

**ADDENDUM SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE PROPOSED TOWN CENTRE BOUNDARY
CHANGES PROPOSED BY THE BROXTOWE BOROUGH COUNCIL PART 2 LOCAL PLAN FOR
BEESTON, EASTWOOD, KIMBERLEY AND STAPLEFORD.**

Broxtowe Borough Council

Updated November 2018

Version 3

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL – ‘Updating and Contracting the Boundary of Beeston Town Centre’ Option

															Very major/important positive
															Major positive
															Moderate to major positive
															Moderate positive
															Minor positive
1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure	7. Environment and Landscape	8. Natural Resources & flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure	? = unknown impact No fill = negligible impact or not relevant	
															Minor negative
															Moderate negative
															Moderate to major negative
															Major negative
															Very major/important negative

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Updating and contracting the size of Beeston town centre may free-up sites on the periphery of the town centre for housing.	
2. Health	Reducing the town centre boundary for Beeston is unlikely to have any significant impact upon the Health Objective. In the case of Beeston, either option would score well for 'Health'.	
3. Heritage	Concentrating the focus of the town centre upon a slightly reduced area may increase the likelihood that buildings of architectural merit (both designated and non-designated heritage assets) will be better utilised and protected.	
4. Crime	Focusing upon a slightly reduced town centre boundary and allowing sites on the periphery to be re-developed for housing may have a minor impact upon the 'Crime' Objective, as derelict or poor-maintained properties or areas can attract vandalism and anti-social behaviour.	
5. Social	Both options score well in the case of Beeston.	
6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure	No relevance to either option.	
7. Environment Landscape	No relevance to either option.	
8. Natural Resources & Flooding	It could be argued that the more efficient use of town centres will reduce the need to develop sites in less sustainable locations, such as within the countryside / Green Belt.	
9. Waste	No significant impact in relation to either option.	
10. Energy & Climate Change	More efficient use of buildings within the town centre may have a marginal impact upon energy consumption.	
11. Transport	A more focused town centre may have a marginal positive impact upon the Transport Objective, as it may be slightly easier to navigate the town centre by foot and public transport options may be located very slightly closer to the main retail area of the centre.	

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
12. Employment	There is the potential for contracted town centre boundaries to slightly reduce the amount of town centre-related employment within the centre.	This could be mitigated through the more efficient use of existing properties, including upper floors which may currently be underutilised.
13. Innovation	Schemes (such as incubation space in Beeston town centre) will continue to be developed, irrespective of the proposed boundary changes.	
14. Economic Structure	Reducing the town centre boundary could slightly reduce the choice of available sites for some town centre uses.	Continual monitoring of town centre sites and uses. Flexibility to review the situation, possibly through an SPD if required. Policy encouragement in this Local Plan for use of upper floors.

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Schemes in and around the town centre, such as the former Beeston Police Station site, will still continue to be delivered; slightly fewer sites may however be available for residential use.	
2. Health	Reducing the town centre boundary for Beeston is unlikely to have any significant impact upon the Health Objective. In the case of Beeston, either option would score well for 'Health'.	
3. Heritage	Concentrating the focus of the town centre upon a slightly reduced area may increase the likelihood that buildings of architectural merit (both designated and non-designated heritage assets) will be better utilised and protected.	
4. Crime	Focusing upon a slightly reduced town centre boundary and allowing sites on the periphery to be re-developed for housing may have a minor impact upon the 'Crime' Objective, as derelict or poor-maintained properties or areas can attract vandalism and anti-social behaviour.	
5. Social	Both options score well in the case of Beeston.	
6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure	No relevance to either option.	
7. Environment Landscape	No relevance to either option.	
8. Natural Resources & Flooding	It could be argued that the less efficient use of town centres will increase the need to develop sites in less sustainable locations, such as within the countryside / Green Belt.	
9. Waste	No significant impact in relation to either option.	
10. Energy & Climate Change	Less efficient use of buildings within the town centre may have a marginal negative impact upon energy consumption.	

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
11. Transport	A less focused town centre may have a marginal negative impact upon the Transport Objective, as it may be slightly more difficult to navigate the town centre by foot / public transport options may be very slightly further away from the main retail area of the centre.	
12. Employment	The existing town centre boundaries may potentially provide more town centre-related employment opportunities.	
13. Innovation	Schemes (such as incubation space in Beeston town centre) will continue to be developed, irrespective of the proposed boundary changes.	
14. Economic Structure	Retaining the existing town centre boundary will maintain the existing supply of available sites for some town centre uses.	

