

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Sustainability Group

**Meeting 10
30 March 2008**

Record of Meeting

Attendance

Phil Griffiths	Caerphilly CBC (Countryside)
Dave Lucas	Caerphilly CBC (Forward Planning)
Richard Jones	Countryside Council For Wales
Caroline Drayton	Environment Agency (Wales)
Jim Parry	Glamorgan Gwent Archaeological Trust
Alison Jones	Caerphilly CBC (Ecology)
Gemma Thomas	Caerphilly CBC (Highways)
Steve Martin	Caerphilly CBC (Energy)
Ralph Bourke	Caerphilly CBC (Research)
Heddwyn Evans	Caerphilly CBC (Env Health)
Paul Cooke	Caerphilly CBC (Sustainability)

Apologies

Pat Martin	Caerphilly CBC (Conservation)
Ryan Bowen	Welsh Water
Stanley Evelyn	BT
Alison Palmer	GAVO
Steve Spode	WAG (DET)
Melanie Phillips	Caerphilly CBC (Econ Dev)



REGENERATION

THE LIVING ENVIRONMENT

EDUCATION FOR LIFE

HEALTH SOCIAL CARE & WELL BEING



Outcomes For The Meeting

1. To Agree the changes made to the Strategy element of the LDP as a result of the second assessment
2. To develop understanding of the process of assessment of detailed plan policies

Introduction To Meeting And Update From Last Meeting

Members of the Group were welcomed to the meeting, which was the first of the meetings to take place in the new Penallta House Offices in Tredomen. The Group were advised that the meeting represented the start of the formal assessment process that will lead to the production of the environmental report on the LDP.

Apologies were given for the cancelling of the two meetings in February, which was due to the fact that the Deposit version of the LDP, in particular the policies, was not in a sufficiently robust state to be the subject of assessment at that time. It was confirmed that the policies that will be assessed under this process will be from the 3rd version of the Deposit Plan, to ensure consistency.

29 Consider the amendments included in the Draft LDP in respect of the second assessment of the LDP Strategy

- 29.1 The Group was advised that the results of the reassessment of the LDP strategy, which was undertaken by the group at the 9th meeting, had been forwarded to the officers responsible for drafting the Strategy. The officers had considered the results and the comments and had produced a response to each of the results and comments, identifying where changes had been made to the strategy and where other elements within the main body of the LDP had covered the issues raised. This paper had been forwarded to the group prior to the meeting (document included at Appendix 1).
- 29.2 The Group decided to consider any additional comments they had on this matter and to forward them to the Council at least 3 days before the next meeting for consideration. **The deadline for comments is Monday 7th April.**

30 Introduction To The Detailed Policy Assessment Process

- 30.1 The Group was advised that each policy and proposal of the LDP would need to be assessed against the 76 assessment tests that the group considered and agreed at the 8th meeting. In assessing the detailed policies of the LDP the group were advised that they not only had to consider the potential effects of the implementation of the policy, but also needed to address the following:
 - i The likelihood of the effect taking place;
 - ii How significant the effect will be;
 - iii Whether the effect will be widespread or local in nature;
 - iv Whether the effect will be long lasting or permanent;
 - v Any cumulative, synergistic or secondary effects that may be realised with the implementation of the policy with other policies in the plan; and
 - vi When the effect will take place.
- 30.2 The Group were advised that all the policies and proposals within the LDP would need to be assessed against the detailed assessment tests. Based upon some initial trial assessments undertaken by the council, single tests were taking over an hour to complete and so the task at hand was very extensive and time consuming. Most of the assessments would be undertaken by the council, using a team of assessors that included the SG lead officers, the council's sustainability officer, and relevant members of the LDP team to provide background information.

The Group would have two roles in the process, firstly to assess specific policies/proposals from the LDP and secondly to review and agree the results emanating from the internal assessment group.

- 30.3 The Group was also advised that the assessment they were to undertake was the first formal assessment that had been undertaken on the LDP. As such the council were looking to this assessment to be a benchmark for all of the assessments in how the tests were approached, giving indicators on how some tests were to be interpreted and judged.

