

## West of England Joint Spatial Plan

### Sustainability Appraisal of the Emerging Spatial Strategy (November 2016)

#### Methodology Paper

The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the JSP Emerging Spatial Strategy has been guided by the Revised SA Scoping Report (November 2015). This set out effect criteria linked to each objective, which were used to score the locations appraised. In carrying out the appraisal, it was found necessary to refine aspects of this approach as the availability of relevant data became clearer. The following table therefore documents the changes made. It is based on Table 13 of the Revised SA Scoping Report; the columns identifying themes and SEA topics are omitted – this information has not changed since 2015 – and a new column has been added noting adjustments arising from the appraisal work. Infrastructure mitigation thresholds mentioned in this paper are indicative only. Actual mitigation would be determined on a case-by-case basis dependent on viability, deliverability and site conditions.

Sustainability Objective	Effect Criteria		Adjustments
	Positive Effect (+/++)	Negative Effect (-/--)	
<p><b>1a. Achieve reasonable access to public open space</b> (Designated Open Spaces, Town and Village Greens, and Public Rights of Way)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development in location providing access to suitable (in terms of both quantity and quality) public open space</li> <li>• Development on or adjacent primary walking network / public rights of way routes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reasonable Distance</b> <i>Open Space</i>                      400m</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development in location lacking access to suitable (in terms of both quantity and quality) public open space</li> <li>• Development on public open space which reduces quantity, quality and accessibility.</li> <li>• Development outside public rights of way network</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistency / objectivity unlikely to be achieved at this stage: LPA standards / data availability differ. NSC have included 2km distance from major open spaces.</li> <li>○ Generally the standards used are: 400m from playgrounds, 800 metres from natural spaces, countryside in reasonable</li> </ul>

		<p><b>Reasonable Distance</b></p> <p><i>Open Space</i>                      400m</p>	<p>walking distance, e.g. via PRowS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ [+] or [-], depending on compliance.</li> <li>○ [++] where range of facilities is exceptionally good, e.g. both major and minor POS, or urban fringe site with direct access to POS plus PRow access to countryside.</li> <li>○ [?] where location already includes POS but it is not known whether this would be retained or replaced by development.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1b. Minimise impacts on air quality and locate sensitive development away from areas of poor air quality</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensitive uses (residential, schools, children’s facilities, food production and distribution) placed outside of AQMA</li> <li>• Construction methods / design to reduce and / or eliminate air pollution within new sensitive development</li> <li>• Multiple trees included to assist in reducing poor air</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No consideration or inclusion of mitigation techniques / methods proposed for sensitive development in areas of high air pollution and AQMA</li> <li>• Development which will significantly increase pollution in and around AQMA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ [+] no AQMA, not next to motorway.</li> <li>○ [+/?] close to AQMA – additional traffic could lead to deteriorating conditions.</li> <li>○ [-] AQMA or next to motorway.</li> <li>○ [--] if no mitigation exists.</li> <li>○ Note need for transport impact assessment as framework for mitigation.</li> </ul>

