

PROVISION OF RECREATIONAL OPEN SPACE IN NEW HOUSING SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report

December 2007



**ROCHDALE
METROPOLITAN BOROUGH
COUNCIL**

Strategic Planning
Rochdale MBC
PO Box 32
Telegraph House
Baillie Street
Rochdale
OL16 1JH

CONTENTS

| Content | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Chapter 1: Introduction | 3 |
| What is sustainability appraisal? | 3 |
| Rochdale Borough Local Development Framework | 5 |
| Brief Explanation of Supplementary Planning Document | 5 |
| The SA process | 5 |
| How the SA was done | 6 |
| Compliance with the Habitats Directive | 7 |
| Commenting on the SA report, Habitats Regulations Assessment and SPD | 8 |
| Chapter 2: Context | 9 |
| Introduction | 9 |
| Review of other Policies, Plans, Programmes, Strategies and Initiatives | 9 |
| Collecting baseline information | 9 |
| Difficulties encountered compiling information or carrying out assessment | 10 |
| Key sustainability issues | 10 |
| Developing the SA framework | 12 |
| Chapter 3: Appraisal of Provision of Recreational Open Space in New Housing SPD | 14 |
| Introduction | 14 |
| Appraisal of the SPD | 14 |
| Appraisal of the SPD objectives | 15 |
| Appraisal of options | 18 |
| Chapter 4: Next steps and monitoring framework | 21 |
| Next steps | 21 |
| Monitoring framework | 21 |
| Appendix 1: Appraisals | 22 |
| Appendix 2: SA framework | 44 |
| Appendix 3: Scoping Report consultation comments summary | 55 |
| Appendix 4: Most relevant UDP policies | 56 |
| Appendix 5: Habitats Directive screening opinion | 57 |
| Appendix 6: Location of documentation and comments forms | 58 |

List of Tables

| Table Content | Page |
|---|-------------|
| Table 1: Compliance with the SEA Directive | 3 |
| Table 2: Links between SA and SPD development | 5 |
| Table 3: Summary of key sustainability issues for Recreational Open Space in New Housing | 10 |
| Table 4: plan objectives | 12 |
| Table 5: SPD objectives testing | 16 |
| Table 6: Summary of compatibility of SPD objectives/ SA objectives | 17 |
| Table 7: SPD/ DPD options appraisal summary | 19 |
| Table 8: Summary of mitigation measures/ suggested changes to the SPD/ DPD | 20 |

Chapter 1: Introduction

- 1.1 This document is the Sustainability Appraisal report (SA report) of the Provision of Recreational Open Space in New Housing Supplementary Planning Document. The SA report is the key output of the SA process, documenting the work carried out during the appraisal of the SPD.
- 1.2 This chapter briefly summarises the process of developing the SPD and the requirements of SA. It explains how the SA was carried out and how it influenced the development of the SPD. It also explains the consultation process and how you can comment.

What is Sustainability Appraisal?

- 1.3 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 made Sustainability Appraisal (SA) a requirement for Development Plan Documents (DPD) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). The SA helps planning authorities to fulfil the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development in the preparation of their plans.
- 1.4 The purpose of SA is to promote sustainable development through better integration of sustainability considerations in the preparation and adoption of plans. SA identifies and reports on the likely significant effects of the plan and the extent to which the implementation of the plan will achieve the social, environmental and economic objectives by which sustainable development can be defined.
- 1.5 SA must also meet the requirements of the European Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive 2001/42/EC (SEA Directive). The Council will ensure the requirements of the SEA Directive are met within this SA. The requirements of the SEA Directive and at what stages they are met are set out in Table 1.

Table 1: Compliance with SEA Directive requirements

| The SEA Directive Requirements | Where covered in this report |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Preparation of Environmental Report (Art. 5 and Annex I) | |
| a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationships with other relevant plans and programmes | Para 2.2, para 3.6 |
| b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme | Para 1.14-1.15, Appendix 2 |
| c) The environmental characteristics of the areas likely to be significantly affected. | Table 3, Appendix 2 |
| d) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan including, in particular those relating to any areas of particular environmental importance. | Table 3, Appendix 2 |
| e) The environmental protection objectives established at international community or national level, which are relevant to | Para 2.1 – 2.3 |

| The SEA Directive Requirements | Where covered in this report |
|---|---|
| the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation. | |
| f) The likely significant effects on the environment, including issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. | Table 5, Table 7, Appendix 1 |
| g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme. | Table 8 |
| h) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties. | Para 3.3 – 3.12 |
| i) A description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Article 10. | Para 4.2, Appendix 2 |
| The report shall include the information that may be reasonably required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, its stage in the decision-making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process to avoid duplication of the assessment | Para 1.7 Table 3 |
| Consultation | |
| Authorities with environmental responsibility, when deciding on the scope and the level of details of the information to be included in the environmental report | Para 1.10 |
| Authorities with environmental responsibility and the public shall be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan and the accompanying environmental report before adoption of the plan or programme | Para 1.18 – 1.19 |
| Taking the environmental report and the results of the consultations into account in decision making | |
| <p>Provision of information on the decision</p> <p>When the plan or programme is adopted, the public and any countries under Article 7 shall be informed and the following made available to those so informed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan or programme as adopted • A statement summarising how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme and how the environmental report, the opinions of the public and statutory consultees, have been taken into account in accordance with Article 8 and the reasons for choosing the plans adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with and: • The measures decided concerning monitoring. | Not applicable at this stage |
| Monitoring of the significant environmental effects of the plan's or programme's implementation | Para 4.2, Appendix 2 |
| Quality assurance: environmental reports should be of a sufficient standard to meet the requirements of the SEA Directive | Part of Planning Inspectorates 'tests of soundness' |

Rochdale Borough Local Development Framework

- 1.6 The Local Development Framework (LDF) will gradually replace the Rochdale Borough Unitary Development Plan (UDP), the existing statutory land-use plan for the Borough. The LDF is a portfolio of documents which primarily consists of Development Plan Documents (DPD) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). The existing UDP policies will be saved until they are replaced within the LDF. Each DPD and SPD produced will be subject to SA. A full list of documents which will make up the LDF can be found within the Local Development Scheme, the project plan for the LDF, at www.rochdale.gov.uk.

Provision of Recreational Open Space in New Housing Supplementary Planning Document

This Supplementary Planning Document aims to expand upon policy H/6 of the UDP, by detailing the kinds of recreational open space provision which would be expected in new housing developments in particular circumstances and clarifying the procedures for making contributions to off-site provision. It will specify thresholds for different recreational provisions (in terms of numbers of bedrooms) and will also give design guidance for recreational facilities.

The SA process

- 1.8 The SA process and its links to the SPD process are indicated in table 2. The SPD and SA are currently at stage 3 and D1 respectively. This SA report primarily covers the work required to complete stage B of the SA process, however the Scoping report, which covers stage A of the SA process, can be found at www.rochdale.gov.uk.

