



# Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal for Welwyn Hatfield Local Plan September 2021

**Final report**

Prepared by LUC

September 2021

**Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal for  
Welwyn Hatfield Local Plan  
September 2021**

Version	Status	Prepared	Checked	Approved	Date
1.	Draft for Client Comment	K. Kaczor S. Smith	S. Smith H. Kent	H. Kent	11.08.2021
2.	Final for Committee	S. Smith	H. Kent	H. Kent	20.09.2021

Bristol  
Edinburgh  
Glasgow  
London  
Manchester  
  
landuse.co.uk

Land Use Consultants Ltd  
Registered in England  
Registered number 2549296  
Registered office:  
250 Waterloo Road  
London SE1 8RD  
  
100% recycled paper

Landscape Design  
Strategic Planning & Assessment  
Development Planning  
Urban Design & Masterplanning  
Environmental Impact Assessment  
Landscape Planning & Assessment  
Landscape Management  
Ecology  
Historic Environment  
GIS & Visualisation



FS566056



EMS566057



OHS627041



# Contents

<b>Chapter 1</b>			
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Appendix B</b>	
		<b>Appraisal Matrices for Additional Site Options</b>	<b>B-1</b>
<b>Chapter 2</b>		Land at 2 New Road – Dig1	B-1
<b>Methodology</b>	<b>3</b>	Land to the east of Danesbury Park Road –OMH6	B-4
<b>Chapter 3</b>			
<b>Assessment of New Site Options</b>	<b>5</b>		
Overview	5		
Summary of SA Findings	5		
Sites now considered to be unsound	6		
<b>Chapter 4</b>			
<b>Appraisal of Previously Assessed Sites</b>	<b>9</b>		
Overview	9		
<b>Chapter 5</b>			
<b>Assessment of Alternative Strategic Options for Growth</b>	<b>11</b>		
Overview	11		
Developing Strategic Growth Options	11		
SA Findings for Strategic Growth Options	14		
Reasons for Selection of Preferred Option	14		
<b>Chapter 6</b>			
<b>Summary and Conclusions</b>	<b>24</b>		
Overview	24		
Additional Sites	24		
Reassessment of Previously Assessed sites	24		
Strategic Growth Options	24		
Cumulative Effects	25		
<b>Appendix A</b>			
<b>Updated SA Framework and Assumptions</b>	<b>A-1</b>		
Housing	2		

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

**1.1** A Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report was prepared by LUC as part of the integrated Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Welwyn Hatfield Proposed Submission Local Plan 2016. The version of the SA submitted alongside the Local Plan for Examination is the Welwyn Hatfield Proposed Submission Local Plan 2016 Sustainability Appraisal (August 2016) (Submission document SUB/6). An Errata Sheet (Submission document SUB/7) was published in April 2017 to correct some minor errors in the SA Report.

**1.2** The Proposed Submission Local Plan and accompanying SA Report were subject to consultation from August 2016 until October 2016 and the Local Plan, supporting evidence and consultation responses were submitted for Examination in May 2017.

**1.3** An SA Addendum (examination document EX200) was prepared in February 2020, which included:

- an assessment of additional reasonable alternative site options identified through the 2019 call for sites.
- An assessment of alternative strategic options for growth, identified by the Council.
- A summary of the implications of updates to the evidence base (Green Belt Study, Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)) on the existing Local Plan allocated sites and their reasonable alternatives in terms of SA.
- A summary of how the proposed changes to the Local Plan would affect the SA results reported in 2016.

**1.4** This document should be read in conjunction with the previous SA work listed above.

**1.5** Following the Stage 9 Hearings, the Inspector advised that the proposed Local Plan should be updated to provide for at least an additional 3,200 homes to meet the full objectively assessed housing need (FOAHN) of 15,200 homes over the plan period. In addition, one new site option has been identified (Dig1: Land at 2 New Road) and one site option is now considered to be a reasonable alternative (OMH6: Land to the east of Danesbury Park).

**1.6** This document has three main functions:

## Chapter 1

### Introduction

Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal for Welwyn Hatfield Local Plan  
Plan  
September 2021

- To present an assessment of two additional reasonable alternative site options.
- To summarise the implications of the updated FOAHN for site assessments presented in previous iterations of the SA.
- To assess two alternative strategic options for growth identified by the Council to meet the updated FOAHN.