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL – ‘Updating and Contracting the Boundary of Eastwood District Centre’ Option

															Very major/important positive
															Major positive
															Moderate to major positive
															Moderate positive
															Minor positive
1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure	7. Environment and Landscape	8. Natural Resources & flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure	? = unknown impact No fill = negligible impact or not relevant	
															Minor negative
															Moderate negative
															Moderate to major negative
															Major negative
															Very major/important negative

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Contracting the size of Eastwood district centre may free-up sites on the periphery of the district centre for housing.	
2. Health	Reducing the district centre boundary for Eastwood is unlikely to have any significant impact upon the Health Objective.	
3. Heritage	Concentrating the focus of the district centre upon a slightly reduced area may increase the likelihood that buildings of architectural merit (both designated and non-designated heritage assets) will be better utilised and protected.	
4. Crime	Focusing upon a slightly reduced district centre boundary and allowing sites on the periphery to be re-developed for housing may have a minor impact upon the 'Crime' Objective, as derelict or poor-maintained properties or areas can attract vandalism and anti-social behaviour.	
5. Social	There may be a slightly positive impact upon the 'Social' Objective, as this district centre is more in need of intervention than some of the others. Without this intervention, the Social function of the centre is more likely to be undermined.	
6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure	No relevance to either option.	
7. Environment Landscape	No relevance to either option.	
8. Natural Resources & Flooding	It could be argued that the more efficient use of district centres will reduce the need to develop sites in less sustainable locations, such as within the countryside / Green Belt.	
9. Waste	No significant impact in relation to either option.	
10. Energy & Climate Change	More efficient use of buildings within the district centre may have a marginal impact upon energy consumption.	

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
11. Transport	A more focused district centre may have a marginal positive impact upon the Transport Objective, as it may be slightly easier to navigate the district centre by foot and public transport options may be very slightly closer to the main retail area of the centre.	
12. Employment	There is the potential for reduced a district centre boundary to slightly reduce the amount of town centre-related employment within the district centre.	This can be mitigated through the more efficient use of existing properties, including upper floors which may currently be underutilised.
13. Innovation	Schemes will continue to be developed, irrespective of the proposed boundary changes.	
14. Economic Structure	Reducing the district centre boundary could slightly reduce the choice of available sites for some district centre uses.	Continual monitoring of town centre sites and uses. Flexibility to review the situation, possibly through an SPD if required. Policy encouragement in this Local Plan for use of upper floors.

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL – ‘Retaining the Existing Boundary of Eastwood District Centre’ Option

															Very major/important positive
															Major positive
															Moderate to major positive
															Moderate positive
															Minor positive
															?
															? = unknown impact
															No fill = negligible impact or not relevant
															Minor negative
															Moderate negative
															Moderate to major negative
															Major negative
															Very major/important negative
1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure	7. Environment and Landscape	8. Natural Resources & flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure		

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Schemes in and around the district centre will still continue to be delivered; slightly fewer sites will however be available for residential use.	
2. Health	Reducing the district centre boundary is unlikely to have any significant impact upon the Health Objective. In the case of Eastwood, either option would score well for 'Health'.	
3. Heritage	Concentrating the focus of the district centre upon a slightly reduced area may increase the likelihood that buildings of architectural merit (both designated and non-designated heritage assets) will be better utilised and protected.	
4. Crime	Focusing upon a slightly reduced district centre boundary and allowing sites on the periphery to be re-developed for housing may have a minor impact upon the 'Crime' Objective, as derelict or poor-maintained properties or areas can attract vandalism and anti-social behaviour.	
5. Social	There may be a slightly negative impact upon the 'Social' Objective, as this district centre is more in need of intervention than some of the others. Without this intervention, the Social function of the centre is more likely to be undermined.	
6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure	No relevance to either option.	
7. Environment Landscape	No relevance to either option.	
8. Natural Resources & Flooding	It could be argued that the less efficient use of district centres will increase the need to develop sites in less sustainable locations, such as within the countryside / Green Belt.	
9. Waste	No significant impact in relation to either option.	

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
10. Energy & Climate Change	Less efficient use of buildings within the district centre may have a marginal negative impact upon energy consumption.	
11. Transport	A less focused district centre may have a marginal negative impact upon the Transport Objective, as it may be slightly more difficult to navigate the district centre by foot and public transport options may be located very slightly further away from the main retail area of the centre.	
12. Employment	The existing district centre boundaries may potentially provide more town centre-related employment opportunities.	
13. Innovation	Schemes will continue to be developed, irrespective of the proposed boundary changes.	
14. Economic Structure	Retaining the existing district centre boundary will maintain the existing supply of available sites for some town centre uses.	