Table 2: Links between SA and SPD development (Based on ODPM 05)

| SPD Stage | SA Stage |
|--|--|
| <p>1. Evidence Gathering This stage involves collecting background information so that decisions are founded on a thorough understanding of the issues.</p> | <p>Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A1: Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and sustainable development objectives • A2: Collecting baseline information • A3: Identifying sustainability issues and problems • A4: Developing the SA Framework • A5: Consulting on the scope of the SA |
| <p>2. Preparation of draft SPD At this stage the Council will consider options for the SPD and work towards producing a draft SPD for public</p> | <p>Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B1: Testing the LDF objectives against the SA Framework • B2: Developing the SPD options • B3: Predicting the effects of the draft SPD • B4: Evaluating the effects of the draft SPD • B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and |

| | |
|--|---|
| consultation. | <p>maximising beneficial effects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of the SPD |
| <p>3. Consultation At this stage the Council will publish a draft SPD for public consultation and then assess the representations and make any necessary changes.</p> | <p>Stage C: Preparing the SA Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C1: Preparing SA Report <p>Stage D: Consulting on draft SPD and SA Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D1: Public participation on the SA Report and draft SPD • D2: Assessing significant changes |
| <p>4. Adoption</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D3: Making decisions and providing information |
| <p>5. Implementation, Monitoring and Review Once the document is adopted it will be monitored to review its effectiveness and reviewed as necessary.</p> | <p>Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the SPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E1: Finalising aims and methods for monitoring • E2: Responding to adverse effects |

How the SA was done

- 1.9 The SA has been primarily carried out within the Strategic Planning Team of Rochdale MBC Planning and Regulation Services.
- 1.10 A Scoping report was produced in spring 2007 following the process highlighted in table 2. This went out for formal consultation during April/ May 2007. The following statutory bodies and organisations were consulted either by letter or email on the Scoping report:
- Natural England
 - English Heritage
 - The Environment Agency
 - Government Office for the North West
 - The North West Regional Assembly
 - Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
 - Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce
 - Rochdale Civic Society
 - Rochdale Local Strategic Partnership
 - Home Builders Federation
 - National Playing Fields Association
 - Sport England
 - Others as necessary
- 1.11 The Final Scoping Report, taking on board comments from the consultation, can be found at www.rochdale.gov.uk. A copy of the

schedule of comments received on the Scoping Report and the Councils response to these comments can be found in appendix 3.

1.12 Throughout the whole of the SA process there has been a focus upon the key objectives of SA and SEA, namely to:

- 'provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation of the draft SPD with a view to promoting sustainable development (SEA Directive, Article 1).
- 'contribute to the achievement of sustainable development' (Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, regulation 39.2)

1.13 This has been achieved through:

- a focus on the key issues within the DPD/SPD, rather than attempting to cover every issue in great detail;
- a focus on negative impacts, with suggestion for alternative approaches or mitigation measures where possible;
- a 'real time' appraisal. The SA was carried out whilst the draft SPD was being developed enabling it to inform the development of the SPD and;
- an attempt to be concise in the SA document, to facilitate discussion and consultation on the SPD.

Compliance with the Habitats Directive

1.14 The Council are required under Articles 6(3) and (4) of the Habitats Directive to assess the potential effects of their policies on European Sites which lie within and outside the borough. The purpose of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) is to ensure the protection of the integrity of European sites is a part of the planning process.

1.15 There are two European sites within the borough:

- Rochdale Canal Special Area of Conservation
- South Pennine Moors SAC and Special Protection Area (SPA)

1.16 To meet this requirement Rochdale MBC requested Greater Manchester Ecology Unit to carry out HRA on the SPD. In accordance with government guidance this process involves 3 stages:

- Task 1 – Identify likely significant effects
- Task 2 – Appropriate assessment and ascertaining the effect on site integrity: and
- Task 3 – Mitigating measures and alternative solutions.

- 1.17 Task 1, also referred to as 'screening', determines whether the other tasks are required. Greater Manchester Ecology Unit have provided a Screening Opinion which has indicated that the implementation of the SPD will not cause significant harm to the special interests of any European protected sites. A formal screening opinion is included as part of this SA in appendix 5.

Commenting on the SA report, Habitats Regulations Assessment and SPD

- 1.18 Comments on the draft SA report, Habitats Regulations Assessment and the SPD, can be made during the six-week consultation period. Official comments forms are available at www.rochdale.gov.uk and also at the locations listed in appendix 6.

- 1.19 All comments must be submitted by **5 pm on Monday 28th January 2008** to:

By post: Strategic Planning Team
Floor 2
Telegraph House
Baillie Street
Rochdale, OL16 1JH

By fax: 01706 864144

By email: Strategic.planning@rochdale.gov.uk

Chapter 2 Context

Introduction

- 2.1 This section discusses the policy, environmental, social and economic context within which the Provision of Recreational Open Space in New Housing SPD has been developed. The policy context sets out other policies which the SPD should be compatible with. The environmental, social and economic context highlights current issues which the SPD should try and address.

Review of other Policies, Plans, Programmes, Strategies and Initiatives (PPPSIs)

- 2.2 The Provision of Recreational Open Space in New Housing SPD is set within the context of other policies, plans, programmes, strategies and initiatives (PPPSIs). These PPPSIs will influence the content of the SPD and in some cases vice-versa. It is therefore important that the relationships between the PPPSIs and the SPD are identified so that potential inconsistencies and constraints can be addressed.
- 2.3 A wide range of PPPSIs were reviewed as part of the Scoping Report. The purpose of this review was to:
- Identify social, environmental or economic objectives that should be reflected in the SPD;
 - identify any factors that might influence the preparation of the SPD;
 - consider whether the policies in other PPPSIs may lead to cumulative effects when combined with the SPD; and
 - highlight any incompatibilities between the PPPSIs and the SPD.

The full list of PPPSIs reviewed for the SPD can be found within the Scoping Report, this is available at www.rochdale.gov.uk.

Collecting Baseline Information

- 2.4 The collection of baseline social, economic and environmental data helps to identify the current state of Rochdale Borough as well as Rochdale town centre and provides the basis for predicting and monitoring the effects of the SPD. It also assists in the identification of key sustainability issues and potential opportunities for an area. The baseline data supports the process of setting meaningful objectives, targets and indicators for use in the SA process.
- 2.5 The collection of baseline data is an ongoing process and therefore data will be updated and refined for each subsequent SA. The Scoping Report included information on the characteristics of Rochdale Borough and sets out a picture of the current state of the district and

Rochdale town centre. This is an ongoing piece of work which will be updated as and when new information becomes available. A statistical summary of the baseline information available for the borough is indicated within the SA framework (appendix 2). This statistical information together with any relevant qualitative information will be used to help predict and monitor possible effects of the SPD as well as other plans, policies, programmes and initiatives.

- 2.6 Current baseline data, together with sustainability objectives and indicators are shown in appendix 2.

Difficulties encountered compiling information or carrying out the assessment

- 2.7 There are always some difficulties in collecting baseline data and undertaking assessments. The main reasons for this are that the data available may not be up-to-date or certain characteristics of the baseline have not been previously monitored. There are currently gaps in the baseline data available for this SPD, which will need to be collected in the future to enable the effects of the SPD to be monitored effectively. The Council are currently working towards formulating a Sustainability Appraisal Toolkit for the whole of the Borough which will provide a full range of monitoring information to enable baseline data to be collected and monitored.

Key sustainability issues

- 2.8 The key sustainability issues facing Rochdale town centre have been identified through the assessment of the PPPSIs and the baseline data collected. As baseline data is refined and gathered it is possible new issues may emerge, therefore the key issues for Rochdale Borough and the town centre will need to be reviewed on a regular basis.