31 Assess Strategy Policies

- 31.1 The SG Lead officers had identified 5 policies for the Group to assess. Due to the depth of consideration and debate surrounding many of the issues only one policy, SP 21, was assessed completely by the Group. The assessment for this policy is included as Appendix 2

The meeting closed following completion of the assessment of Policy SP21.

Appendix 1 – Changes to LDP Strategy

Assessment Test	Result	Comment/Mitigation/ Change	Response to changes in Plan
1 Promote reduced resource consumption by residents.	○	More Information required on policies SP25, SP11, SP12, and SP23. Additional information in respect of transport and accessibility	SP25 Replaced with SPIO which provides targets. SP11 Incorporated within place-making policy SP6. SP12 Good design is incorporated within place-making policy SP6 SP23 Covered by SP7, issue of accessibility covered by SP22.
2 Provide a sufficient amount and mix of housing	+	<p>Could be upgraded to +++ with inclusion of SPG (and policy upon which to hang it).</p> <p>Need to address issues such as sheltered housing as well as affordable housing.</p> <p>Policies SP1, SP2, SP3 outline strategy.</p>	<p>SPG policy included in County-wide policy section.</p> <p>Issue of diversifying housing stock is picked up in SP1 but further detail is included in section C of the plan - 'allocations'</p>
3 Provide a wide range of educational opportunities.	×	<p>No objective relating to education Strategy is weak in this whole area. No reference to life-long education, skill straining or education for all.</p>	<p>Difficult for land use planning to influence 'educational opportunities' Policy SP7 relates to planning obligations for schools and ancillary facilities in order to make development acceptable and section C of the plan contains 'allocations' for new schools that are deemed necessary over the plan period. The concept of lifelong learning is ensured by policy SP7 that requests the provision of schools and ancillary facilities in line with development. The reasoned justification for policy SP7 makes reference to lifelong learning facilities.</p>
4 Promote equality of opportunity	+	<p>Transport key to this one, accessibility in respect of social exclusion. More explicit reference required. Considered well for the north, but not in the south of the county borough.</p>	<p>SP21 satisfies assessment test 4 with specific reference to addressing social exclusion throughout the County Borough.</p>
5 Provide for business investment and increase the range of job opportunities.	+	<p>Some omissions mean that it is not higher ranked – Offices in town centres and links to education and skills training would realise a higher result.</p>	<p>SP19 promotes the enhancement of town centres. The reasoned justification for this policy support employment opportunities within town centres.</p> <p>The concept of lifelong learning</p>

Assessment Test		Result		Comment/Mitigation/ Change	Response to changes in Plan
					is ensured by policy SP7 that requests the provision of schools and ancillary facilities in line with development. The reasoned justification for policy SP7 makes reference to lifelong learning facilities.
6	Promote a diverse economy and increase the wealth of residents	+		Again links to education and skill training required for a higher result.	The concept of lifelong learning is ensured by policy SP7 that requests the provision of schools and ancillary facilities in line with development. The reasoned justification for policy SP7 makes reference to lifelong learning facilities.
7	Encourage residents to remain in the County Borough	+		This is linked to the above tests and as their results are general positive this should follow suit.	The Heads of the valleys Regeneration Area experiences the largest out-migration of population and thus the largest net decrease in population. SP1 seeks to maintain the population of the Heads of the Valleys regeneration area.
8	Provide a healthy and safe environment and an improved feeling of well-being for residents.	Health Promotion +	Health Provision ×	Promotion – significant references to providing healthy environments in most areas. Provision – no reference at all in the strategy to any element of health service provision. Needs an objective in relation to health service provision. This is a component of the test and currently lowers the overall result to ×	SP6 promotes healthy and safe environments and is supported by SP13 – Countryside Recreation and SP14 – Development of the Valleys Regional Park, SP15 – Development of a leisure centre within the Heads of the Valleys regeneration area and SP20 – protection of strategic leisure network. In addition section C of the plan allocates land for health service provision.
9	Ensure improvement to air quality	●		Transport strategy element is key to this test as are the details of the Design policy (SP12).	SP6 addresses this assessment test in addition to policy SP22 which promotes development in assessable locations and reduces the need to travel.
10	Protect the landscape and built heritage of the County Borough.	Built ×	Natural ○	No information or reference to the built heritage. Needs reference and policy in strategy and possibly an objective. Policy SP24 needs to address the natural heritage, particularly addressing the landscape of the county borough.	SP12 specifically addresses this assessment test and is supported by SP6.