**1.7** A further iteration of the SA will be produced to assess any implications of the Main Modifications to the Proposed Submission Local Plan recommended by the Planning Inspector.

## Chapter 2 Methodology

**2.1** The assessments presented in this document are broadly consistent with the methodology for previous iterations of the SA. As set out in the August 2016 SA Report, each site option was assessed against six SA objectives, each with sub-objectives, which together formed the SA framework.

**2.2** The 2020 SA Addendum updated the assumptions to guide site appraisals slightly to account for updated landscape and Green Belt evidence, as well as an updated housing number (included in Appendix 2 of the 2016 SA Report). The majority of the assumptions remain as presented in the 2020 SA Addendum with the exception of the assumptions for SA objective 5.1 (meeting needs for housing), which have been updated to reflect an updated housing target. These changes have been applied in the assessment of additional sites and all site assessments included in the 2016 SA Report have been revisited with regards to these SA objectives (see **Chapter 4**).

**2.3** The updated SA framework and assumptions for assessing housing allocation options are presented in **Appendix A**, showing deleted text in ~~strike through~~ and additional text underlined. The SA uses colour-coded scores to indicate the performance of each site option against each SA objective. **Figure 2.1** shows how these scores were applied to the appraisals.

Figure 2.1: Key to symbols and colour coding used in the SA of the Local Plan

++	Significant positive effect likely
+	Minor positive effect likely
0	Negligible effect likely
-	Minor negative effect likely
--	Significant negative effect likely
+/-	Mixed effect likely <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> There may be a need to distinguish further between mixed effects which will be addressed in the appraisals

?	Likely effect uncertain
N/A	Policy is not relevant to SA objective

# Chapter 3

## Assessment of New Site Options

### Overview

**3.1** This chapter presents the assessment of two additional site options. These are as follows:

- **Dig1:** This site is located at Digswell and could provide between 25 and 130 dwellings. As 130 dwellings is less than 1% of the housing need, the assessment results in relation to criterion 5.1 would not differ if 25 dwellings or 130 dwellings were delivered at this site.
- **OMH6:** This site is located at Oaklands and Mardley Heath and could provide up to 25 dwellings, in conjunction with OMH9. It was previously not considered to be a reasonable alternative due to a lack of access, but an adjacent landowner has agreed access could be provided.

**3.2** **Table 3.1** summarises the likely effects identified for these sites. A summary of the SA findings is presented below, with the full assessment matrices presented in **Appendix B** of this document.

### Summary of SA Findings

#### Dig1

##### SA findings – social objectives (1.1, 1.2, 5.1)

**3.3** **Dig1** is considered to have a minor positive effect on health as the site is within walking distance of community and employment facilities such as schools, employment area and playing fields.

**3.4** The site is expected to have a negligible effect on the amount of housing (SA objective 5.1) as it would contribute less than 1% of the Borough's housing need (this is the case regardless of whether developed for 25 dwellings or 130 dwellings). The site is expected to have a significant positive effect on affordable housing and dwellings for older people.

##### SA findings – environmental SA objectives (2.2, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.8, 4.10)

**3.5** The site is assessed as having a negligible effect on SA objective 2.2 (flood risk) as it is not within Flood Zones 2 or 3.

**3.6** The site is assessed as having a significant positive effect on SA objective 4.2 (reducing greenhouse gas



emissions) and 4.3 (avoid and reduce air pollution), as it is located within 400m of a bus stop with at least a six day a week service. The site is also considered to have a significant positive effect in regard to its distance to an employment site.

**3.7** The site is assessed as having negligible effects on SA objective 4.4 (open space), as none of the site is located within existing open space. The site is expected to have a minor negative uncertain effect on landscape character, as the site has a moderate landscape sensitivity.

**3.8** In relation to the SA objective 4.5 (conserve and enhance Borough's character) the site is expected to have significant negative uncertain effects as it is located adjacent to a Registered Park and Garden and within close proximity to a number of listed buildings.

**3.9** The site is expected to have a minor negative effect in relation to SA objectives 4.6 (biodiversity), 4.8 (avoid water pollution), and 4.10 (productive agricultural land and previously developed land) due to the presence of sensitive features.