Table 3: Summary of key sustainability issues for Provision of Recreational Open Space in New Housing

| Key Sustainability Issues | Baseline Data Source | Action | Key PPPSIs Supporting Action |
|--|-----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| Economic Issues | | | |
| Rochdale's economy is underperforming, and needs to expand, modernise and diversify in order to generate wealth locally and assist regeneration. | Unitary Development Plan | Improvement in the residential and general environment will help to attract inward investment. | PPS1, PPS3 |
| Environmental Issues | | | |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|-------------|
| Open space is defined as 'water compatible' and can reduce the impact of flooding by providing permeable areas and therefore reducing run-off. | Environment Agency | When considering open space in new housing the sequential test should be applied so that open space rather than housing is located in high flood risk areas. | PPS1, PPG25 |
| There is currently a lack of quality accessible greenspace in the Borough. | Green Space Audit, UDP | Direct developers contributions towards improving quality and accessibility of greenspace. | PPS9, PPG17 |
| Social Issues | | | |
| There are shortfalls in the provision of junior playing pitch facilities and some adult playing pitch facilities, both current and projected to 2013 | Playing Pitch Strategy | Use developer contributions to meet these shortfalls | PPG17 |
| There are shortfalls in the provision of play facilities for children from some groups, such as children with special needs, 0-4 year olds and other age-specific facilities | Play and Freetime Strategy | Use developer contributions to meet these shortfalls | PPG17 |
| A high percentage of adults and children do not visit local open spaces due to fears about safety and crime. Only 48% of young people regularly take part in sporting activity outside school. | Play and Freetime Strategy, Rochdale Community Strategy | Use developer contributions to improve open spaces and make more secure. Ensure design / layout and location of new spaces are secure. | PPS1, PPG17 |
| All but two electoral wards have a higher Standard Mortality Rate than the average for the rest of the country. | Rochdale Community Strategy | Improve access to exercise opportunities. | PPS1, PPG17 |

Developing the SA framework (SA objectives)

2.9 SA is essentially a test of the environmental, social and economic soundness of a plan. When deciding upon the SA objectives against which the SPD was to be assessed regard was paid to national and regional guidance on SA, such as the Integrated Appraisal Toolkit for the North West. The SA framework incorporates a range of objectives and questions adapted from these sources to fit the key sustainability issues and aspirations of Rochdale Borough as set out within documents such as Pride of Place, the Boroughs Community Strategy. The SA framework indicated below has been amended from that included within the Scoping Report for the SPD. This has been done to take account of consultation responses, to rationalise the assessment process and to be more compatible with the emerging Rochdale MBC SA Toolkit, which is currently being developed in consultation with statutory consultees.

Table 4: Provision of Recreational Open Space in New Housing SPD SA objectives/ supplementary questions.

| SA Objective | Supplementary Questions |
|---|--|
| Objective A: To protect and enhance townscapes and places of historic, cultural and archaeological value | A1: Will the initiative protect and sustainably manage designated heritage sites? |
| | A2: Will the initiative be based on high quality design that respects local character and enhances local distinctiveness? |
| | A3: Will the initiative help to reduce the number of vacant buildings through re-use as well as redevelopment? |
| Objective B: To protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and local landscape character | B1: Will the initiative help to protect any designated wildlife species or landscape areas? |
| | B2: Will the initiative protect and enhance endangered species and habitats and provide opportunities for new habitat creation? |
| | B3: Will it improve the amount and quality of, and access to, local green space? |
| Objective C: Contribute to the provision of cleaner, safer, greener communities | C1: Will the initiative protect or improve inland waters? |
| | C2: Will the initiative protect or enhance soils and/or land whilst promoting the re-use or regeneration of previously developed land? |
| | C3: Will the initiative protect or improve local air quality? |
| | C4: Will the initiative reduce exposure to high noise levels? |
| Objective D: To ensure prudent use of natural resources and reduce waste | D1: Will the initiative encourage sustainable consumption, including water consumption? |
| | D2: Will the initiative encourage re-using, recycling and/ or recovery? |
| | D3: Will the initiative reduce waste generation? |
| Objective E: To reduce the vulnerability to climate change and reduce the potential impacts of flooding | E1: Will the initiative help to mitigate greenhouse gases, particularly by maximising use of renewable energy or through energy efficiency? |
| | E2: Will the initiative help to adapt climate change, including the increased use of sustainable drainage and by promoting catchment wide approach to minimising flood risk? |
| | E3: Will the initiative address the social and economic as well as environmental impacts, of energy use? |
| Objective F: To increase and improve | F1: Will the initiative enhance the lives of ALL members of communities within its scope? |

| SA Objective | Supplementary Questions |
|--|--|
| access to public open spaces and improve the liveability of communities | F2: Will the initiative encourage up-take of exercise opportunities? |
| | F3: Will the initiative improve access to public open spaces? |
| Objective G: To reduce the fear and occurrence of crime and disorder | G1: Will the initiative reduce the amount of litter, fly tipping or graffiti in local communities? |
| | G2: Will the initiative reduce crime and the fear of crime whilst offering opportunities for the rehabilitation of offenders? |
| Objective H: To reduce the effect of traffic in the community | H1: Will the initiative reduce traffic congestion and improve safety for all road users? |
| | H2: Will the initiative encourage walking, cycling and/ or travelling by public transport? |
| | H3: Will the initiative promote sustainable travel alternatives such as communication infrastructure which supports ideas of home working? |
| | H4: Will the initiative reduce unnecessary freight movements? |
| Objective I: To improve access to/ of local services and facilities within and beyond the immediate neighbourhood | I1: Will the initiative improve and ensure local accessibility of jobs, community goods and services as well as amenities? |
| | I2: Will the initiative reduce the need to travel? |
| Objective J: To create an economy capable of sustainable growth through investment, innovation and entrepreneurship | J1: Will the initiative encourage innovation as well as research and development together with knowledge transfer? |
| | J2: Will the initiative encourage the formation, survival and growth of sustainable enterprise schemes? |
| | J3: Will the initiative support growth in key cities/ towns and/or areas remote from growth? |
| Objective K: To improve access to good quality, affordable and resource efficient housing | K1: Will the initiative contribute to high quality, well-designed living environments? |
| | K2: Will the initiative deliver affordable housing with planned access to local services, amenities and employment? |

Chapter 3: Provision of Recreational Open Space in New Housing Supplementary Planning Document

Introduction

- 3.1 This Supplementary Planning Document aims to expand upon policy H/6 of the UDP, by detailing the kinds of recreational open space provision which would be expected in new housing developments in particular circumstances and clarifying the procedures for making contributions to off-site provision. It will specify thresholds for different recreational provisions (in terms of numbers of bedrooms) and will also give design guidance for recreational facilities.
- 3.2 This section describes how the SPD has developed and tests the SPD against the SA Framework.

Appraisal of the SPD

- 3.3 Government guidance on sustainability appraisal requires that options are developed and considered to ensure that the identified objectives for the document can be met. It is considered that the options in respect of on-site and off-site provision are already set out in the policy, as are options in respect of spending of contributions; it is therefore considered that the only viable options which can be considered here are:
- To produce the SDP, with its introduction of specific thresholds, definitions, design guidance, clarification on the requirement for amenity areas, clarified requirement for children's play facilities and introduction of Township-wide funds from developer contributions.
 - To rely instead on the existing UDP policy, which is not as specific in terms of the above areas.
- 3.6 The SPD appraisal process has been undertaken in two stages. The first stage of the appraisal process was to test the compatibility of the SPD objectives against the SA objectives. The results of this testing are set out within Table 5. The second phase of the appraisal process was to test the options;
- To produce the SDP, with its introduction of specific thresholds, definitions, design guidance, clarification on the requirement for amenity areas, clarified requirement for children's play facilities and introduction of Township-wide funds from developer contributions.
 - To rely instead on the existing UDP policy, which is not as specific in terms of the above areas.

These options were appraised against the SA objectives and supplementary questions. A summary of the results of this testing are set out within Table 7.