Assessment Test		Result	Comment/Mitigation/Change	Response to changes in Plan
11	Protect the cultural identity of the County Borough.	✗	No mention of the Welsh language! SP27 Place Making could have a significant role to play in establishing this and policy SP23 needs to be bulked up.	SP6 addresses this assessment test by specifying 'local distinctiveness' this can be interpreted to mean all matters that are local in nature which includes the Welsh language and pockets of Welsh speakers.
12	Ensure the protection of water resources and water quality improved.	○	SP 11 should be split into separate water and energy efficiency parts. The water policy could then address this test.	SP6 addresses this assessment test.
13	Reduce the impact of flooding.	+	SP16 addresses this issue. If the strategy and plan accommodated issues surrounding soil permeability and sustainable drainage systems it would be ++	SP8 addresses this assessment test, the reasoned justification explains that as a general principle the Council will seek to locate development away from the floodplain and will promote sustainable drainage systems. (SUDS)
14	Ensure the effective use of land and soils including the protection of important geological sites.	○	SP17 is relevant. No reference to soils in the strategy SP24 needs to cover geological sites and soils.	SP9 addresses this assessment test in part and is further supported by SP6 which reflects to the promotion of water and soil conservation.
15	Reduce the amount of waste produced and increase the reuse of materials	+	References to promotion of use of secondary aggregates would realise a better response.	SP11 addresses this assessment in conjunction with SP6 which refers to the promotion of water and soil conservation.
16	Conserve the biodiversity of the County Borough	○	Policy SP24 is essential to this test.	SP12 addresses this assessment in addition criterion (i) of policy SP6.
17	Assist in meeting climate change obligations primarily through reducing CO2 production.	○	Strategic policies in respect of transport, SP 25 on renewables and SP12 design are all important in respect of this test.	SP10 and SP22 addresses this assessment in addition to criterion (g) of SP6
18	Reduce the need to travel, particularly by car	○	Transport strategy required for this test.	SP22 and SP4 address this assessment test.
19	Promote the supply and use of renewable energy	○	Policy SP25 required in respect of this test.	SP10 addresses this assessment.

Assessment Test		Result	Comment/Mitigation/ Change	Response to changes in Plan
20	Improve the performance of existing infrastructure	+	No specific references but as an entity the strategy seeks to maximise existing services and infrastructure through land allocations and policy and strategy content.	SP4, criterion A of SP6, SP19 and Sp21 address this assessment test.

Appendix 2 – Policy Assessment – SP21

Policy/Proposal No: SP21		Assessing Officers: Sustainability Group				Date: 20 March 2008		
Assessment Test		Predicted Effect				Comments		
		Nature of Effect	Additional Effects	Assessment of Effect				
				Effect Period				
S/T	M/T	L/T	Analysis Any Mitigation Measures Assumptions					
1	Will it reduce the need to travel?	High Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	✗	✗	✗	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why target Air quality management area specifically Criteria A and C likely to realise reduction Criterion B likely to realise increase Dependant upon allocations 	
2	Will it encourage walking as the mode of travel to local amenities due to the proximity of development to existing services/facilities?	Medium Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy has 2 criteria specifically on it 	
3	Will it promote reduced resource use?	High Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	✗	✗	✗	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact could be reduced through sustainable construction methods and using renewable materials Promotion of sustainable transport 	
4	Will it maximise the production or use of renewable materials?			●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact could be reduced through sustainable construction methods and using renewable materials Promotion of sustainable transport 	
5	Will it help sustain the local community?	Medium Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible question over long term benefits petering out. 	
6	Does it promote a mix of housing types?			●	●	●	•	
7	Does it provide affordable housing?			●	●	●	•	
8	Does it help protect or improve housing stock?		Secondary	●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could realise benefits from secondary effects. 	
9	Will it remove derelict land? (brownfield)		Secondary	●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could realise benefits from secondary effects. 	
10	Will it help promote or sustain educational establishments?		Secondary	●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could realise benefits from secondary effects. 	
11	Will it meet the educational needs of local people?		Secondary	●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could realise benefits from secondary effects. 	
12	Will it enable skills progression?		Secondary	●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could realise benefits from secondary effects. 	
13	Will it increase the levels of participation and attainment in education?			●	●	●	•	
14	Does it help reduce disparities between Southern and Northern Wards?	Medium Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeting the poorer transport infrastructure, prevalent in the north 	
15	Does it consider the needs of vulnerable/minority groups?	Medium Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive effect from targeting areas of need. 	
16	Does it provide equality of access to services?	Medium Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive effect from targeting areas of need. 	
17	Will it provide jobs in accessible locations by all modes?		Secondary	●	●	●	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could realise benefits from secondary effects. 	
18	Will it support the role and function of the settlement within which it is located?	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+++	+++	+++	•	
19	Will it contribute			●	●	●	•	

