller settlements without impacting on local character and adversely affecting the setting of the high number of heritage assets present. This however would be dependent upon the design and precise location of new development. While this option provides less development at the potentially less sensitive location of the Gloucester Fringe, the location by Sharpness also contains a reduced concentration of heritage assets. The loss of greenfield land generally may have adverse impacts on undesignated archaeological features but may also offer opportunities to preserve and record them.</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>It is also recognised that high quality new development may offer the opportunity to enhance the setting of nearby heritage features. Therefore, an overall mixed effect (minor positive/minor negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective although this is uncertain depending on the design of development and its specific location.</p> <p>Option 4: This option would result in new growth in the district mainly occurring at three new growth points with very large sites accommodating the majority of new development. The new growth point locations would avoid providing high levels of new development at Stroud and Stonehouse as well as within the smaller rural villages. As such this approach would avoid providing new development in locations which contain higher concentrations of heritage assets (including the Industrial Heritage Conservation Area) and would also help to preserve the character of the rural villages. The locations of high levels of growth within the south Gloucester Fringe and by Sharpness in particular would help to make use of land which contains a lower concentration of heritage assets. The loss of greenfield land generally may have adverse impacts on undesignated archaeological features but may also offer opportunities to preserve and record them. It is also recognised that high quality new development may offer the opportunity to enhance the setting of nearby heritage features. Therefore, an overall mixed effect (minor positive/ minor negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective although this is uncertain.</p>
SA 10: To ensure that air quality continues to improve.	+	+/-	-	+/-	<p>The effects of the distribution of development within the district on ensuring ensure that air quality continues to improve will be mainly determined by the transport habits which it helps to encourage. Impacts on air quality are expected to be more positive where a greater decrease in journeys undertaken and modal shift is encouraged.</p> <p>Option 1: This option would deliver the majority of new development over the plan period in close proximity to Tier 1 settlements focussed mainly at a smaller number of locations. A large amount of the new development would be provided in close proximity to the southern Gloucester Fringe and the high level transport assessment work² undertaken by the council has identified this area as the most sustainable location in the district in terms</p>

² Stroud Local Plan Review Strategy Options Transport Discussion Paper. Stroud District Council, June 2018.

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>of existing passenger transport services. In addition, new development along the transport corridor between Stonehouse and Stroud presents an opportunity to achieve a high level of self-containment in terms of travel (i.e. less out-commuting for work). This option would also provide a reduced level of development within the southern portion of the district which is more rural and dependent upon journeys by private car. Furthermore, as this option would provide a high level of new development at strategic sites there is greater potential to attract government funding to address the cumulative impacts of the development. Given that this approach would help to reduce the need to travel longer distances from rural locations and encourage modal shift in the district a minor positive effect is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 2: This option would provide new development in a more widely distributed pattern mainly at Tier 1 and 2 settlements at smaller sites in the district. A degree of development would occur in close proximity to the southern Gloucester Fringe which the council has identified as the most sustainable location in the district in terms of existing passenger transport services through high level transport assessment work. Furthermore new development along the transport corridor between Stonehouse and Stroud presents an opportunity to achieve a high level of self-containment in terms of travel. New development within the rural south of district would be provided at and beyond the focus around Cam and Dursley where there is potential for rail improvements to be provided. As this option would result in a smaller number of large sites coming forward there would be reduced potential for government funding to address the cumulative impacts of the development. As such there may be a reliance upon S106/CIL which may raise issues to do with viability. This approach would result in elements of development proceeding at locations which might encourage modal shift but this will require a degree of investment in passenger transport options for which funding may prove difficult to secure. A mixed effect (minor positive/minor negative) is therefore expected on this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 3: This option would provide the majority of development across Tier 1, 2 and 3 settlements with further development dispersed across Tier 4 and 5 settlements and at the new growth point by Sharpness. Beyond the new growth point, medium and smaller sites would provide for the majority of new development. This option would result in the lowest level of growth occurring within the south Gloucester Fringe which has been identified through the council's high level transport assessment work as the most sustainable location in the district in terms of existing passenger transport