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL – ‘Updating and Contracting the Boundary of Kimberley District Centre’ Option

															Very major/important positive
															Major positive
															Moderate to major positive
															Moderate positive
															Minor positive
1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure	7. Environment and Landscape	8. Natural Resources & flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure	? = unknown impact No fill = negligible impact or not relevant	
															Minor negative
															Moderate negative
															Moderate to major negative
															Major negative
															Very major/important negative

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Contracting the size of Kimberley district centre may free-up sites on the periphery of the district centre for housing.	
2. Health	Reducing the district centre boundary for Kimberley is unlikely to have any significant impact upon the Health Objective.	
3. Heritage	Concentrating the focus of the district centre upon a slightly reduced area may increase the likelihood that buildings of architectural merit (both designated and non-designated heritage assets) will be better utilised and protected.	
4. Crime	Focusing upon a slightly reduced district centre boundary and allowing sites on the periphery to be re-developed for housing may have a minor impact upon the 'Crime' Objective, as derelict or poor-maintained properties or areas can attract vandalism and anti-social behaviour.	
5. Social	Both options score well in the case of Kimberley.	
6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure	No relevance to either option.	
7. Environment Landscape	No relevance to either option.	
8. Natural Resources & Flooding	It could be argued that the more efficient use of district centres will reduce the need to develop sites in less sustainable locations, such as within the countryside / Green Belt.	
9. Waste	No significant impact in relation to either option.	
10. Energy & Climate Change	More efficient use of buildings within the district centre may have a marginal impact upon energy consumption.	
11. Transport	A more focused district centre may have a marginal positive impact upon the Transport Objective, as it may be slightly easier to navigate the district centre by foot and public transport options may be located very slightly closer to the main retail area of the centre.	

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
12. Employment	There is the potential for reduced district centre boundaries to slightly reduce the amount of town centre-related employment within the district centre.	This can be mitigated through the more efficient use of existing properties, including upper floors which may currently be underutilised.
13. Innovation	Schemes will continue to be developed, irrespective of the proposed boundary changes.	
14. Economic Structure	Reducing the district centre boundary could slightly reduce the choice of available sites for some district centre uses.	Continual monitoring of town centre sites and uses. Flexibility to review the situation, possibly through an SPD if required. Policy encouragement in this Local Plan for use of upper floors.

**SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL – ‘Retaining the Existing Boundary of Kimberley District Centre’
Option**

																Very major/important positive
																Major positive
																Moderate to major positive
																Moderate positive
																Minor positive
																?
																? = unknown impact
																No fill = negligible impact or not relevant
																Minor negative
																Moderate negative
																Moderate to major negative
																Major negative
																Very major/important negative
1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure	7. Environment and Landscape	8. Natural Resources & flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure			

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Schemes in and around the district centre will still continue to be delivered; slightly fewer sites may however be available for residential use.	
2. Health	Reducing the district centre boundary is unlikely to have any significant impact upon the Health Objective. In the case of Kimberley, either option would score well for 'Health'.	
3. Heritage	Concentrating the focus of the district centre upon a slightly reduced area may increase the likelihood that buildings of architectural merit (both designated and non-designated heritage assets) will be better utilised and protected.	
4. Crime	Focusing upon a slightly reduced district centre boundary and allowing sites on the periphery to be re-developed for housing may have a minor impact upon the 'Crime' Objective, as derelict or poor-maintained properties or areas can attract vandalism and anti-social behaviour. This will however be marginal in the case of Kimberley.	
5. Social	Both options score well in the case of Kimberley.	
6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure	No relevance to either option.	
7. Environment Landscape	No relevance to either option.	
8. Natural Resources & Flooding	It could be argued that the less efficient use of district centres will increase the need to develop sites in less sustainable locations, such as within the countryside / Green Belt. This will however be marginal in the case of Kimberley.	
9. Waste	No significant impact in relation to either option.	

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
10. Energy & Climate Change	Less efficient use of buildings within the district centre may have a marginal negative impact upon energy consumption.	
11. Transport	A less focused district centre may have a marginal negative impact upon the Transport Objective, as it may be slightly more difficult to navigate the district centre by foot and public transport options may be located very slightly further away from the main retail area of the centre.	
12. Employment	The existing district centre boundaries may potentially provide more town centre-related employment opportunities.	
13. Innovation	Schemes will continue to be developed, irrespective of the proposed boundary changes.	
14. Economic Structure	Retaining the existing district centre boundary will maintain the existing supply of available sites for some district centre uses.	