#### SA findings – economic SA objectives (6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6)

**3.10 Dig1** is expected to have negligible effects on SA objective 6.1 (business and employment), 6.3 (vitality of town centres) and 6.5 (mineral resources). Assessments of the SA objectives 6.2 (business and employment) and 6.4 (sustain rural communities) were not carried out for this site as they only relate to provision of employment land. A significant positive uncertain effect is identified for SA objective 6.6 (learning and skills) as the site is within a walking distance of local educational facilities.

#### OMH6

#### SA findings – social objectives (1.1, 1.2, 5.1)

**3.11 OMH6** is considered to have a minor positive effect on health as the site is within walking distance of community facilities.

**3.12** The site is expected to have a negligible effect on the amount of housing as it will contribute to the Borough's overall housing need by less than 1%. The site is expected to have a significant positive effect on affordable housing and dwellings for older people.

#### SA findings – environmental SA objectives (2.2, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.8, 4.10)

**3.13** The site is assessed as having a negligible effect on SA objective 4.2 (reducing greenhouse gas emissions) and 4.3 (avoid and reduce air pollution), as it is not located within

400m of a bus stop with a six day a week service and is further than 1400m from the nearest employment site.

**3.14** In relation to SA objective 4.4 (open space), the site is considered to have a negligible effect as none of the site is located within existing open space. The site is expected to have a minor negative uncertain effect on landscape character, as the site has a moderate landscape sensitivity.

**3.15** In relation to the SA objective 4.5 (conserve and enhance Borough's character) the site is expected to have minor negative uncertain effects as it is located within 250m - 1,000m of a Conservation Area and a number of listed buildings. **OMH6** is expected to have significant negative effects in relation to SA objective 4.6 (biodiversity) as it is within 250m of a local wildlife site and a local nature reserve. The site is expected to have a negligible effect in relation to SA objective 4.8 (avoid water pollution).

**3.16** The site is assessed as having a minor negative effect on SA objective 4.10 (promote conservation and sustainable use of agricultural land) as majority of the site is predominantly greenfield land.

#### SA findings – economic SA objectives (6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6)

**3.17 OMH6** is expected to have negligible effects on SA objective 6.1 (business and employment), 6.3 (vitality of town centres) and 6.5 (mineral resources). Assessments of the SA objectives 6.2 (business and employment) and 6.4 (sustain rural communities) were not carried out for this site as they only relate to provision of employment land. A significant positive uncertain effect is identified for SA objective 6.6 (learning and skills) as it is within a walking distance of local educational facilities.

#### Sites now considered to be unsound

**3.18** Note that some sites assessed in previous iterations of the SA were found to be unsound by the Inspector. As such, those sites are no longer considered to be reasonable alternatives. The sites now considered to be unsound are as follows:

- Pea97: Former Norton Building.
- Pea106: 73-83 Bridge Road East.
- Pea103: 29 Broadwater Road.
- Pea105: 61 Bridge Road.
- StL17: Land at Great North Road.
- BrP34: Brookmans Park Transmitting Station,
- No10/HS31: Land west of St Martin de Porres Catholic Church.

**3.19** The sites listed above that are within Welwyn Garden City (Pea97, Pea106, Pea103 and Pea105) are considered unsound because they are being proposed for housing in a designated employment area. StL17 is considered unsound because it extends into the critical gap between Hatfield and Welwyn Garden City, which has been classified as part of the most essential Green Belt. Site BrP34 is considered unsound because it is not considered a sustainable location, development would cause moderate-high harm to the Green Belt and its delivery is not certain. For site No10/HS31, there are concerns that a viable site may not be deliverable at this location during the plan period.