Appraisal of the SPD objectives

3.6 The original SPD objectives were set out within the SA Scoping Report. These have now been amended and expanded to take account of early SA work on these objectives and to provide greater guidance upon the aims of the DPD/SPD. The principle objectives for the SPD;

- To give clarity to developers as to what will be expected of them in terms of on-site recreational open space facilities.
- To secure the provision of high quality, appropriate amenity open space for new high-density residential developments.
- To secure safe and convenient access to quality local open space facilities to all residents of new housing developments, in accordance with the Council's standards.
- To secure safe and convenient access to quality outdoor sports provision for all residents of new housing developments, in accordance with the Council's standards.
- To ensure that new recreational open spaces within housing developments are designed and laid out to an acceptable standard.
- To ensure that contributions for off-site recreational open space provision are calculated in a manner that fairly reflects the cost of providing quality, accessible and convenient recreational open space for residents of new housing developments in accordance with the Council's standards.
- To enhance the environment and biodiversity of new housing developments.

3.7 The assessments of the objectives are set out in Table 5.

3.8 The appraisal indicates that the SPD objectives are generally either very compatible with the sustainability objectives or have little relationship with them; there are no negative relationships. There is particularly good compatibility with social objectives, particularly the aim of cleaner, safer, greener communities and access to open space / liveability of communities. The compatibility between the two sets of objectives is set out within Table 6.

Table 5: Rochdale Town Centre East Area Framework draft objectives testing

| SA Objectives | SPD Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| A | ? | + | + | ? | ++ | ? | ++ | | | | | | | | | |
| B | ++ | + | ++ | + | + | ? | ++ | | | | | | | | | |
| C | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | | | | | | | | | |
| D | + | ? | ? | ? | + | ? | ? | | | | | | | | | |
| E | + | ? | ? | + | + | ? | ? | | | | | | | | | |
| F | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | + | ++ | | | | | | | | | |
| G | + | + | + | ? | ++ | ? | + | | | | | | | | | |
| H | + | ? | + | ++ | ? | ? | ? | | | | | | | | | |
| I | ? | ? | ++ | ++ | + | + | ? | | | | | | | | | |
| J | ? | ? | + | + | + | + | + | | | | | | | | | |
| K | ? | + | ? | ? | + | + | + | | | | | | | | | |

Key:

| | |
|-----|--|
| ++ | Likely to have a positive impact |
| + | Likely to have a minor positive impact |
| +/- | Positive or Negative dependent upon implementation |
| - | Likely to have a minor negative impact |
| -- | Likely to have a negative impact |
| ? | No relationship/ Neutral/ Uncertain |

Table 6: Summary of compatibility SPD objectives/ SA objectives

| Social | Environmental | Economic |
|--|--|---|
| <p>The relationship between the SPD objectives and the social goals of the sustainability objectives is generally very good. In particular, there is a very positive relationship with the aim of improving accessibility to open space and the liveability of communities. The SPD objectives will also contribute towards reducing fear and occurrence of crime and disorder and improving access to local services. There is a more neutral relationship with the objective of reducing the effect of traffic. There are no negative relationships.</p> | <p>The relationship between the SPD objectives and the environmental sustainability objectives is generally fairly good, although there are significant areas where there is a neutral relationship, e.g. ensuring prudent use of natural resources and reducing vulnerability to climate change. However, there is a very good relationship where it comes to provision of cleaner, greener, safer communities and protecting, enhancing and managing biodiversity and local landscape character.</p> | <p>The relationship between the SPD objectives and economic objectives is fairly neutral.</p> |

Appraisal of the options

- 3.9 The appraisals of the options have been undertaken by taking a professional judgement of the likely impacts of the options, producing an SPD or relying on existing policy, against each SA Objective and a series of questions (Table 7). These professional judgements have been made by taking account of available baseline information, trends within the data and the most recent advice upon these issues. It is considered that this approach has provided a robust assessment methodology which provides a degree of certainty regarding the likely sustainability effects of the options. This approach will be further enhanced by taking account of consultation responses received during consultation upon this SA Report and the SPD.
- 3.10 The appraisals have also been undertaken using an iterative process so that the SA has informed the development of the SPD. This has ensured that the draft SPD has already met many of the sustainability objectives within the Councils framework. However as is common with most plans the SPD has not fully met all of the SA objectives, this is partially due to the remit of the SPD, and the conflicts this may have with some of the SA Objectives. To minimise these negative effects and where possible to maximise beneficial effects the SA has suggested a number of mitigation measures which may be undertaken.
- 3.11 Table 7 sets out a summary of the options appraisal for the SPD, the most recent iteration of the SPD, and the other options. The assessment of the SPD has been undertaken taking account of the whole content of the document. The full assessments for each of these options can be found in appendix 1.
- 3.12 Table 7 and appendix 1 indicate that the proposed SPD relates to sustainability objectives in two ways – either it will have a positive impact or a neutral impact. In particular, the design guidance and clarity in respect of provision required will help to improve liveability of communities and reduce fear of crime and disorder; in the long term, the SPD can help towards climate change mitigation measures. Relying on existing policy will not allow these benefits to occur, and the appraisal has concluded that the production of the SPD will have an overall positive impact in sustainability terms. Two areas of mitigation have been identified, namely increased emphasis on biodiversity enhancement and protecting bodies of water in open spaces; a summary of these measures can be found in Table 8.

Table 7: SPD options appraisal summary

| SPD Options | SA Framework | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------|---|-----|---|---|-----|----|----|---|---|---|-----|
| | Impact (Yrs) | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K |
| Preferred Option (SPD) | S (0-5) | + | + | + | ? | + | ++ | ++ | ? | ? | ? | + |
| | M (6-10) | + | + | + | ? | + | ++ | ++ | ? | ? | ? | + |
| | L (11+) | + | + | + | ? | ++ | ++ | ++ | ? | ? | ? | + |
| Rely on existing policy | S (0-5) | ? | +/- | + | ? | +/- | ++ | + | ? | + | ? | +/- |
| | M (6-10) | ? | +/- | + | ? | + | ++ | + | ? | + | ? | +/- |
| | L (11+) | ? | +/- | + | ? | + | ++ | + | ? | + | ? | +/- |

Key

| | | | |
|-----|--|----|-------------------------------------|
| ++ | Positive Impact | -- | Negative Impact |
| + | Minor Positive Impact | - | Minor Negative Impact |
| +/- | Positive/ Negative dependent upon implementation | ? | No Relationship/ Neutral/ Uncertain |

Table 8: Summary of mitigation measures/ suggested changes to the SPD

| Issue | Suggested Mitigation/ Changes |
|--|--|
| Protecting and enhancing endangered species and habitats and providing opportunities for new habitat creation. | Ensure that the SPD makes clear that the definition of recreational open space can include natural areas which encourage wildlife, and that protecting and enhancing biodiversity is an important element in any new open spaces layout |
| Protecting and improving inland waters. | Ensure that the SPD makes it clear that existing bodies of water can be considered local open space |
| | |
| | |

Chapter 4: Next steps and monitoring framework

Next steps

- 4.1 Following consultation upon this document and the SPD the consultation responses and the findings of this report will be incorporated, where appropriate, into the SPD prior to adoption by the Council. If there are significant changes to the SPD that have not already been the subject of this SA it will be necessary to assess these changes against the SA framework to ensure that the significant social, environmental and economic effects are appraised.

Monitoring framework

- 4.2 Monitoring is considered to be an important element of the new planning system and SA. Such monitoring will allow any unforeseen impacts of implementing the chosen option to be identified and quantified at the earliest opportunity. This will allow any remedial action that is necessary and considered appropriate to be identified and undertaken. The collection of such information will also be a useful source of future baseline data for future documents and projects.
- 4.3 The relevant indicators relating to this SA Report are shown in appendix 2.

Appendix 1: Appraisals

- Option 1: To produce the SDP, with its introduction of specific thresholds, definitions, design guidance, clarification on the requirement for amenity areas, clarified requirement for children’s play facilities and introduction of Township-wide funds from developer contributions.