	quality		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note nearby railway line if this may give rise to an air quality issue. Evidence on rail traffic levels may be insufficiently clear to affect the score.</li> </ul>																				
<b>1c. Achieve reasonable access to healthcare facilities</b> (Doctors, Opticians, Pharmacies, Dentists, Hospitals)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development generating need for health facilities within reasonable distance.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reasonable distance</b></p> <table> <tr> <td><i>Hospital</i></td> <td><i>5km</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>GP Surgery</i></td> <td><i>1200m</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Dentist</i></td> <td><i>1200m</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Opticians</i></td> <td><i>800m</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Pharmacies</i></td> <td><i>800m</i></td> </tr> </table>	<i>Hospital</i>	<i>5km</i>	<i>GP Surgery</i>	<i>1200m</i>	<i>Dentist</i>	<i>1200m</i>	<i>Opticians</i>	<i>800m</i>	<i>Pharmacies</i>	<i>800m</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development generating need for health facilities outside reasonable distance.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reasonable distance</b></p> <table> <tr> <td><i>Hospital</i></td> <td><i>5km</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>GP Surgery</i></td> <td><i>1200m</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Dentist</i></td> <td><i>1200m</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Opticians</i></td> <td><i>800m</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Pharmacies</i></td> <td><i>800m</i></td> </tr> </table>	<i>Hospital</i>	<i>5km</i>	<i>GP Surgery</i>	<i>1200m</i>	<i>Dentist</i>	<i>1200m</i>	<i>Opticians</i>	<i>800m</i>	<i>Pharmacies</i>	<i>800m</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[++] location is within the specified distance of all 5 aspects.</li> <li>[+] 1-4 aspects.</li> <li>Otherwise, [-] or [--], depending on potential for mitigation.</li> <li>At least 1,500 homes needed to deliver a small satellite surgery, but trend is towards super surgeries.</li> </ul>
<i>Hospital</i>	<i>5km</i>																						
<i>GP Surgery</i>	<i>1200m</i>																						
<i>Dentist</i>	<i>1200m</i>																						
<i>Opticians</i>	<i>800m</i>																						
<i>Pharmacies</i>	<i>800m</i>																						
<i>Hospital</i>	<i>5km</i>																						
<i>GP Surgery</i>	<i>1200m</i>																						
<i>Dentist</i>	<i>1200m</i>																						
<i>Opticians</i>	<i>800m</i>																						
<i>Pharmacies</i>	<i>800m</i>																						
<b>2a. Deliver a suitable quantum of high quality housing for the West of England sub-region</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development that contributes to meeting the needs identified by the wider Bristol SHMA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development that does not contribute to meeting the needs identified by the wider Bristol SHMA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally [++] as all locations deliver housing within one of the relevant HMAs – now including Bath as well as Bristol.</li> <li>Exception only where slope angle and on-site restrictions could severely limit development potential,</li> </ul>																				

			resulting in [0] score.
<b>2b. Deliver a suitable mix of high quality housing types and tenures (including affordable housing) for all parts of society within the West of England sub-region</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development that contributes to meeting the needs identified by the wider Bristol SHMA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development that does not contribute to meeting the needs identified by the wider Bristol SHMA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As 2a: housing quantum.</li> <li>Note greenfield as more viable and so offering more affordable housing.</li> </ul>
<b>2c. Achieve reasonable access to community facilities</b> (post office, meeting venues, youth centres)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development generating need for community facilities within a reasonable distance</li> </ul> <p><b>Reasonable distance</b></p> <p><i>Post Offices</i>                      <i>600m</i></p> <p><i>Meeting Venues</i>                <i>600m</i></p> <p><i>Youth Facilities</i>                <i>400m</i></p>	<p><b>Significant negative effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development generating a need for community facilities, beyond a reasonable distance, with no public transport to community facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development generating a need for community facilities, beyond a reasonable distance</li> </ul> <p><b>Reasonable distance</b></p> <p><i>Post Offices</i>                      <i>600m</i></p> <p><i>Meeting Venues</i>                <i>600m</i></p> <p><i>Youth Facilities</i>                <i>400m</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistency / objectivity unlikely to be achieved at this stage: LPA standards / data availability differ.</li> <li>[++] location within specified distance of all 3 aspects.</li> <li>[+] 1-2 aspects.</li> <li>Otherwise, [-] or [--], depending on potential for mitigation.</li> <li>Libraries added as equivalent to meeting venues, as they may have potential for evening use.</li> <li>Around 1,500 homes needed to deliver a new community meeting space.</li> </ul>
<b>2d. Achieve reasonable access to educational facilities</b> (primary schools,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development generating a need for education facilities within reasonable</li> </ul>	<p><b>Significant negative effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development generating a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment split into primary and secondary,</li> </ul>