	towards a balanced range of employment sites?						
20	Is it likely to encourage inward investment?	Medium Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	•
21	Will it promote business start-ups?		Secondary	●	●	●	• Possible positive secondary effects
22	Will it provide a broad range of jobs and employment opportunities?			●	●	●	•
23	Will it promote economic growth particularly in the most deprived areas?	Medium Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	•
24	Will it meet the employment needs of local people?			●	●	●	•
25	Will it provide facilities that will encourage residents to remain in the County Borough?			●	●	●	• Assumption that transport infrastructure itself is not a facility for the context of this test
26	Will The facilities be particularly relevant to young people?			●	●	●	• Assumption that transport infrastructure itself is not a facility for the context of this test
27	Is it likely to maintain a sense of community?			?	?	?	• Will generate positive and negative impacts, although their significance will be dependant upon
28	Does it provide increased accessibility to healthcare?	Medium Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	•
29	Does it encourage active and healthy lifestyles?			?	?	?	• Will generate positive and negative impacts, although their significance will be dependant upon • Making reference to the transport hierarchy of pedestrian/cyclist, then public transport then finally car will clarify.
30	Does it provide increased accessibility to facilities for physical or recreational activities?	Medium Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	•
31	Does it protect quality of life for the residents?	Low Minor Local Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	+	• General positive effects, although localised negative effects may be realised.
32	Will it help reduce health inequalities in the community?			●	●	●	•
33	Will it promote design that discourages crime and helps reduce fear of crime?			●	●	●	•
34	Is it likely to improve air quality within a designated air quality management area?	High Moderate Local Temporary	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+++	+	●	• Criterion D should be split into separate criteria • Positive benefit will be realised when scheme implemented, but may reduce and cease due to increasing traffic over time.
35	Will it maintain or improve local air quality?			?	?	?	• Dependant upon schemes brought forward and how they are designed.
36	Is it likely to increase light pollution?	Medium Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	×	×	×	• Effects can be mitigated by careful detailed design
37	Is it likely to increase noise pollution?	Medium Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	×	×	×	• Effects can be mitigated by careful detailed design
38	Is it likely to increase odour pollution?			●	●	●	•
39	Does it promote high standards of design			●	●	●	• May realise positive benefits dependant upon detailed design.

	that reflect local character and distinctiveness?						
40	Will it maintain or improve landscape quality?	Medium Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	✗	✗	✗	• Effects can be mitigated by careful detailed design
41	Is it likely to adversely affect an area of landscape importance?			●	●	●	• More relevant to allocations than Strategy Policy.
42	Is it likely to adversely affect a building, structure or area of heritage importance?			●	●	●	• More relevant to allocations than Strategy Policy.
43	Will it improve the range and quality of cultural, sporting and leisure facilities?			●	●	●	• More relevant to allocations than Strategy Policy.
44	Will it promote the use of the Welsh language?			●	●	●	•
45	Will it support community development?			●	●	●	•
46	Does it adversely impact on the biological and chemical water quality in water courses in the County Borough?	High Moderate Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	✗	✗	✗	• Effects can be mitigated by careful detailed design
47	Will it minimise the use of water?			●	●	●	• May realise positive benefits dependant upon detailed design.
48	Is it likely to have a detrimental impact on the amount and quality of groundwater resources?	Low Minor Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	✗	✗	✗	• Effects can be mitigated by careful detailed design
49	Is it located outside of an area at risk of flooding			●	●	●	• More relevant to allocations than Strategy Policy.
50	<i>Permeable Surfaces (EAW to suggest wording)</i>	Medium Minor Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	✗	✗	✗	• Effects can be mitigated by careful detailed design
51	Flood Mitigation (EAW to suggest wording)		Secondary	●	●	●	• Potential for secondary adverse effects from providing access to areas of risk.
52	Does it protect high quality agricultural land? (1&2 &3a)			●	●	●	• More relevant to allocations than Strategy Policy.
53	Will it impact locally on recognised site of geological importance?			●	●	●	• More relevant to allocations than Strategy Policy.
54	Will it potentially reduce the amount of derelict, contaminated degraded or underused land?			●	●	●	•
55	Does it promote alternatives to land fill/land raise sites?			●	●	●	• More relevant to allocations than Strategy Policy.
56	Will it promote the use of recycled and secondary materials?			●	●	●	•
57	Will it minimise the			●	●	●	•