Key

| | | | |
|-----|--|----|-------------------------------------|
| ++ | Positive Impact | -- | Negative Impact |
| + | Minor Positive Impact | - | Minor Negative Impact |
| +/- | Positive/ Negative dependent upon implementation | ? | No Relationship/ Neutral/ Uncertain |

Option 1 – Produce SPD

| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
|---|---|-----------------|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective A: To protect and enhance townscapes and places of historic, cultural and archaeological value | A1: Will the initiative protect and sustainably manage designated heritage sites? | | + | + | + | ✓ | | If the site is adjacent to a heritage site, it is likely to enhance and protect that site. | |
| | A2: Will the initiative be based on high quality design that respects local character and enhances local distinctiveness? | | + | + | + | ✓ | | The design guidance in the document is likely to support this objective. | |
| | A3: Will the initiative help to reduce the number of vacant buildings through re-use as well as redevelopment? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | |

| Option 1 – Produce SPD | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|--|--|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective B: To protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and local landscape character | B1: Will the initiative help to protect any designated wildlife species or landscape areas? | Rochdale borough has two European sites, the South Pennine Moors and Rochdale Canal. The latter travels through the urban area for much of its length. There is a deficiency in good quality green space in the Borough. | ++ | ++ | ++ | ✓ | | The proposed design section of the SPD and its emphasis on biodiversity support this objective. | None |
| | B2: Will the initiative protect and enhance endangered species and habitats and provide opportunities for new habitat creation? | | - | - | - | | ✓ | Where play takes place, biodiversity will be limited. There may be conflict between recreational use and biodiversity. | Place emphasis in UDP upon enhancing biodiversity. |
| | B3: Will it improve the amount and quality of, and access to, local green space? | | ++ | ++ | ++ | ✓ | | The details contained within the SPD will assist in this objective being met. | None |

| Option 1 – Produce SPD | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|---|---|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective C: Contribute to the provision of cleaner, safer, greener communities | C1: Will the initiative protect or improve inland waters? | There was a decrease in river quality in the borough between 2004 to 2005 with 55.9% being Good in 2004 compared to 38.9% in 2005. However the remainder are all Fair. The borough has declared Air Quality Management Area in parts of the Borough. | +- | +- | +- | ✓ | | This will depend upon whether or not the open space includes bodies of water. | Place emphasis in UDP on incorporating bodies of water where appropriate. |
| | C2: Will the initiative protect or enhance soils and/or land whilst promoting the re-use or regeneration of previously developed land? | | ++ | ++ | ++ | ✓ | | | None |
| | C3: Will the initiative protect or improve local air quality? | | + | + | ++ | ✓ | | Trees improve air quality, but the impact is likely to be medium to long term. Remediation of brownfield sites can improve air quality. | None |
| | C4: Will the initiative reduce exposure to high noise levels? | | ? | ? | ? | | | Play areas could actually increase noise, but this impact is likely to be very minor. | None |

| Option 1 – Produce SPD | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective D: To ensure prudent use of natural resources and reduce waste | D1: Will the initiative encourage sustainable consumption, including water consumption? | Conditions on planning approvals are increasingly requiring higher levels of sustainability in consumption. | ? | ? | ? | | | None. | |
| | D2: Will the initiative encourage re-using, recycling and/ or recovery? | | ? | ? | ? | | | None. | |
| | D3: Will the initiative reduce waste generation? | | ? | ? | ? | | | None. | |

| Option 1 – Produce SPD | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|---|----------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective E: To reduce the vulnerability to climate change and reduce the potential impacts of flooding | E1: Will the initiative help to mitigate greenhouse gases, particularly by maximising use of renewable energy or through energy efficiency? | Renewable energy installations are now beginning to be installed across the borough. New developments are required to take measures to ensure minimal risk of flooding. | ? | +/- | +/- | | ✓ | This will depend on how many trees are planted, although any impact is likely to take time as trees grow. | None. |
| | E2: Will the initiative help to adapt to climate change, including the increased use of sustainable drainage and by promoting catchment wide approach to minimising flood risk? | | ++ | ++ | ++ | | ✓ | SUDs schemes, etc, can be incorporated into open spaces. | None. |
| | E3: Will the initiative address the social and economic as well as environmental impacts, of energy use? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None. |

| Option 1 – Produce SPD | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|--|----------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective F: To increase and improve access to public open spaces and improve the liveability of communities | F1: Will the initiative enhance the lives of ALL members of communities within its scope? | Access to quality open space in the Borough is currently poor. | ++ | ++ | ++ | ✓ | | None | |
| | F2: Will the initiative encourage up-take of exercise opportunities? | | ++ | ++ | ++ | ✓ | | None | |
| | F3: Will the initiative improve access to public open spaces including green spaces? | | ++ | ++ | ++ | ✓ | | None | |

| Option 1 – Produce SPD | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|---|----------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective G: To reduce the fear and occurrence of crime and disorder | G1: Will the initiative reduce the amount of litter, fly tipping or graffiti in local communities? | Rochdale has higher rates of crime than the regional average. | ++ | ++ | ++ | ✓ | | Recreational provision can provide facilities for young people who might otherwise cause nuisance in other areas. Additionally, the maintenance guidance in the SPD will help to ensure that recreational areas will be less likely to be vandalised / flytipped. Offenders often serve community service maintaining open spaces, and in addition sport can provide rehabilitation opportunities. | None |
| | G2: Will the initiative reduce crime and the fear of crime whilst offering opportunities for the rehabilitation of offenders? | | ++ | ++ | ++ | ✓ | | | None |

| Option 1 – Produce SPD | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|--|----------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective H: To reduce the effect of traffic in the community | H1: Will the initiative reduce traffic congestion and improve safety for all road users? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None |
| | H2: Will the initiative encourage walking, cycling and/ or travelling by public transport? | | + | + | + | ✓ | | The initiative should encourage more walking. | None |
| | H3: Will the initiative promote sustainable travel alternatives such as communication infrastructure which supports ideas of home working? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | |
| | H4: Will the initiative reduce unnecessary freight movements? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None |

| Option 1 – Produce SPD | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|--|----------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective I: To improve access to/ of local services and facilities within and beyond the immediate neighbourhood | I1: Will the initiative improve and ensure local accessibility of jobs, community goods and services as well as amenities? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None |
| | I2: Will the initiative reduce the need to travel? | | + | + | + | ✓ | | | None |

| Option 1 – Produce SPD | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective J: To create an economy capable of sustainable growth through investment, innovation and entrepreneurship | J1: Will the initiative encourage innovation as well as research and development together with knowledge transfer? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None |
| | J2: Will the initiative encourage the formation, survival and growth of sustainable enterprise schemes? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None |
| | J3: Will the initiative support growth in key cities/ towns and/or areas remote from growth? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None |

| Option 1 – Produce SPD | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans- bound ary | | |
| Objective K: To improve access to good quality, affordable and resource efficient housing | K1: Will the initiative contribute to high quality, well-designed living environments? | | ++ | ++ | ++ | ✓ | | | |
| | K2: Will the initiative deliver affordable housing with planned access to local services, amenities and employment? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | |

| Option 2 – Rely on existing policy | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|--------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans- boundary | | |
| Objective A: To protect and enhance townscapes and places of historic, cultural and archaeological value | A1: Will the initiative protect and sustainably manage designated heritage sites? | | + | + | + | ✓ | | If the site is adjacent to a heritage site, it is likely to enhance and protect that site. | |
| | A2: Will the initiative be based on high quality design that respects local character and enhances local distinctiveness? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | |
| | A3: Will the initiative help to reduce the number of vacant buildings through re-use as well as redevelopment? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | |

| Option 2 - Rely on existing policy | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|--|----------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective B: To protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and local landscape character | B1: Will the initiative help to protect any designated wildlife species or landscape areas? | Rochdale borough has two European sites, the South Pennine Moors and Rochdale Canal. The latter travels through the urban area for much of its length. There is a deficiency in good quality green space in the Borough. | + | + | + | | ✓ | | None |
| | B2: Will the initiative protect and enhance endangered species and habitats and provide opportunities for new habitat creation? | | - | - | - | | ✓ | | None |
| | B3: Will it improve the amount and quality of, and access to, local green space? | | + | + | + | ✓ | | | None |

| Option 2 - Rely on existing policy | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|--|----------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective C: Contribute to the provision of cleaner, safer, greener communities | C1: Will the initiative protect or improve inland waters? | There was a decrease in river quality in the borough between 2004 to 2005 with 55.9% being Good in 2004 compared to 38.9% in 2005. However the remainder are all Fair. The borough has declared Air Quality Management Area in parts of the Borough. | +/- | +/- | +/- | | ✓ | | None. |
| | C2: Will the initiative protect or enhance soils and/or land whilst promoting the re-use or regeneration of previously developed land? | | + | + | + | ✓ | | | None |
| | C3: Will the initiative protect or improve local air quality? | | + | + | + | ✓ | | | None |
| | C4: Will the initiative reduce exposure to high noise levels? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None |

| Option 2 – Rely on existing policy | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective D: To ensure prudent use of natural resources and reduce waste | D1: Will the initiative encourage sustainable consumption, including water consumption? | Conditions on planning approvals are increasingly requiring higher levels of sustainability in consumption. | ? | ? | ? | | | | None. |
| | D2: Will the initiative encourage re-using, recycling and/ or recovery? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None. |
| | D3: Will the initiative reduce waste generation? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None. |

| Option 2 – Rely on existing policy | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|--|----------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective E: To reduce the vulnerability to climate change and reduce the potential impacts of flooding | E1: Will the initiative help to mitigate greenhouse gases, particularly by maximising use of renewable energy or through energy efficiency? | Renewable energy installations are now beginning to be installed across the borough. New developments are required to take measures to ensure minimal risk of flooding. | ? | +/- | +/- | | ✓ | | None. |
| | E2: Will the initiative help to adapt to climate change, including the increased use of sustainable drainage and by promoting catchment wide approach to minimising flood risk? | | ++ | ++ | ++ | | ✓ | | None. |
| | E3: Will the initiative address the social and economic as well as environmental impacts, of energy use? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None. |

| Option 2 – Rely on existing policy | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|--|----------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective F: To increase and improve access to public open spaces and improve the liveability of communities | F1: Will the initiative enhance the lives of ALL members of communities within its scope? | Access to quality open space in the Borough is currently poor. | ++ | ++ | ++ | ✓ | | | None |
| | F2: Will the initiative encourage up-take of exercise opportunities? | | ++ | ++ | ++ | ✓ | | | None |
| | F3: Will the initiative improve access to public open spaces including green spaces? | | ++ | ++ | ++ | ✓ | | | None |

| Option 2 – Rely on existing policy | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|--|----------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective G: To reduce the fear and occurrence of crime and disorder | G1: Will the initiative reduce the amount of litter, fly tipping or graffiti in local communities? | Rochdale has higher rates of crime than the regional average. | + | + | + | ✓ | | The design guidelines in the SPD will ensure better design than purely relying on existing policy. | None |
| | G2: Will the initiative reduce crime and the fear of crime whilst offering opportunities for the rehabilitation of offenders? | | + | + | + | ✓ | | | None |

| Option 2 – Rely on existing policy | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|--|----------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective H: To reduce the effect of traffic in the community | H1: Will the initiative reduce traffic congestion and improve safety for all road users? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None |
| | H2: Will the initiative encourage walking, cycling and/ or travelling by public transport? | | + | + | + | ✓ | | | None |
| | H3: Will the initiative promote sustainable travel alternatives such as communication infrastructure which supports ideas of home working? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | |
| | H4: Will the initiative reduce unnecessary freight movements? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None |

| Option 2 – Rely on existing policy | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans- bound ary | | |
| Objective I: To improve access to/ of local services and facilities within and beyond the immediate neighbourhood | I1: Will the initiative improve and ensure local accessibility of jobs, community goods and services as well as amenities? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None |
| | I2: Will the initiative reduce the need to travel? | | ++ | ++ | ++ | ✓ | | Current policy requires recreational open space as close as possible to development – SDP proposes contributions to Township-wide funds | None |

| Option 2 – Rely on existing policy | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective J: To create an economy capable of sustainable growth through investment, innovation and entrepreneurship | J1: Will the initiative encourage innovation as well as research and development together with knowledge transfer? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None |
| | J2: Will the initiative encourage the formation, survival and growth of sustainable enterprise schemes? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None |
| | J3: Will the initiative support growth in key cities/ towns and/or areas remote from growth? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | None |

| Option 2 – Rely on existing policy | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--------------|-----------|----------|-------|----------------|--|----------------------------------|
| SA Objective | Sub Questions | Current Picture | Impact (Yrs) | | | Scale | | Supporting Evidence/ Secondary or Cumulative Effect | Suggested Changes/ Mitigation |
| | | | S 0-5 | M 6-10 | L 11+ | Local | Trans-boundary | | |
| Objective K: To improve access to good quality, affordable and resource efficient housing | K1: Will the initiative contribute to high quality, well-designed living environments? | | + | + | + | ✓ | | | |
| | K2: Will the initiative deliver affordable housing with planned access to local services, amenities and employment? | | ? | ? | ? | | | | |

Appendix 2: SA framework (Objectives, Supplementary Questions, Targets, Data and Trends)