<p>secondary schools)</p>	<p>distance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development which adds to capacity of educational facilities, where known capacity issues exist.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reasonable distance</b></p> <p><i>Primary School 800m</i></p> <p><i>Secondary School 1500m</i></p>	<p>need for educational facilities beyond a reasonable distance, and no public transport access to educational facilities.</p> <p><b>Negative effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development in location beyond a reasonable distance to education facilities.</li> <li>• Development which places capacity on educational facilities, where known capacity issues exist.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reasonable distance</b></p> <p><i>Primary School 800m</i></p> <p><i>Secondary School 1500m</i></p>	<p>with separate scores reflected in overall score.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ [++] if mostly within 800m of primary AND mostly within 1500m of secondary.</li> <li>○ [+] if compliant with only one of these.</li> <li>○ [-] if school lacking in the location but potential to provide one. Can combine with positive score as [+/-] if the other type of school is already present.</li> <li>○ [--] if impossible to provide a required school (e.g. scale of new housing may be insufficient to fund). This applies mainly to secondary schools: can combine with score for existing primary school as [+/-].</li> <li>○ Around 5,000 homes needed to deliver a new secondary school</li> <li>○ Around 600 homes for a small primary school.</li> <li>○ Note any potential for</li> </ul>
---------------------------	--	---	---

			<p>strategic mitigation: redrawing of notional catchment areas, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Capacity issues fall into mitigation, i.e. extra classrooms would be needed and form part of developer costs.</li> <li>○ May need to highlight existing school sites that are too small to accommodate extra classrooms. Scope here for [?] score if unclear.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2e. Achieve reasonable access to town centre services and facilities</b> (Designated City, Town and District Centres)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Development within reasonable distance of designated city, town or district centre.</li> <li>● Development which adds to the retail and leisure services and facilities within a city, town or district centre.</li> <li>● Development which would create a demonstrable increase in footfall and potential use of a centre.</li> <li>● Development with</li> </ul>	<p><b>Significant negative effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Development beyond reasonable distance to designated centres, and no public transport access to town centre services and facilities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Development beyond a reasonable distance of designated city, town or district centre.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reasonable distance</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consistency / objectivity unlikely to be achieved at this stage: LPAs vary in approach to defining centres.</li> <li>○ Villages are likely to score poorly. Note village shop if there is one but score on access to district centre and above.</li> <li>○ [++] if mostly within both distances.</li> <li>○ [+] if mostly within one</li> </ul>

	<p>potential to create a critical mass / sense of place which would enable conditions / circumstances to establish a new town / district centre</p> <p><b>Reasonable distance</b></p> <p><i>City centre (plus WsM) 5km</i></p> <p><i>(includes access by public transport)</i></p> <p><i>Town / District Centre 1500m</i></p>	<p><i>City centre (plus WsM) 5km</i></p> <p><i>(includes access by public transport)</i></p> <p><i>Town / District Centre 1500m</i></p>	<p>distance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ [-] if mostly beyond 5km of city / WsM centre but with reasonable public transport access available. Can be combined with being within 1500m of district centre, as [+/-].</li> <li>○ [--] if mostly beyond both distances and no reasonable public transport available.</li> <li>○ Around 5,000 homes needed to deliver a new district centre.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2f. Reduce poverty and income inequality, and improve the life chances of those living in areas of concentrated disadvantage</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that helps to regenerate the areas identified as the most deprived 20% of areas in England</li> <li>• Development that provides good access to employment opportunities for the areas identified as the most deprived 20% of areas in England</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that does not help to regenerate the areas identified as the most deprived 20% of areas in England</li> <li>• Development that does not provide good access to employment opportunities for the areas identified as the most deprived 20% of areas in England</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Standard practice is to present IMD data on the basis of the most deprived 25%, not 20%, and this figure should therefore be substituted.</li> <li>○ Where locations adjoin areas of concentrated disadvantage, mitigation column needs to refer to difficulty of making any credible linkage. This may</li> </ul>