services. However, it would also provide new development along the transport corridor between Stonehouse and Stroud which presents an opportunity to achieve a high level of self-</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>containment in terms of travel. The inclusion of the new growth point by Sharpness would result in impacts on connectivity issues by Berkeley which the transport assessment work has identified. In all the more dispersed approach to development is likely to be the least sustainable in terms of reliance on journeys by private car and the distribution of development across smaller sites is likely to mean improvements to support travel by sustainable modes is less likely to come forward from government funding. As such a minor negative effect is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 4: This option would provide new development in the district at very large sites at three new growth points. A high level of the new development would be provided in close proximity to the southern Gloucester Fringe and the high level transport assessment work undertaken by the council has identified this area as the most sustainable location in the district in terms of existing passenger transport services. Furthermore while new development resulting in approximately 55% of new traffic generated would be provided in the more rural south of the district where existing travel patterns would see an increase in journeys by private car, there is potential for the development of new passenger transport services. The large scale of the sites which this option would involve means that the government funding could be attracted for transport mitigation schemes, however the cost of the mitigation package required would likely to be higher. A mixed effect (minor positive/minor negative) is therefore expected on this SA objective.</p>
SA 11: To maintain and enhance the quality of ground and surface waters and to achieve sustainable water resources management in the District.	-	--	--	0	<p>The potential for new development to impact water quality and sustainable water use in the district is dependent to an extent on design of new development and the provision of new infrastructure which is required to avoid increased pressure on waste water facilities and adverse effects of increased discharge from those facilities. At present no waste water issues have been identified for the district, with responsibility for treatment of waste water in Stroud outside of the responsibility of the District Council. The two main sewage treatment works for Gloucestershire are located outside of Stroud at Netheridge in Gloucester and Hayden to the south west of Cheltenham. Proximity of the broad locations for development to Ground Water Nitrate Vulnerability Zones and Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones has been taken into account.</p> <p>Option 1: This option would result in new development being provided within or in close proximity to the Ground Water Nitrate Vulnerability Zone at Stroud. Development would also be provided within or in close proximity to the Drinking Water Safeguarding Zone (Surface Water) at this settlement and also around Cam and</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>Stonehouse. Furthermore development provided at Dursley through this option may impact upon the Source Protection Zone at this location. As such while most of the development would be distributed within areas outside of Source Protection Zones in the district it is likely to impact upon other designations relating to the protection of water quality. A minor negative effect is therefore expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 2: This option would result in new development being provided within or in close proximity to the Ground Water Nitrate Vulnerability Zone at Stroud, Nailsworth, Minchinhampton and Brimscombe. Development would also be provided within or in close proximity to the Drinking Water Safeguarding Zone (Surface Water) by Stroud, by Cam and also around Stonehouse. Furthermore development provided at Dursley, Minchinhampton, Brimscombe and Nailsworth through this option may impact upon the Source Protection Zone designated across these locations. As such portions of development would be distributed within or in close proximity to areas in Source Protection Zones in the district through this option and may impact upon other designations relating to the protection of water quality. A significant negative effect is therefore expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 3: This option would result in new development being more dispersed across the district. While the development to the south of Sharpness and the development to the north west of the district is away from water quality protection zones, the remaining development to be provided would be within locations where water quality vulnerabilities have been identified. Development provided at Stroud, Nailsworth, Minchinhampton and Brimscombe is likely to be located within or in close proximity to the Ground Water Nitrate Vulnerability Zone which covers much of the east of the district. High levels of development would also be provided within or in close proximity to the Drinking Water Safeguarding Zone (Surface Water) by Stroud, by Cam and also around Stonehouse. Furthermore development at Dursley, Minchinhampton, Brimscombe and Nailsworth and dispersed across the smaller settlements within the eastern part of the Cotswolds AONB through this option may impact upon the Source Protection Zone at these locations. In addition, the water quality of the internationally designated Severn Estuary biodiversity site could be affected by the large development at Sharpness. As such portions of development would be distributed within or in close proximity to areas in Source Protection Zones in the district and may impact upon other designations relating to the protection of water quality. A significant negative effect is therefore expected in relation to this SA objective.