	production of waste?						
58	Will it provide facilities for recycling?			●	●	●	• More relevant to allocations than Strategy Policy.
59	Does it protect areas of importance for biodiversity?			●	●	●	• More relevant to allocations than Strategy Policy.
60	Will it provide opportunities for new habitat creation or habitat enhancement?			○	○	○	• Dependant upon the detailed design of schemes and the nature of the improvement
61	Does it protect woodlands, hedgerows, trees and watercourses?			●	●	●	•
62	Will it provide the opportunity for the reduction of invasive plant species?			●	●	●	•
63	Does it guard against habitat fragmentation?	Medium Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	✗	✗	✗	• Effects can be mitigated by careful detailed design
64	Will it minimise greenhouse gas emissions?	High Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	✗✗	✗✗	✗✗	• Assumed increased movements (from AT1) leads to increased emissions. • Reference to the transport hierarchy of walking/cycling, then public transport, then finally the car could reduce the potential negative effect..
65	Will it promote reduced journey length by private vehicles?	Medium Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	✗	✗	✗	• Needs to make reference to the transport hierarchy of walking/cycling, then public transport, then finally the car.
66	Will it allow for carbon offsetting?			●	●	●	• May realise positive benefits dependant upon detailed design.
67	Can it provide for habitat routes to allow other species to adapt to the changing environment?	Medium Major Countywide Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	✗	✗	✗	• There is potential to offset some of the adverse effects as part of detailed design.
68	Does it promote the use of alternative travel other than the car?			?	?	?	• Reference to transport hierarchy of promoting walking/cycling, then public transport then finally the car, would realise a positive result.
69	Will it deliver services and facilities in locations accessible by modes other than the car?			●	●	●	•
70	Does it provide safe routes for walking and cycling?			?	?	?	• Reference to transport hierarchy of promoting walking/cycling, then public transport then finally the car, would realise a positive result.
71	Will it reduce congestion through the development and improvement of the strategic transport infrastructure	Low Moderate Local Temporary	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+	+	●	• Reality could be the opposite if inappropriate schemes are implemented.
72	Will it improve communities through the development and improvement of the strategic transport infrastructure	Medium Major Local Permanent	Cumulative Synergistic Secondary	+++	+++	+++	•
73	Does it facilitate the generation of energy from renewable sources?			●	●	●	• May realise positive benefits dependant upon detailed design incorporating renewable energy within the design (e.g. solar powered lighting).
74	Does it encourage the use of energy from renewable sources?			●	●	●	•
75	Does it facilitate the supply of renewable energy to the national grid?			●	●	●	•
76	Does it encourage energy efficiency?			●	●	●	• May realise positive benefits dependant upon detailed design incorporating renewable energy within the design (e.g. solar powered lighting).

Comment

The natural assumption for a policy that seeks to improve transport infrastructure for accessibility to services and facilities is that it will inevitably lead to an increase in both the need to travel and the use of the car. In respect of the issue of increasing the need to travel it is only natural for a policy aimed at targeting social exclusion to increase the need to travel, as it opens up opportunities to reach facilities and services that previously were not accessible to some. However the mode of travel chosen (as and when additional travel takes place) is key for this policy. Improvements need to be targeted in accordance with the County Wide Policy SD2 which identifies a transport mode hierarchy (modal hierarchy). The policy or Reasoned Justification to the policy needs to make clear reference to this issue.