			mean that all or most scores are [0] but this is a realistic assessment.
<b>3a. Deliver a reasonable quantum of employment floorspace/land and increase access to work opportunities for all parts of society within the West of England sub-region</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that contributes towards the needs identified by the Economic Development Needs Assessment and the outputs and requirements of the Strategic Economic Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that [does not] contribute towards the needs identified by the Economic Development Needs Assessment and the outputs and requirements of the Strategic Economic Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Emphasis of assessment under 3a should be employment development potential rather than current employment opportunities.</li> <li>○ Most locations suitable for housing will also be suitable for some level of employment provision, though commercial attractiveness may be expected to be higher in the larger settlements where economic opportunities of all kinds are wider.</li> <li>○ [++] for towns and above (including urban extensions).</li> <li>○ [+] for villages.</li> <li>○ If evidence exists that a location is unsuited to employment, discount to the next lower score.</li> </ul>

<p><b>3b. Achieve reasonable access to major employment areas</b></p> <p><b>Major Employment sites</b> Enterprise Zones Locally designated key employment areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development within reasonable distance of major employment areas</li> </ul> <p><i>Thresholds to be confirmed:</i> <i>Walking/Cycling distances,</i> <i>Served by Public Transport</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development beyond reasonable distance of major employment areas</li> </ul> <p><i>Thresholds to be confirmed:</i> <i>Walking/Cycling distances,</i> <i>Served by Public Transport</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Emphasis of assessment under 3b should be current employment opportunities rather than employment development potential.</li> <li>○ Consistency / objectivity unlikely to be achieved at this stage: LPAs vary in approach to defining major employment areas / priority sites. As well as EZ / EA and designated employment areas, could consider significant undesignated complexes such as the port and airport.</li> <li>○ No distance thresholds have been established, either in terms of direct access or by public transport. Future work could consider further possible indicators of proximity, journey length, journey time, and mode of travel.</li> <li>○ At this stage, a [+/-]</li> </ul>
---	--	--	--

			judgement has to be made on whether or not good employment opportunities are available in the location assessed.
<p><b>4a. Minimise impact on and where appropriate enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings</b></p> <p><b>Assets</b>  Listed Buildings,  Conservation Areas,  Scheduled Ancient Monuments,  Registered Historic Parks and Gardens,  Unregistered Historic Parks and Gardens  Registered Battlefields,  Undesignated local assets (HER)  World Heritage Site  Protected Wreck Site  Locally listed structure  Town and village greens  Local Green Spaces</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development is likely to safeguard, protect, and where appropriate enhance, the significance of any affected heritage asset, historic townscape or landscape</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that leads to loss, change or harm of significance of any affected heritage assets, historic townscape or landscape</li> <li>• Development in locations which would harm the character and setting of an asset</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ [0] if no known heritage constraints.</li> <li>○ [-] if evidence of avoidable harm. Mitigation of avoidable harm includes reducing the area considered for development.</li> <li>○ [--] for registered landscape (i.e. scheduled monument, open space landscape), if this is unavoidable harm, with no way of mitigating negative impact.</li> <li>○ [?] for listed buildings. Impact could be positive, neutral or negative and will not be known until design work is progressed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4b. Minimise impact on and where possible enhance habitats and species (taking</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that integrates/preserves or enhances existing local</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on or adjacent national and local sites (including Wildlife</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Similar range to 4a: heritage.</li> <li>○ [0] if no known biodiversity</li> </ul>