</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>Option 4: Concentrating development mostly by Hardwicke, Cam and the new growth point to the south of Sharpness would mean that development would be unlikely to be delivered in Source Protection Zones in the district. Furthermore only the development by Cam would be provided at a location which would be within a Surface Water Drinking Water Safeguarding Zone. It is considered likely that despite the high level of development to be provided by Hardwicke and to the south of Sharpness it could be delivered to avoid the Surface Water Drinking Water Safeguarding Zones which are to the north of both locations respectively. Given that this option would avoid the provision of new development within a Source Protection Zone but that high level of development by Cam would be provided within a Drinking Water Safeguarding Zone (Surface Water) a minor negative effect is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p>
SA 12: To manage and reduce the risk of flooding and resulting detriment to public wellbeing, the economy and the environment.	+/-	-	--	-	<p>Option 1: Allowing for development within and adjoining the Tier 1 settlements in the district may result in a proportion of development occurring on brownfield land. Given the scale of development which is to be accommodated this is expected to be a small percentage of the overall growth required over the plan period and as such, a high level of development is likely to proceed on greenfield which could increase flood risk due to the creation of more impermeable surfaces. Locations at Stonehouse and Stroud along the River Frome and Stroudwater Navigation Canal fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3. There are also smaller areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 in close proximity to the settlements of Hardwicke, Cam and Dursley where this option would also deliver development. This option would avoid development to the west however where significant areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3 are present in close proximity to the River Severn. Overall a mixed effect (minor positive/minor negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 2: Allowing for a wider distribution of development within and adjoining the larger villages and towns may present some opportunities for development to occur on brownfield land. As such the high level loss of greenfield land could increase flood risk due to the creation of more impermeable surfaces. Locations at Stonehouse and Stroud along the River Frome and Stroudwater Navigation Canal fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3. There are also smaller areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 in close proximity to the settlements of Hardwicke, Cam and Dursley where this option would also deliver development. This option would also deliver new development by Berkeley which falls in close proximity to the significant areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3 present by the River Severn. The level of development to be delivered at this location is not significant and furthermore parts of the</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>area benefit from flood defences. Overall a minor negative effect is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 3: Allowing for a dispersed pattern of development with most villages including at least one small to medium site may present limited opportunities for development to occur on brownfield land. The area of greenfield land which would be developed as a result of this option is likely to be increased given that the smaller tier settlements would have limited opportunities for brownfield development and it would include development at the new growth point the south of Sharpness. As such the high level loss of greenfield land could increase flood risk due to the creation of more impermeable surfaces. Locations at Stonehouse and Stroud along the River Frome and Stroudwater Navigation Canal fall within Flood Zones 2 and 3. There are also smaller areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 in close proximity to the settlements of Hardwicke, Cam and Dursley where this option would also deliver development. This option would also deliver a high level of new development to the south of Sharpness however this area would likely avoid the significant areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3 present by the River Severn. Development would be delivered by Berkeley which is in close proximity to these areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3 however it is noted that parts of this area benefit from flood defences. Other smaller levels of development which are to be delivered to the west by Arlingham, Longney and Frampton have the potential to fall within Flood Zones 2 or 3 by the River Severn depending on their precise location, although it is noted that there are flood defences present at some of these locations. Overall a significant negative effect is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 4: Providing development at new large sites at the edge of large settlements as well as at new growth points in the district is likely to result in the development of a large area of greenfield land. This is expected to be to the detriment of flood risk in the district. This option avoids the significant area of Flood Zones 2 and 3 along the River Frome and Stroudwater Navigation Canal at Stonehouse and Stroud. However, there are smaller areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 in close proximity to the settlements of Hardwicke and Cam where this option would provide high levels of new development. Development would also be delivered by Berkeley which is in close proximity to areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3 by the River Severn however it is noted that parts of this area benefit from flood defences. Overall a minor negative effect is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p>