The major issue regarding this policy is that the level traffic is predicted to grow throughout the plan period. This will have a major “watering-down” effect of any positive effect that may be realised through the policy over the plan period, and a possible increasing effect on any negative effects. Unfortunately it is not within the powers of the LDP to reverse the predicted increases in traffic levels (it is likely only fiscal intervention by government could realise this), the LDP can only seek to “slow-down” the increase to below that which is currently predicted. As such a number results have shown declining positive effects over time that, if traffic levels remained constant would remain the same.

Changes to the Policy as a result of the assessment

The reasoned Justification to the policy be amended to include reference to providing improvements in accordance with the modal hierarchy.

Definitions for Assessment of Effects

Likelihood	Low	There is only a limited chance of the effect taking place, possibly dependant upon certain circumstances being prevalent.
	Medium	The effect has potential for taking place but is not an absolute certainty. Some factors may lead to the effect not being realised.
	High	The effect will almost certainly be realised, except if some exceptional circumstances prevent it.
Significance	Minor	The impact of the effect is light and having the least amount of impact. Such effects are unlikely to have significant cumulative or synergistic effects
	<i>Moderate</i>	<i>The effect is notable and will have an noticeable impact. Cumulative impacts are probable and synergistic impacts are possible.</i>
	<i>Major</i>	<i>The effect is clear and the impacts are significant and possibly severe. Both cumulative and synergistic impacts are likely, as are secondary impacts.</i>
Geography	County	The effect is general to the county borough, being exhibited throughout the county borough or the effect itself is county borough wide.
	Local	The effects are localised, either to a small area of to a specific site.
Duration	Temporary	The effect will occur but will either reduce below a significant level or be removed over time. This should be reflected in the long, medium and short term assessment boxes.
	Permanent	The effect will not reduce or disappear over time. The effect should be reflected in the long, medium and short term boxes – being present in all.
Cumulative	Where the policy being assessed will have a combined effect that would lead to a greater effect than the policy/proposal would realise on its own. You only have to note if there would be a cumulative impact for the policy, not specifically identify the other policies.	
Synergistic	This is where two or more policies work together to produce an effect that is greater than the added effects of the policies. Again this would only be the identification of the presence of such an effect, not the identification of specific policies.	
Secondary	Where the primary effect, either on its own, or in conjunction with other elements of the plan, create a second effect.	
Effect Period	S/T	An effect that will only last a short period during the plan period.
	M/T	An effect that will last longer than one 5 year period of the plan.
	L/T	An effect that will last through into the last through the plan period and beyond.

Responses to Tests

Response	Additional Information	
<p> The Policy/Proposal will realise significant negative impacts that could undermine the environmental and/or Sustainability integrity of the Plan. Mitigation is likely to only reduce the negative effects.</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>	<p>Negatives need to be balanced by positives</p> <p>Other aspects that could be introduced to relieve the worst effects.</p>
<p> The Policy/Proposal delivers negative impacts which require mitigation or amendment</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>	<p>Mitigation to reduce or remove the negative effects and balance with positives.</p> <p>Changes that could be made to the strategy to make the strategy more acceptable</p>
<p> The Policy/Proposal has little or no anticipated impact, either positive or negative.</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>	<p>None necessary</p> <p>None (unless measures to make the strategy more acceptable)</p>
<p> Impacts are anticipated, but more detailed information (possibly outside the remit of the LDP – e.g. detailed proposal design) would be required to identify the level and nature of the impacts.</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>	<p>What additional information would be required.</p> <p>(None – unless negative impacts can be identified.)</p>
<p> The Policy/Proposal could result in positive or negative impacts dependant upon how it is implemented.</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>	<p>What is not clear</p> <p>For possible negative impacts</p>
<p> The Policy/Proposal has the potential to realise significant positive environmental and/or sustainable effects.</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>	<p>None unless desired</p> <p>None unless action to make the effect more positive</p>
<p> The Policy/Proposal will definitely realise significant positive environmental and/or sustainable effects.</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Mitigation:</p>	<p>None unless desired</p> <p>None unless desired</p>