<p><b>account of climate change)</b></p> <p><b>National Sites and assets</b>  SSSI  National Nature Reserves  Local Nature Reserves  UK Priority Habitat  <b>Local Sites</b>  SNCI – All authorities  Wildlife Corridors – Bristol  Ecological Networks</p>	<p>sites habitats or features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that maintains/enhances the connectivity and integrity of Wildlife Networks</li> <li>• Development which enhances existing GI corridors and linked assets</li> <li>• Development that takes opportunities to provide new/strengthen existing GI corridors</li> </ul>	<p>Corridors) that creates potential for harm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that would fragment the Connectivity and Integrity of Wildlife Networks</li> <li>• Development that severs existing GI corridor</li> <li>• Development that leads to loss of individual GI assets on existing corridors in the Strategic Network</li> </ul>	<p>constraints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ [-] if evidence of avoidable harm. Mitigation of avoidable harm includes reducing the area considered for development.</li> <li>○ [--] where impact on European sites seems likely, if this is unavoidable harm, with no way of mitigating negative impact.</li> <li>○ [?] for most sites – SNCI, etc. Impact could be positive, neutral or negative and will not be known until design work is progressed. Phase 1 assessments may be needed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4c. Minimise impact on and where appropriate enhance valued landscapes</b></p> <p><b>National designations</b>  AONB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development utilises topography and landform to enhance valued landscape</li> <li>• Development that avoids the impacts on the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Damage or harm to sensitive areas of the AONB</li> <li>• Overbearing or unsympathetic development in and around key landscape features</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Note AONB where present but scoring now extended to landscape as a whole, based on initial assessment of sensitivity to strategic level of development:  [++] Low  [+] Low to medium</li> </ul>

			<p>[0] Medium</p> <p>[-] Medium to high</p> <p>[--] High</p>
<p><b>4d. Promote the conservation and wise use of land, maximising the re-use of previously developed land</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on previously developed land / brownfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on previously undeveloped / open space / greenfield sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ [--] in almost all conceivable cases. Opportunities for urban intensification were examined at the Issues &amp; Options stage; this stage of SA is focused on greenfield alternatives supplementing that potential. Except at Severnside, brownfield land at the locations assessed is likely to be minimal.</li> <li>○ Explain score: no scope for mitigation.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4e. Minimise the loss of productive land, especially best and most versatile agricultural land</b></p>	<p><b>Significant positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safeguarding the protection of high value agricultural land (1 to 3a) which is also outside of flood risk zones 3a and 3b.</li> </ul> <p><b>Positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on land with no current or immediate</li> </ul>	<p><b>Significant negative effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development on land with agricultural value 1 to 3a, which is also outside of flood risk zones 3a and 3b.</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of local food growing land of demonstrable value</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Use the provisional ALC data except where superseded by site-specific surveys.</li> <li>○ [--] Grades 1 to 3a, outside FZ3</li> <li>○ [-] Grades 1 to 3a, inside FZ3</li> <li>○ [?] Grade 3 (where 3a/3b split unknown)</li> <li>○ [+] Grades 3b to 5</li> </ul>

	<p>potential agricultural value</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision or enhancement of local food growing land of demonstrable value</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ [++] Non-agricultural land – but ALC includes under this heading some urban fringe land planned for development in the past that is currently farmed: commentary needs to acknowledge this.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4f. Minimise vulnerability to tidal / fluvial flooding (taking account of climate change), without increasing flood risk elsewhere</b></p>	<p><b>Significant positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly vulnerable and more vulnerable development in flood zone 1 (as contained in Table 3 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change PPG).</li> </ul> <p><b>Positive effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development proposed in areas of lowest flood risk (as contained in Table 2 and 3 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change PPG).</li> <li>• Development which mitigates existing flood risk from tidal or fluvial sources</li> </ul>	<p><b>Significant negative effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly, more and less vulnerable development in flood risk zone 3b (as contained in Table 3 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change PPG).</li> <li>• Highly vulnerable development in flood risk zone 3a</li> </ul> <p><b>Negative effect:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any other development in areas of flood risk (as contained in Table 3 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change PPG).</li> <li>• Flood defences and mitigation measures would have negative effects on</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ [++] FZ1</li> <li>○ [+] FZ2</li> <li>○ [-] FZ3a</li> <li>○ [--] FZ3b (current locations affected are already sieved-out but significant negative impact could be reintroduced via climate change)</li> <li>○ [+/-] if substantially mixed</li> <li>○ Normally no need for [?] as all land has a known FZ status: exceptions can be made where climate change effect is unclear.</li> </ul>