SA 13: To improve efficiency in land use	+/--	--	--	--	<p>Option 1: Allowing for development within and adjacent to the Tier 1 settlements in the district may result in reasonable opportunities for development occurring on brownfield land. Given the scale of development which is</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
and protection of soil quality through the re-use of previously developed land and existing buildings and encouraging urban renaissance.					<p>to be accommodated this is expected to be a small percentage of the overall growth required over the plan period. The notable larger levels of development by Hardwicke and Cam in particular are likely to result in loss of significant areas of Grade 3 agricultural soils. Overall a mixed effect (minor positive/ significant negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 2: Allowing for a wider distribution of development at the edge of the larger villages and towns may present some opportunities for development to occur on brownfield land. While there are significant swathes of Grade 4 agricultural soils to the east within the Cotswolds AONB where some of the development would be delivered through this option, development at areas such as Hardwicke, Cam and Minchinhampton are surrounded by larger areas of Grade 3 agricultural soils which might be lost as a result of development. Overall a significant negative effect is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 3: Allowing for a dispersed pattern of development with most villages including at least one small to medium site allocated may present limited opportunities for development to occur on brownfield land. The area of greenfield land which would be developed as a result of this option is likely to be increased given that it would include development at the new growth point the south of Sharpness. This approach would allow for higher levels of development to occur within the undeveloped east within the boundaries of the Cotswolds AONB. While there are significant swathes of Grade 4 agricultural soils within the boundaries of the AONB development at areas such as Hardwicke, Cam and Minchinhampton are surrounded by larger areas of Grade 3 agricultural soils which might be lost as a result of development. Overall a significant negative effect is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 4: Providing development at new large sites at the edge of large settlements and new growth points in the district may result in a limited amount of development occurring at brownfield land. However, given the scale of development which is to be accommodated this is expected to be a small percentage of the overall growth required over the plan period. Furthermore the provision of a high level of new development at the growth point to the south of Sharpness is likely to result in the development of a large additional area of greenfield land. All areas identified to accommodate the higher levels of development through this option have been identified as containing Grade 3 agricultural land. A significant negative effect is therefore expected on this SA objective.</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
SA 14: To implement strategies that help mitigate global warming by actively reducing greenhouse gases and adapt to unavoidable climate change within the District.	+	+/-?	-	+/-?	<p>Promotion of energy efficiency cannot be known until detailed planning applications come forward, and the generation of clean, low carbon, decentralised and renewable electricity and heat is not directly part of these strategic growth options. The effects of the distribution of development within the district in terms of helping to limit the release of greenhouse gases will be mainly determined by the transport habits which it helps to encourage. Impacts on climate change are expected to be more positive where a greater decrease in journeys undertaken and modal shift is encouraged.</p> <p>Option 1: This option would deliver the majority of new development over the plan period in close proximity to Tier 1 settlements focussed mainly at a smaller number of locations. A large amount of the new development would be provided in close proximity to the southern Gloucester Fringe and the high level transport assessment work³ undertaken by the council has identified this area as the most sustainable location in the district in terms of existing passenger transport services. In addition, new development along the transport corridor between Stonehouse and Stroud presents an opportunity to achieve a high level of self-containment in terms of travel (i.e. less out-commuting for work). This option would also provide a reduced level of development within the southern portion of the district which is more rural and dependent upon journeys by private car. Furthermore as this option would provide a high level of new development at strategic sites there is greater potential to attract government funding to address the cumulative impacts of the development. It is also noted that providing the majority of new development at larger sites may provide better opportunities for incorporating low carbon or renewable energy infrastructure, as this may be more viable at large development sites. Furthermore, providing the majority of new homes at a smaller number of larger sites may increase the potential to overcome logistical issues relating to the provision of physical space to incorporate required infrastructure and relating to the linking of new homes provided by a higher number of developers to these types of infrastructure. Mostly importantly, this approach would help to reduce the need to travel longer distances from rural locations and encourage modal shift in the district and therefore a minor positive effect is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 2: This option would provide new development in a more widely distributed pattern mainly at Tier 1 and 2 settlements at smaller sites in the district. A degree of development would occur in close proximity to the</p>

³ Stroud District Council (June 2018) *Stroud Local Plan Review Strategy Options Transport Discussion Paper*.