Figure 3.1: Summary of effects for new site options

	1.1 & 1.2 Health		2.2 flood risk		4.2 greenhouse gas emissions from transport		4.3 air pollution		4.4 open space and landscape character, retaining local distinctiveness			4.5 Character, sense of place and local distinctiveness, historic environment	4.6 Protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	4.8 water pollution	4.10 productive agricultural land and previously developed land	5.1 Housing			6.1 business and employment	6.2 economic investment and regeneration	6.3 Enhance the vitality and attraction of Welwyn Garden City and Hatfield town	6.4 Sustain rural communities and their economies	6.5 mineral resources	6.6 Learning and skills
	Proximity to employment and services/ housing	Proximity to transport	Proximity to employment and services	Proximity to transport	Open Space	Landscape character	Previously Developed Land	local distinctiveness						Amount of housing	Affordable housing	Dwellings for older people								
<b>Digswell</b>																								
Dig1	+	0	++	++	++	++	0	-?	0	0	--?	-?	-?	-	0	++	++	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	++?	
<b>Oaklands and Mardley Heath</b>																								
OMH6	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	-?	0	0	-?	--?	0	-	0	++	++	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	++?	

# Chapter 4

## Appraisal of Previously Assessed Sites

### Overview

**4.1** This chapter summarises the implications of updates to the housing need for the Borough, which affects the assumptions for SA objective 5.1 (amount of housing). LUC reviewed the latest site assessments, presented in the 2020 SA Addendum, to determine whether the change to the housing need, and resulting change in the assumptions for SA objective 5.1, results in any changes to the SA conclusions. For site WGC4a only, the latest assessment is not that presented in the 2020 SA Addendum, but an update to this which was prepared in November 2020, to account for an updated housing number. The latest assessment of WGC4a is that presented in examination document EX219G<sup>2</sup>.

**4.2** For the majority of sites, the changes to SA objective 5.1 resulting from the updated housing need do not result in a change to the effect recorded, as they still fall within the same percentage range with regards to the percentage of the overall housing need they will meet.

**4.3** The exception to this is site SB1, Land South of Swanley Bar Lane. This site was previously assessed as having negligible effects with regards to amount of housing (SA objective 5.1). This is now updated to minor positive effects as, given the change to the FOAHN, the site will now provide between 1 and 5% of the Borough's overall housing need. Table 4.1: presents an updated summary of SA findings for site SB1.

**4.4** In addition, the capacity of site OMH9 has increased from 12 to 25 dwellings, however this change does not influence the assessment of negligible effects (0) for SA objective 5.1 (amount of housing) previously recorded, as the site would still provide less than 1% of the Borough's total housing need.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.welhat.gov.uk/media/17713/EX219G-Updated-appraisal-for-WGC4a-revised-housing-number-Nov-11->

[2020/pdf/EX219G\\_Updated appraisal for WGC4a revised housing number Nov 11 2020.pdf?m=637455669100030000](https://www.welhat.gov.uk/media/17713/EX219G-Updated-appraisal-for-WGC4a-revised-housing-number-Nov-11-2020.pdf?m=637455669100030000)

Table 4.1: Summary of effects for SB1: Land South of Swanley Bar Lane

Swanley Bar																							
SB1	+	0	++	++	++	++	0	-?	0	-	--?	--?	0	-	+	++	++	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	++?
	1.1 & 1.2 Health	2.2 flood risk	4.2 greenhouse gas emissions from transport		4.3 air pollution		4.4 open space and landscape character, retaining local distinctiveness				4.5 Character, sense of place and local distinctiveness, historic environment	4.6 Protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity	4.8 water pollution	4.10 productive agricultural land and previously developed land	5.1 Housing			6.1 business and employment	6.2 economic investment and regeneration	6.3 Enhance the vitality and attraction of Welwyn Garden City and Hatfield town	6.4 Sustain rural communities and their economies	6.5 mineral resources	6.6 Learning and skills
	Proximity to employment and services/ housing	Proximity to transport	Proximity to employment and services	Proximity to transport	Open Space	Landscape character	Previously Developed Land	local distinctiveness						Amount of housing	Affordable housing	Dwellings for older people							

# Chapter 5

## Assessment of Alternative Strategic Options for Growth

### Overview

**5.1** This chapter presents the assessment of alternative strategic options for growth identified by the Council. Policies SP2 and SP3 will be updated in light of the proposed approach once this is finalised.