		flooding elsewhere	
<p><b>4g. Minimise vulnerability to surface water flooding and other sources of flooding, without increasing flood risk elsewhere</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development proposed outside of identified high risk surface water areas.</li> <li>• Development which includes measures to reduce run off</li> <li>• Development which mitigates existing surface water flood risk</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development proposed in identified areas at high risk from surface water flooding</li> <li>• Development which significantly increases run off, increasing the risk of surface water flooding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Variety of the locations encountered makes consistent scoring difficult.</li> <li>○ Use EA Updated Flood Map for Surface Water and score directly if possible: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>[--] 1 in 30</li> <li>[-] 1 in 100</li> <li>[+] 1 in 1000</li> <li>[++] less than 1 in 1000.</li> </ul> This data is comprehensive and so avoids the need for a [0] score. </li> <li>○ On most sites with SWF, the area at risk is little more than the width of local watercourses, so will be a mixed score [+/-] unless a wider area is noticeably affected.</li> <li>○ Where a score based on EA categories appears not relevant, because of the complexity of SWF risk across the site, an alternative scoring is possible, based on</li> </ul>

			<p>assessment of the extent of the area at risk and potential for mitigation [-], including reduced site area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SuDS may offer a solution to be noted as possible mitigation.</li> <li>○ Note groundwater (also reservoir) information where known but consistency unlikely to be achievable at this stage as data availability varies between LPAs.</li> </ul>
<p><b>4h. Minimise harm to, and where possible improve, water quality and availability</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Development with potential to improve water quality and/or availability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Development posing a risk to water quality and/or availability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Generally [0], unless an issue exists: examples below.</li> <li>○ [?/-] in Groundwater Source Protection Zone.</li> <li>○ [?] GSPZ nearby.</li> <li>○ [?] location crossed by major streams, especially if of wildlife interest, as polluted run-off from housing could affect these, even if damage is accidental.</li> </ul>

<p><b>5a. Achieve reasonable access to sustainable transportation</b> (rail station, bus stops, cycle paths, footways)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development generating need for travel within reasonable distance of rail station</li> <li>• Development generating need for travel within reasonable distance of bus stops</li> <li>• Development with access to multiple bus routes</li> <li>• Development on or adjacent to the existing cycling and PROW network</li> <li>• Extension or enhancement to cycling network to facilitate and encourage sustainable travel</li> </ul> <p><b>Reasonable distance:</b></p> <p><i>Rail Station</i>                      800m</p> <p><i>Bus Stop</i>                              400m</p> <p><i>Cycle and Public Rights of Way</i>                      400m</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development generating need for travel outside reasonable distance of rail station</li> <li>• Development generating need for travel outside distance to bus stops</li> <li>• Development outside cycling network</li> <li>• Development that reduces connectivity, safety or use of cycling network</li> </ul> <p><b>Reasonable distance:</b></p> <p><i>Rail Station</i>                      800m</p> <p><i>Bus Stop</i>                              400m</p> <p><i>Cycle and Public Rights of Way</i>                      400m</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ [+] or [-], depending on compliance. Many locations will be mixed [+/-].</li> <li>○ Note where significant mitigation required.</li> <li>○ ‘Reasonable access to sustainable transportation’ is mainly about distance to travel facilities but note any capacity constraints that if severe can reduce score to [--].</li> </ul>
<p><b>5b. Reduce non-renewable energy consumption and ‘greenhouse’ emissions, and provide opportunities to link</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that contributes to reducing non-renewable energy consumption and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that does not contribute to reducing non-renewable energy consumption and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sustainable development teams can advise on heat opportunities.</li> </ul>

<p><b>into existing heat networks</b></p>	<p>'greenhouse' emissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that provide opportunities to link into an existing energy network</li> </ul>	<p>'greenhouse' emissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development that does not provide opportunities to link into an existing energy network</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Generally [0], as although there is potential for more energy-efficient housing, opportunities will not vary greatly by broad location.</li> <li>○ Note that dispersed development is likely to have some negative effects. Where these have been identified under other more specific objectives it would be double-counting to repeat them under this.</li> <li>○ [?] if urban extension or close to Bristol and potential for heat network cannot be ruled out.</li> </ul>
---	--	---	--