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>southern Gloucester Fringe which the council has identified as the most sustainable location in the district in terms of existing passenger transport services through high level transport assessment work. Furthermore new development along the transport corridor between Stonehouse and Stroud presents an opportunity to achieve a high level of self-containment in terms of travel. New development within the rural south of district would be provided at and beyond the focus around Cam and Dursley where there is potential for rail improvements to be provided. As this option would result in a smaller number of large sites coming forward there would be reduced potential for government funding to address the cumulative impacts of the development. As such there may be a reliance upon S106/CIL which may raise issues to do with viability. This approach would result in elements of development proceeding at locations which might encourage modal shift but this will require a degree of investment in passenger transport options for which funding may prove difficult to secure. A mixed effect (minor positive/minor negative) is therefore expected on this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 3: This option would provide the majority of development across Tier 1, 2 and 3 settlements with further development dispersed across Tier 4 and 5 settlements and at the new growth point by Sharpness. Beyond the new growth point, medium and smaller sites would provide for the majority of new development. This option would result in the lowest level of growth occurring within the south Gloucester Fringe which has been identified through the council's high level transport assessment work as the most sustainable location in the district in terms of existing passenger transport services. However, it would also provide new development along the transport corridor between Stonehouse and Stroud which presents an opportunity to achieve a high level of self-containment in terms of travel. The inclusion of the new growth point by Sharpness would result in impacts on connectivity issues by Berkeley which the transport assessment work has identified. In all, the more dispersed approach to development is likely to be the least sustainable in terms of reliance on journeys by private car and the distribution of development across smaller sites is likely to mean improvements to support travel by sustainable modes is less likely to come forward from government funding. As such a minor negative is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 4: This option would provide new development in the district mainly at very large sites at three new growth points. A large amount of the new development would be provided in close proximity to the southern Gloucester Fringe and the high level transport assessment work undertaken by the council has identified this area as the most sustainable location in the district in terms of existing passenger transport services.</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>Furthermore while new development resulting in approximately 55% of new traffic generated would be provided in the more rural south of the district where existing travel patterns would see an increase in journeys by private car, there is potential for the development of new passenger transport services. The large scale of the sites which this option would involve the development of means that the government funding could be attracted however the cost of the mitigation package required would likely to be higher. It is also noted that providing the majority of new development at larger sites may provide better opportunities for incorporating low carbon or renewable energy infrastructure, as this may be more viable at large development schemes. Furthermore, providing the majority of new homes at a smaller number of larger sites may increase the potential to overcome logistical issues relating to the provision of physical space to incorporate required infrastructure and relating to the linking of new homes provided by a higher number of developers to these types of infrastructure. A mixed effect (minor positive/minor negative) is therefore expected on this SA objective.</p>
<p>SA 15: To minimise the amount of waste produced, maximise the amount that is reused or recycled, and seek to recover energy from the largest proportion of the residual material, and achieve the sustainable management of waste.</p>	+?	0	0	+?	<p>The total amount of household waste generated would be unaffected by the distribution of development within the district, and per capita waste generation would not be affected. This, and levels of recycling, would instead be influenced by consumer behaviour and the incorporation of sustainable waste management systems within new developments.</p> <p>Option 1: This option would deliver the majority of new development over the plan period in close proximity to Tier 1 settlements focussed mainly at a smaller number of locations. This approach would provide the majority of the new development over the plan period at larger sites in the district. It is expected that this approach could offer good opportunities to incorporate new sustainable waste disposal solutions at such sites as they would be more viable and there would be more space for the required infrastructure. A minor positive effect is therefore expected in relation to this SA objective although this is uncertain depending on whether new developments would in fact support the delivery of infrastructure which would facilitate more sustainable waste management in the district.