**5.2** The Council must decide how to distribute the additional growth required as a result of the updated FOAHN of 15,200. The housing targets throughout the plan period are shown in **Table 5.1:** below<sup>3</sup>. These have a bearing on the choice of strategic housing distribution. There are different approaches to the calculation of a five year land supply. The one more usually used on appeal is known as the Sedgefield approach and is a tougher requirement to meet as it requires making up for any shortfall in the first five years following adoption. The second approach is known as the Liverpool approach and allows for any shortfall to be met by the end of the plan period. In East Herts the Planning Inspector adopted a third approach (referred to in this document as the 'alternative method'), which requires the shortfall to be met by the end of the first ten years. **Table 5.1:** includes three different targets, based on these three methods.

**5.3** Whilst the FOAHN is 15,200, part of this figure includes existing commitments and completions, as well as an allowance for windfall sites. Taking this into account, the Council needs to identify land for 10,233 dwellings. Some 8,578 of these can be provided for at allocations already put forward by the Council in 2016 and 2019 that the Inspector has found sound, or could be found sound subject to Main Modifications As such, the Council must decide where to allocate the outstanding 1,655 dwellings.

### Developing Strategic Growth Options

**5.4** Five strategic growth options were assessed in the 2020 SA Addendum. These were based on an FOAHN of 16,000, although not all options included enough housing to meet that OAN.

**5.5** Given the change to the FOAHN and Inspector's conclusions from hearings sessions, the Council has started afresh with regards to considering strategic growth options. The five options presented in the previous SA Addendum are

---

<sup>3</sup> Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 included within Report of Corporate Director (Public Protection, Planning and Governance) to Cabinet Housing &

Parking Panel 14<sup>th</sup> October 2021: Local Plan – Additional Sites and Modifications to the Plan

no longer considered to be reasonable alternatives because the Inspector asked for a more nuanced approach with regards to site selection, with a finer grained approach to locational accessibility. The Inspector supports a strategy based on generally proportionate distribution and emphasised the importance of meeting local need, either in the settlements themselves or the wider parish.

**5.6** The Council identified two initial growth options:

- A.** Natural/proportional growth in the villages, with Symondshyde (15,365 homes in total).
- B.** Additional (maximum) growth in the villages, without Symondshyde (15,204 homes in total).

**5.7** However, neither of these options were considered reasonable. This is because, whilst both options would meet the FOAHN of 15,200, Option A (proportional village growth) would result in a poor five year housing land supply in the short term, because of the lag time in establishing a new community at Symondshyde. However, Option B (additional village growth) would result in a poor housing land supply in the last five years of the plan period.

**5.8** As such, the Council amended these two options to resolve these issues, resulting in options C and D:

- C.** Variation of B: additional (maximum) growth in the villages plus 500 homes at Symondshyde within the plan period. This option would provide for 15,345 dwellings in the plan period overall.

- D.** Variation of A: natural/proportional growth in the villages, with Symondshyde, but with additional growth in last five years. This option would provide for 15,606 dwellings in the plan period overall.

**5.9** Both options include growth at Symondshyde (Hat15) but for Option D the site would be fully built out within the plan period, whereas for Option C only 500 homes would be provided at Symondshyde within the plan period, with the remainder coming forward beyond the plan period. The additional village growth included in Option C would be located primarily at Brookmans Park, Welwyn and Welham Green, as well as at Cuffley, with a small amount of additional growth at Lemsford and Digswell. Of these villages, Brookmans Park, Cuffley, Welham Green and Digswell are served by a railway station. **Table 5.2:** and **Table 5.3:** show how the options are distributed by settlement and by settlement hierarchy respectively.

**5.10** All options fall short of the required delivery of homes in the final five years of the plan period, as a result of fewer large, strategic sites, but the Council's ability to address this is limited by the number of suitable large, strategic sites available for allocation. The Council considers Options C and D to be as close to the housing requirement across the plan period as possible. Options C and D have therefore been subject to SA. Note that these growth options focus on the distribution of housing growth, therefore the assessment does not consider those objectives that relate solely to employment growth (SA objectives 6.2 and 6.4).