Draft Rochdale SA Framework – integrating North West IAT

| Theme | Previous Objective(s) | IAT Main Question | Draft Pride of Place (2007) Theme | New Objective | Sub-questions | Indicator(s) | Target | Baseline/Trend |
|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|--|----------------------------|----------------|
| Biodiversity/ Landscape | To maintain and enhance biodiversity, flora and fauna | Will the initiative protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and local landscape character? | Creating a cleaner, greener environment | To protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and local landscape character | Will the initiative help to protect any designated wildlife sites or landscape areas? | Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance, including: (i) change in priority habitats and species; and (ii) change in areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value including international, national, regional, sub-regional or local significance. | BAP to inform | |
| | To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | | | | Will the initiative protect and enhance endangered species and habitats and provide opportunities for new habitat creation? | | | |
| | | | | | Will it improve the amount and quality of, and access to, local green space? | Open Space Audit to identify indicator | Open Space Audit to inform | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| Buildings – Heritage | To conserve and improve where appropriate the quality of the historic environment | Will the initiative protect places of historic, cultural and archaeological value? | | To protect and enhance townscape s and places of historic, cultural and archaeological value | Will the initiative protect and sustainably manage designated heritage sites? | % listed buildings at risk % scheduled ancient monuments at risk | Target zero? Target zero? | 4 (Buildings at Risk Survey 2004) Awaiting results of Scheduled Ancient Monument s at Risk Survey |
| | To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | | | | Will the initiative be based on high-quality design that respects local character and enhances local distinctiveness? | Design guides? Number/ extent of conservation areas | Target no loss? | 13 Conservati on areas, covering 11.28ha |
| | | | | | Will the initiative help to reduce the number of vacant buildings, through re-use as well as redevelopment? | Area of derelict land within local authority No. retail vacancies within Town Centres | Target reduction? GB average 9.13% | Rochdale TC 12.27% Heywood Middleton |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Climate Change and Energy | To reduce vulnerability to climate change and reduce the potential impacts of flooding | Will the initiative develop or deliver local, regional and national policies to tackle climate change? | Creating a cleaner, greener environment | To reduce vulnerability to climate change and reduce the potential impacts of flooding | Will the initiative help to mitigate greenhouse gases? | Renewable energy capacity installed by type | Overall RSS target – 10% 2010, 15% 2015, 20% 2020 | Up to 2005/06 (AMR) PV – 51,075 Kwh Wind – 1,752 Kwh (Scout Moor 65MW to be implemented 07) Solar Thermal - 60,040 Kwh |
| | | | | | Will the initiative help to adapt to climate change? | No. planning permissions granted contrary to advice of Environment Agency on flood defence | None | None (AMR) |
| | | | | | Will the initiative address the social and economic, as well as environmental impacts, of energy use? | No. of developments reaching BREAM/ SEAM standard Number of vulnerable households living in fuel poverty (LAA indicator) | Decrease from 15,394 to 13,661 (by 2010) | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|--|----------------------------|--|--|---|-----------------------------|---|
| Community | To reduce the fear and occurrence of crime and disorder | Will the initiative contribute to developing and maintaining sustainable communities ? | Improving community safety | To contribute to active, inclusive and safe communities | Will the initiative enhance the lives of ALL members of communities within its scope? | | | |
| | | | | | Will the initiative engage all members of the community in the development and delivery of the project / programme / plan? | % people who feel they can influence decisions affecting their local area (LAA) | New target to be set by LAA | Baseline still to be determined |
| | | | | | Will the initiative improve and ensure local accessibility of jobs, community goods and services as well as amenities? | Amount of new residential development within 30 mins public transport time of : areas of employment, a primary school, secondary school, and a major retail centre(s) | | 2005/6 AMR Areas of employment 100%; Primary School 100%; Secondary School 83.9%; Major retail centres 100% |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--|---|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| | | | | | Will the initiative reduce crime, disorder and the fear of crime whilst offering opportunities for rehabilitation to offenders? | % domestic burglaries per 1000 population % of vehicle crimes per 1000 population % residents who feel the borough is a safe place to live (LAA indicator) | Reduce all by 26% from 03/04 to 2008 (Draft Pride of Place 2007) Increase % of citizens who feel the Borough is a safe place to live to 68% by March 2008 and 72% by March 2010. (LAA) | 20.8% 21.2% (2005) 27% |
| Economy | To create an economy capable of sustainable growth through | Will the initiative encourage sustainable economic growth and | Increasing jobs and prosperity | To increase jobs and prosperity within and throughout | Will the initiative encourage innovation as well as research & development together with knowledge transfer? | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| | | | | | <p>Will the initiative encourage the formation, survival and growth of sustainable enterprise schemes?</p> | <p>Amount of floorspace developed for employment by type</p> <p>Losses of employment land in (i) employment/ regeneration areas and (ii) local authority area. (AMR)</p> | | <p>2005/6 AMR B1 2975 sqm B2 874 sqm B8 2952 sqm Mixed 21,400 sqm</p> <p>(i) 0.4 ha (ii) 7.5 ha</p> |
| | | | | | <p>Will the initiative make linkages to ensure vacancies are accessible to all communities and locations especially disadvantaged areas?</p> | <p>Amount of floorspace developed for employment by type, in employment or regeneration areas. (AMR)</p> <p>No. Rochdale Borough residents securing employment on Kingsway (LAA)</p> | <p>545 Cumulative (2009/10 LAA)</p> | <p>2005/6 AMR 27, 665ha (100%)</p> <p>0</p> |
| | | | | | <p>Will the initiative support growth in key cities/towns and/or areas remote from growth?</p> | <p>Amount of completed retail, office and leisure development in town centres (AMR)</p> | | <p>2005/6 AMR B1 – 0% Leisure – 0% Retail -</p> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|---|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Health and Well-being | None | Will the initiative improve health and/or improve access to health care in the region particularly in deprived areas? | Ensuring better health for all | Ensure better health for all | Will the initiative improve income levels in deprived areas? | | | |
| | | | | | Will the initiative encourage up-take of exercise opportunities? | % residential properties within 400m of a good quality natural green space, woodland, green space corridor or national cycle network/national trail. (LAA) | LAA target 37.2% (2009/10) | Currently 22.2% (LAA) |
| | | | | | | % of rights of way footpaths easy to use (LAA) | 50% (LAA) | 65% (2009/10 LAA) |
| | | | | | Will the initiative protect mental health and promote wellbeing of communities, particularly those in deprived areas? | Amount of new residential development within 30min public transport time of: GP, hospital (AMR) | | 2005/6 AMR GP – 100% Hospital - 9.8% |
| Housing | None | Will the initiative improve access to good quality, affordable and resource efficient housing? | Ensuring better health for all | To improve access to good quality, affordable and resource efficient housing. | Will the initiative contribute to high quality, well-designed living environments? | Housing trajectory – Net number housing completions per year (AMR) | Current RSS – 240 Net Draft RSS – 400 Net | 2005/6 AMR Net completions 04/05 – 58 05/06 – 350 |
| | | | | | Will the initiative deliver affordable housing with planned access to local services, amenities and employment? | Affordable housing completions (AMR) | | 2005/6 AMR 04/05 – 23 05/06 – 71 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| Local Environmental Quality | To increase and improve access to public open spaces and improve the liveability of communities | Will the initiative contribute to the provision of cleaner, safer, greener communities ? | Creating a cleaner, greener environment | Contribute to cleaner and greener communities | Will the initiative reduce the amount of litter, flytipping or graffiti in local communities? | Environmental Quality BV199b - Graffiti (LAA) | 12% 2009/10 (LAA) | 19% (LAA) |
| | | | | | (additional Q) Will the initiative improve access to public open spaces? | Extent LEAP/ NEAP provision | % of play areas conforming to LEAP standard increases from 32% to 48% (LAA) | |
| | | | | | | No. Local Nature Reserves and Country Parks | Retain/ increase? | 3 LNRs |
| | | | | | | % residential properties within 400m of a good quality natural green space, woodland, green space corridor or national cycle network/ national trail. (LAA) | LAA target 37.2% (2009/10) | Currently 22.2% (LAA) |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|---------------------|---|
| | To improve air quality | | | | Will the initiative protect or enhance soils and/or land whilst promoting the re-use or regeneration of previously developed land? | % new housing/ conversions on PDL (AMR) % employment floorspace on PDL (AMR) | RSS target 80% | 2005/6 AMR 04/05 – 57.6% 05/06 – 79% 06/07 – 87% (BV completions) |
| | To improve water quality | | | | Will the initiative protect or improve inland waters? | % rivers of good or fair quality | 100%? | Envi Agency GQA 04/05 Good – 55.9% (04); 38.9% (05) Fair – 41.5% (04); 61.1% (05) |
| | | | | | Will the initiative protect or improve local air quality? | Levels of Air Quality (NO2) (LAA) | 32.8 (LAA) | 28 (2009/10 LAA) |
| | | | | | Will the initiative reduce exposure to high noise levels? | No. Noise complaints? | | |
| Raw Materials - Waste | To ensure prudent use of natural resources | Will the initiative promote sustainable production? | | To ensure prudent use of natural resources | Will the initiative encourage sustainable consumption? | % municipal waste landfilled (LAA) | 57.7% (LAA 2009/10) | 68.81% (LAA) |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------|--|--|---|--|---|----------------------------|---|
| | | Will the initiative ensure the sustainable management of waste? | | | Will the initiative promote sustainable production? | No. Businesses involved in envi management systems or accredited green business activities (LAA) | TBC (LAA) | 45 (LAA) |
| | | | | | Will the initiative encourage re-using, recycling and/or recovery? | % municipal waste recycled (LAA) | 31% (LAA 2009/10) | 16.56% (LAA) |
| | | | | | Will the initiative reduce waste generation? | Amount of municipal waste arising and managed by type, and the percentage each management type represents of waste managed. (AMR) | | 2005/6 AMR 05/06 – 71,206 tonnes down 9% on 04/05. Household 86% Commercial 12% Garden 5% Bulky 7% |
| Skills and Behaviour | None | Will the initiative bring intermediate or higher levels skills into the current workforce or develop | | Bring intermediate or higher levels skills into the current workforce or develop | Will the initiative support skills development important to growth for key regional sectors? | Increase number of adults gaining skills for life qualifications (LAA) | 1320 (per yr to 09/10) LAA | 1480 (04/05) LAA |
| | | | | | Will the initiative promote the take up of training and/or further education opportunities? | Increase number of working age adults with level 3 and above qualifications (LAA) | 38.9% (09/10 LAA) | 37.4% (04/05) |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|--|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | Will the initiative promote sustainable living and/or working? | Home working? | | | |
| Transport | To reduce the effect of traffic in the community | Will the initiative reduce the need to travel or the distances needed to travel? | | Reduce the need to travel or the distances needed to travel | Will the initiative reduce traffic congestion and improve safety for all road users? | No. green travel plans | | | |
| | To improve access to/of local services and facilities within and beyond the immediate neighbourhood | | | | Will the initiative encourage walking, cycling and/or travelling by public transport? | Amount of new residential development within 30 mins public transport time of : a GP; a hospital, areas of employment, a primary school, secondary school, and a major retail centre(s) (AMR) | Extent of cycleway/footpath provision | | |
| | | | | | Will the initiative promote sustainable travel and alternatives such as communication infrastructure which supports ideas such as home working? | | | | |
| | Will the initiative reduce unnecessary freight movements? | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