</p> <p>Option 2: This option would provide new development in a more widely distributed pattern mainly at Tier 1 and 2 settlements at smaller sites in the district. While this approach would rely on a higher number of smaller sites to deliver a significant proportion of growth over the plan period, it is expected that the district's waste management practices which include bin and recycling kerbside collection would be extended to address new</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>growth. As such a negligible effect is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 3: This option would provide the majority of development across Tier 1, 2 and 3 settlements with further development dispersed across Tier 4 and 5 settlements and at the new growth point by Sharpness. Beyond the new growth point, medium and smaller sites would provide for the majority of new development. While this approach would rely on a higher number of smaller sites to deliver a significant proportion of growth over the plan period, it is expected that the district's waste management practices which involve bin and recycling kerbside collection would be extended to address new growth. As such a negligible effect is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 4: This option would provide new development in the district mainly at very large sites at three new growth points. This approach would provide a majority of the new development over the plan period at larger sites in the district. It is expected that this approach could encourage the incorporation of new sustainable waste disposal solutions at such sites as they would be more viable and there would be more space for the physical infrastructure required. A minor positive effect is therefore expected in relation to this SA objective although this is uncertain depending on whether new developments would in fact support the delivery of infrastructure which would facilitate more sustainable waste management in the district.</p>
SA 16: To deliver, maintain and enhance sustainable and diverse employment opportunities, to meet both current and future needs.	++/-	++/-	+/-	++?/-	<p>Option 1: This option would result in delivery of 30ha B class employment spread between sites in close proximity to Stonehouse and Hardwicke within the Gloucester Fringe. The high level transport assessment work undertaken by the council has identified Gloucester's southern fringe as the most sustainable location in the district in terms of existing passenger transport services. New employment land to be provided in close proximity to Stonehouse would be accessible to a high number of existing residents including those in Stroud. However, this option would result in increased traffic pressures from development along the A419 which serves Stonehouse. Overall this option would deliver a high level of new employment land in relatively accessible locations. While transport pressure resulting from further new growth may impact upon the viability of the location by Stonehouse in particular, the larger size of the sites used to deliver the new growth would support funding of required new infrastructure through government funding and S106/CIL. This option would also help to deliver new infrastructure to facilitate further employment growth around the larger settlements, however, it would not help to support the rural economy in the district. As such a mixed effect (significant positive/minor</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 2: This option would result in delivery of 30ha B class employment spread between sites in close proximity to Stonehouse, and Hardwicke within the Gloucester Fringe. The high level transport assessment work undertaken by the council has identified Gloucester's southern fringe as the most sustainable location in the district in terms of existing passenger transport services. Furthermore new employment in close proximity to Stonehouse would be accessible to existing residents at this settlement as well as those at the town of Stroud. However, this option would result in the greatest proportion of new development traffic along the A419 which serves Stonehouse which could adversely impact the viability of the employment land at this location. Given that this approach would result in new sites being of a small or medium size it is expected that there will be reduced opportunities for government funding or S106/CIL coming forward to deliver new transport infrastructure to facilitate further employment growth. This option would also not specifically help to support the rural economy in the district. As such a mixed effect (significant positive/minor negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 3: This option would result in delivery of 40ha B class employment spread between sites in close proximity to Stonehouse and Hardwicke within the Gloucester Fringe and at the new growth point to the south of Sharpness. The high level transport assessment work undertaken by the council has identified Gloucester's southern fringe as the most sustainable location in the district in terms of existing passenger transport services. Furthermore new employment in close proximity to Stonehouse would be accessible to existing residents at this settlement as well as those at the town of Stroud. However, this option would result in a significant level of new development traffic along the A419 which serves Stonehouse and would also place employment development near Sharpness which is noted to have connectivity issues. As such while this option would deliver a high level of new employment land in relatively accessible locations, transport pressure resulting from further new growth may impact upon the viability of development near Sharpness as well as the development location by Stonehouse. As this approach would result in a dispersed pattern of development across the district the reduced number of larger sites involved would mean that opportunities to deliver new transport infrastructure supported by government funding or S106/CIL which might support further employment growth would be reduced. This option would also not specifically help to support the rural economy in the district. As such a mixed effect</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					<p>(minor positive/significant negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 4: This option would result in deliver of 40ha B class