**Table 5.1: Housing targets and likely delivery across the plan period**

Timing of housing delivery	0-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	Total	Total plus completions (2,514 dwellings)
Requirement "Liverpool Method"	4,989	4,608	3,089	12,686	15,200
Requirement "Sedgefield Method"	5,846	3,800	3,040	12,686	15,200
Requirement "Alternative method"	4,560	5,086	3,040	12,686	15,200
Option A	4,464	5,541	2,846	12,851	15,365
Option B	5,040	5,501	2,149	12,690	15,204
Option C	4,773	5,409	2,649	12,831	15,345
Option D	4,598	5,596	2,899	13,093	15,606

Table 5.2: Options Analysis by Settlement

	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Local need target	Notes
WGC	6,525	6,525	6,525	6,525	1,464 - 6,797	
Hatfield	3,596	3,596	3,596	3,596	995 – 4,621	
Woolmer Green	227	286	261	261	43 - 201	
O&MH	86	86	86	86	89 - 413	
Welwyn	254	502	502	254	112 - 490	
Digswell	104	140	124	104	47 - 206	
Lemsford	0	27	27	0	7 - 30	
Stanborough	19	117	19	19	9 - 41	
Welham Green	368	556	556	441	96 – 419	
Brookmans Park & Bell Bar	421	828	724	549	109 - 506	
Little Heath	104	204	104	104	34 -158	
Cuffley	409	585	585	409	132 - 575	
Symondshyde	1500	0	500*	1500	n/a	*1000 dwellings to be delivered post 2036
Rural Areas	84	84	84	84	137 -588	

Table 5.3: Options Analysis by Settlement Hierarchy

	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	OAN target
Tier 1 and 2 Towns (WCG & Hatfield)	10,121	10,121	10,121	10,121	11,418
Tier 3 large villages	1,452	2,471	2,367	1,653	1,990
Villages with Stations	1,302	2,109	1,989	1,503	1,706
Tier 4 villages	521	743	575	555	978
New Tier 4 village - Symondshyde	1,500	0	500	1,500	n/a



	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	OAN target
Welwyn Parish	444	728	712	444	Local need target 244 – 1,109

## SA Findings for Strategic Growth Options

**5.11** The full SA findings are presented in **Table 5.4:** and summarised below. The appraisal of strategic growth options is necessarily high level. Therefore, the following assessments are somewhat comparative to each other, in order to draw out differences between them.

**5.12** Given the need to provide housing later in the plan period, both options include Symondshyde. The difference between them is the timing of when this comes forward (Option D assumes the whole allocation of 1,500 homes will come forward in the plan period, Option C assumes 500 homes will come forward). As such, both will result in overall similar patterns of development, with more village growth under Option C.

**5.13** Both options are expected to have positive effects for SA objective 1.1 (health) and 6.6 (learning and skills), because they would lead to provision of affordable housing and development within proximity of community services and facilities. For Option D the positive effect is likely to be significant, as new services and facilities would be provided at Symondshyde within the plan period. Option C may put greater pressure on services and facilities in the villages.

**5.14** Planning for growth on this scale is likely to lead to significant negative effects in relation to SA objectives which seek to reduce impacts on the environment, and protect natural and historic assets for all options. Potential significant negative effects are expected in relation to greenhouse gas emissions from built development and transport and there is potential for negative effects from air pollution from traffic from all options (SA objectives 4.1, 4.2, 4.3). Both options would result in significant negative effects in relation to water consumption (SA objective 4.7), with both options likely to have minor negative effects on water pollution (SA objective 4.8) and in relation to flood risk (SA objective 2.2) and agricultural land (SA objective 4.10). Mitigation, which is expected to reduce negative effects, will include other Proposed Submission Local Plan policies (e.g. SP10: Sustainable Design and Construction, SP4: Transport and Travel and SADM3: Sustainable Travel for all), the location of proposed development which seeks to encourage sustainable travel, and technological improvements which are expected to reduce air pollution from traffic.

**5.15** Both options are expected to have mixed minor positive and significant negative effects for SA objective 4.4 (open

space), although it is noted that the effects for Option C are expected to be greater than Option D. Due to a greater level of growth at existing villages, Option C is more likely to put greater pressure on existing open space in these areas and the additional growth at villages has potential to substantially alter their character and the settlement pattern of the Borough. However, both options include growth at Symondshyde, which will introduce a substantial amount of growth to a rural location.

**5.16** Both options would result in mixed positive and negative effects in relation to the historic environment (SA objective 4.5), as development may be able to be sensitively designed but could also adversely affect heritage assets and their settings. For Option C, the negative effect is likely to be significant, as the greater amount of growth around villages has greater potential to affect the historic character of these areas.