Appendix 3: Scoping Report consultation comments summary

| Section | Respondent | Summary of Comments | Response |
|--|--------------------|---|--|
| Stage 1: Table 2 – National Planning Guidance, Regional and Local Plans | Environment Agency | Reference is made to Draft PPS25, however please note that this is now an adopted document and the word 'draft' should be omitted. | Word 'draft' removed |
| | Natural England | <p>We welcome a comprehensive list of documents and ask that you consider all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation (Natural Habitats & C) Regulations 2006 • Guidance for Local Authorities on Implementing the Biodiversity Duty. (Defra, 2007) • Planning Policy Statement 1 Delivering Sustainable Development; • Planning Policy Statement 7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas; • Planning Policy Statement 9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation; • Planning Policy Statement 9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - A Good Practice Guide; | Some of these documents were already included in the list of relevant plans, policies and programmes. Others are considered to be very specific to biodiversity issues which is a fairly peripheral element of this document and therefore it was felt that only those documents clearly relating to the main themes of this document should be referred to. However, it is agreed that PPS7 and Accessible Natural Green Space Standards in Towns and Cities are both of significant relevance and should be referred to; they are therefore been included. |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Policy Statement 17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation; • Working with the Grain of Nature. A Biodiversity Strategy for England. (2002) Defra. • Biodiversity Indicators in Your Pocket. (2007) Defra. • Rising to the Challenge: A Climate Change Action Plan for England's Northwest (2006) NWDA • Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plan. • Greater Manchester Geodiversity Action Plan. (When published) • Environmental Quality in Spatial Planning – Incorporating the natural, built and historic environment, and rural issues in plans and strategies (2005). Natural England (Countryside Agency/English Nature)/English Heritage/Environment Agency. • Accessible Natural Green Space Standards in Towns and Cities. (2003) Natural England (English Nature) <p>We consider that the last publication quoted would be particularly relevant to this SPD and may provide useful guidance on standards and targets for green space provision proportionate to housing.</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|---|
| Stage 2: Baseline Information | Natural England | We expect to see a comprehensive statement of the particular landscape and biodiversity interests for the borough, and perhaps not dissimilar to that already produced for recent SA Scoping reports such as that for the Biodiversity and Development SPD. | Whilst the Borough characterisation makes reference to biodiversity issues, it is not felt appropriate that a comprehensive statement of these issues is appropriate in the way that it would be for the Biodiversity SPD scoping report, and this part of the scoping report concentrates on issues relating to the quality and quantity of open space in the Borough. |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Appendix 4: Most relevant UDP policies

The most relevant RUDP policies are listed below, the full wording of these policies can be found at:

www.rochdale.gov.uk/environment_and_planning/planning.aspx

- **Policy H/6: Provision of Recreational Open Space in New Housing Development**
Makes the requirement that all developments over 100 bedrooms require on-site recreational open space provision, and all developments under 100 bedrooms have to make a contribution towards off-site provision. Defines categories of children's play areas.
- **Part One Policy G/G/1: Greenspace**
The Council will protect and enhance existing public open space and will provide new open space in accordance with identified standards for formal and informal recreational activities and access to natural and amenity greenspace.
- **Policy G/2: Standards for Recreational Open Space**
The Council will ensure the protection and future provision of recreational open space to meet the minimum standards of 1 hectare of local open space and 1.1 hectares of outdoor sports provision per 1000 population.
- **Policy G/4: New Provision of Local Open Space**
The Council will permit development proposals that increase the quantity and quality of local open space across the Borough, including those that lead to:
 - a) Improvements to existing fixed playground sites to meet the LEAP standard, with some upgraded to NEAP standard;
 - b) New fixed playground sites of LEAP standard in areas that are currently deficient;
 - c) Additional areas of informal recreational open space;
 - d) Improvements to existing areas of informal recreational open space; and
 - e) Increased public access to, and within, areas of local open space.
- **New Provision of Outdoor Sports Facilities**
 - a) The Council will permit development proposals for formal outdoor sports facilities that meet existing and future demand, including those that are part of a wider development scheme or to be implemented through developer contributions.

Appendix 5: Habitats Directive screening opinion

Screening Opinion on the Impact of the Rochdale MBC Biodiversity and Development Supplementary Planning Document on the South Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Special Protection Area (SPA)

November 2007

Prepared by

Derek Richardson MIEEM
Principal Ecologist
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
Ryecroft Hall
Manchester Road
Audenshaw
Manchester
M34 5ZJ

(The SPD is referred to as 'the Plan')

Reference should be made to the need to consider the special interest of the Rochdale Canal when open space provision is required on sites adjacent to the Rochdale Canal.

It is concluded that, providing the mitigation recommended above is implemented, the implementation of a supplementary planning document concerned with the provision of recreational open space in new housing developments in Rochdale Borough will not cause significant harm to the special interests of any European protected sites.

No further screening or assessment under the terms of the European Habitats Directive is therefore considered necessary.

Appendix 6: Location of documentation and comments forms

The consultation period for the SPD and the Draft Sustainability Appraisal is between **17th December 2007 and 28th January 2008**. Comments on the documents can be made by:

- Using the on-line response form
http://www.rochdale.gov.uk/council_and_democracy/consultations.aspx
- E-mailing Strategic.planning@Rochdale.gov.uk giving your name and address
- Writing to Strategic Planning, Floor 2, Telegraph House, Baillie Street, Rochdale, OL16 1JH

The draft Provision of Recreational Open Space in New Housing Supplementary Planning Document, and the Sustainability Appraisal and other documents are available for inspection:

- On the Council's website
http://www.rochdale.gov.uk/council_and_democracy/consultations.aspx
- All the Rochdale Borough Libraries
- At some of the Community Centres
- All Council Information Points
- Planning Reception, Floor 1, Telegraph House, Baillie Street, Rochdale (8.45am-4.45pm)

For more information or a Freepost response form phone Strategic Planning on Tel: 01706 924371 or email Strategic.Planning@rochdale.gov.uk

Comments need to reach us by 28th January 2008