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL – ‘Updating and Contracting the Boundary of Stapleford District Centre’ Option

															Very major/important positive
															Major positive
															Moderate to major positive
															Moderate positive
															Minor positive
1. Housing	2. Health	3. Heritage	4. Crime	5. Social	6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure	7. Environment and Landscape	8. Natural Resources & flooding	9. Waste	10. Energy	11. Transport	12. Employment	13. Innovation	14. Economic Structure	? = unknown impact No fill = negligible impact or not relevant	
															Minor negative
															Moderate negative
															Moderate to major negative
															Major negative
															Very major/important negative

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Contracting the size of Stapleford district centre may free-up sites on the periphery of the district centre for housing.	
2. Health	Reducing the district centre boundary for Stapleford is unlikely to have any significant impact upon the Health Objective.	
3. Heritage	Concentrating the focus of the district centre upon a slightly reduced area may increase the likelihood that buildings of architectural merit (both designated and non-designated heritage assets) will be better utilised and protected.	
4. Crime	Focusing upon a slightly reduced district centre boundary and allowing sites on the periphery to be re-developed for housing may have a minor impact upon the 'Crime' Objective, as derelict or poor-maintained properties or areas can attract vandalism and anti-social behaviour.	
5. Social	There may be a slightly positive impact upon the 'Social' Objective, as this district centre is more in need of intervention than some of the others. Without this intervention, the Social function of the centre is more likely to be undermined.	
6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure	No relevance to either option.	
7. Environment Landscape	No relevance to either option.	
8. Natural Resources & Flooding	It could be argued that the more efficient use of district centres will reduce the need to develop sites in less sustainable locations, such as within the countryside / Green Belt.	
9. Waste	No significant impact in relation to either option.	
10. Energy & Climate Change	More efficient use of buildings within the district centre may have a marginal impact upon energy consumption.	

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
11. Transport	A more focused district centre may have a marginal positive impact upon the Transport Objective, as it may be slightly easier to navigate the district centre by foot and public transport options may be located very slightly closer to the main retail area of the centre.	
12. Employment	There is the potential for reduced district centre boundaries to slightly reduce the amount of town centre-related employment within the district centre.	This can be mitigated through the more efficient use of existing properties, including upper floors which may currently be underutilised.
13. Innovation	Schemes will continue to be developed, irrespective of the proposed boundary changes.	
14. Economic Structure	Reducing the district centre boundary could slightly reduce the choice of available sites for some district centre uses.	Continual monitoring of town centre sites and uses. Flexibility to review the situation, possibly through an SPD if required. Policy encouragement in this Local Plan for use of upper floors.

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
1. Housing	Schemes in and around the district centre will still continue to be delivered; slightly fewer sites will however be available for residential use.	
2. Health	Reducing the district centre boundary is unlikely to have any significant impact upon the Health Objective. In the case of Stapleford, either option would score well for 'Health'.	
3. Heritage	Concentrating the focus of the district centre upon a slightly reduced area may increase the likelihood that buildings of architectural merit (both designated and non-designated heritage assets) will be better utilised and protected.	
4. Crime	Focusing upon a slightly reduced district centre boundary and allowing sites on the periphery to be re-developed for housing may have a minor impact upon the 'Crime' Objective, as derelict or poor-maintained properties or areas can attract vandalism and anti-social behaviour.	
5. Social	There may be a slightly negative impact upon the 'Social' Objective, as this district centre is more in need of intervention than some of the others. Without this intervention, the Social function of the centre is more likely to be undermined.	
6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure	No relevance to either option.	
7. Environment Landscape	No relevance to either option.	
8. Natural Resources & Flooding	It could be argued that the less efficient use of district centres will increase the need to develop sites in less sustainable locations, such as within the countryside / Green Belt.	
9. Waste	No significant impact in relation to either option.	
10. Energy & Climate Change	Less efficient use of buildings within the district centre may have a marginal negative	

SA Objectives	Comments	Ideas for mitigation
	impact upon energy consumption.	
11. Transport	A less focused district centre may have a marginal negative impact upon the Transport Objective, as it may be slightly more difficult to navigate the district centre by foot and public transport options may be located very slightly further away from the main retail area of the centre.	
12. Employment	The existing district centre boundaries may potentially provide more town centre-related employment opportunities.	
13. Innovation	Schemes will continue to be developed, irrespective of the proposed boundary changes.	
14. Economic Structure	Retaining the existing district centre boundary will maintain the existing supply of available sites for some district centre uses.	

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This additional Sustainability Appraisal Addendum has found that the option of slightly updating and contracting the town centre boundary of Beeston and the district centre boundaries of Eastwood, Kimberley and Stapleford scores slightly better overall than the option of retaining all of the town and district centre boundaries as they are currently, as per the 2004 adopted Local Plan Proposals Map. Many of the SA score differences are however marginal.

This SA concludes, in relation to the option of amending the town and district centre boundaries, that there is a minor positive effect upon the Housing, Heritage, Crime and Natural Resources & Flooding Objectives. In addition, there is a minor positive effect upon the Social Objective in the cases of Eastwood and Stapleford. The only potential minor negative effects of the option of amending the boundaries would be on the Employment and Economic Structure Objectives, as a result of potentially fewer acceptable locations for town centre-related development to take place and potentially fewer employment opportunities. However, it is considered that these effects will be mitigated through the implementation of other Policies within the Part 2 Local Plan, such as Policy 10, through the more intensive use of existing buildings within the town and district centres, including upper floors.

Updated: November 2018