employment spread between sites in close proximity to Hardwicke within the Gloucester Fringe and at the new growth points by Cam and Sharpness. The high level transport assessment work undertaken by the council has identified Gloucester’s southern fringe as the most sustainable location in the district in terms of existing passenger transport services. Furthermore new employment in close proximity to Stonehouse would be accessible to existing residents at this settlement as well as those at the town of Stroud. This option has been identified as having the least proportion of new development traffic to impact the A419 corridor with much of the development focussed on the south of the district. While the option may require strong transport links to Bristol and the West of England the scale of growth proposed means that there is the opportunity to provide improved non-car based transport improvements. Furthermore as this option would involve the delivery of the vast majority of new growth in the district at larger sites there are likely to increased numbers of opportunities to secure government funding or S106/CIL to support transport infrastructure provision which would benefit further employment growth. While this option would not specifically help to support the rural economy in the district, it would deliver a high level of new employment land in accessible locations dependent to a degree on the delivery of new transport infrastructure. As such a mixed (uncertain significant positive/ minor negative) effect is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p>
SA 17: To allow for sustainable economic growth within environmental limits and innovation, an educated/ skilled workforce and support the long term	+/-	+/-	+/-	++?/-	<p>Option 1: This option would result in deliver of 30ha B class employment spread between sites in close proximity to the settlements of Stonehouse, and Hardwicke within the Gloucester Fringe. The provision of new employment land will help to encourage inwards economic investment in the district. Concentrating the majority of employment growth over the plan period at two locations however is unlikely to help promote the economic growth or the vitality and viability of the town centres of those settlements which have not been identified to accommodate new growth. Furthermore this approach is unlikely to benefit the rural economy in Stroud. Overall a mixed effect (minor positive/minor negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 2: This option would result in deliver of 30ha B class employment spread between sites in close proximity to the settlements of Stonehouse and Hardwicke within the Gloucester Fringe. The provision of new employment land will help to encourage inwards economic investment in the district. Concentrating the majority</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
competitiveness of the District.					<p>of employment growth over the plan period at two locations however, is unlikely to help promote the economic growth or the vitality and viability of the town centres of those settlements which have not been identified to accommodate new growth. Furthermore this approach is unlikely to benefit the rural economy in Stroud. As such a mixed effect (minor positive/minor negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 3: This option would result in deliver of 40ha B class employment spread between sites in close proximity to the settlements of Stonehouse and Hardwicke within the Gloucester Fringe and at the new growth point by Newtown and Sharpness. The provision of new employment land will help to encourage inwards economic investment in the district. Concentrating the majority of employment growth over the plan period at three locations however, is unlikely to help promote the economic growth or the vitality and viability of the town centres of those settlements which have not been identified to accommodate new growth. This option would provide employment land to the south of Sharpness which might better serve the southern part of the district but this is dependent on whether or not the connectivity issues identified at this location through the council's high level transport assessment can be successfully addressed. However, it is unlikely that this approach would benefit the wider rural economy in Stroud. As such a mixed effect (minor positive/minor negative) is expected in relation to this SA objective.</p> <p>Option 4: This option would result in deliver of 40ha B class employment spread between sites in close proximity to the settlements of Stonehouse and Hardwicke within the Gloucester Fringe and at the new growth point by Newtown and Sharpness. The provision of new employment land will help to encourage inward economic investment in the district. Concentrating the majority of employment growth over the plan period at three locations however, is unlikely to help promote the economic growth or the vitality and viability of the town centres of those settlements which have not been identified to accommodate new growth. This option would provide employment land to the south of Sharpness which might better serve the southern part of the district although this is dependent on whether or not the connectivity issues identified at this location through the council's high level transport assessment can be successfully addressed. Given that this approach would provide development at a smaller number of large scale sites in the district it is expected that new transport infrastructure required to make the Sharpness site viable in terms of its connectivity would be more likely to be supported through the securing of government funding. However, it is unlikely that this approach would benefit the wider rural economy in Stroud. As such a mixed effect (uncertain significant positive/minor negative) is</p>

SA Objective	Option 1: Concentrated development	Option 2: Wider distribution	Option 3: Dispersal	Option 4: Focus on a single growth point	Justification
					expected in relation to this SA objective.