**5.17** Mixed minor positive and significant positive effects are expected for both options with regards to biodiversity and geodiversity (SA objective 4.6) as both have potential for biodiversity gain but also could adversely affect sensitive features and lead to habitat loss.

**5.18** Both options would have significant positive effects with regards to housing (SA objective 5.1), as both would provide slightly over the FOAHN. Under Option C, development at Symondshyde would not be completed until after the end of the plan period, therefore it provides for some growth later on as well. However, it is assumed that under both options, an appropriate level of growth would also come forward after the plan period, and this would be guided by an updated Local Plan.

**5.19** Both options are likely to have positive effects for SA objectives 6.3 (vitality of town centres) and 6.4 (vitality of rural communities) as both focus development in and around towns and villages. For SA objective 6.4, Option C is likely to have greater positive effects, given that it will result in greater levels of growth at villages.

## Reasons for Selection of Preferred Option

**5.20** The Council's key reasons for selecting Option D as a preferred option are that:

- Option D seeks to provide greater protection of heritage and environmental assets by minimising levels of growth in some settlements. It therefore better meets the

strategy set out in the Local Plan as well as providing for the strategy set out in the draft submitted plan for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites to remain largely unaltered.

- The Council considers that, on balance, Option D provides a distribution more closely aligned to the vision and objectives and spatial strategy set out in the submitted plan.

Table 5.4: Assessment of Strategic Options for Growth

SA Objective	Likely Effects		Commentary	Mitigation recommendations (focussing on significant adverse effects)
	Option C: additional village growth	Option D: proportional village growth		
<b>Long-term Objective 1: Health Improvement</b>				
1.1: Lead to reduced health inequalities, and in particular improve the health of those living in communities characterised by relatively poor health?	+/-	++/-	<p>All options are likely to have positive effects in relation to reducing health inequalities through the increased provision of housing, including affordable housing and dwellings for older people, green infrastructure and supporting infrastructure, regenerating urban areas, and providing close to the population growth requirement for employment land provision, providing jobs and training opportunities. The majority, if not all, development under both options is expected to be located where residents can access services and facilities, such as education, health and recreation facilities. However, Option C may put more pressure on existing facilities in villages, which may not be able to accommodate the level of growth proposed. In addition, growth at Symondshyde is expected to provide new services and facilities to meet the needs of new residents, contributing to positive effects for Option D. Whilst Symondshyde would still come forward under Option C, it would only be partly developed within the plan period, therefore these new services and facilities would likely not be available within the plan period.</p> <p>Both options would result in loss of greenfield land which could have an adverse effect on people's physical and mental wellbeing unless sufficient access is retained and/or offset by accessible green infrastructure close to residential areas.</p>	<p><b>SP 1: Sustainable Development</b> promotes the increased supply of housing and contributes to the reduction of social and health inequalities.</p> <p><b>Policies SP11: Protection and Enhancement of Critical Environmental Assets</b> and <b>SP13: Infrastructure Delivery</b> will reduce the potential for inadequate infrastructure provision to support new development.</p>
1.2: Lead to improved health for all?			The strategic options are not considered likely to affect those criteria which are shown greyed out.	
<b>Long term Objective 2: Safer Communities</b>				
2.1 Reduce opportunities for crime and anti-social				

SA Objective	Likely Effects		Commentary	Mitigation recommendations (focussing on significant adverse effects)
	Option C: additional village growth	Option D: proportional village growth		
behaviour, and reduce fear of crime?				
2.2: Ensure there is no increase in flood risk to people or property, taking into account climate change?	-?	-?	<p>Both options are likely to lead to increased risk due to greater runoff from increased impermeable surfaces, particularly where development takes place on greenfield land. All effects are uncertain, as it is currently unknown what mitigation measures would be implemented as part of individual development proposals, the extent of green infrastructure provision within the proposals to attenuate surface water run off or the exact design of proposals.</p> <p>[Assumption: The proposed quantities of development could be accommodated within the borough without the need to develop in higher flood risk areas, taking into account climate change. Flood risk associated with particular strategic development locations is assessed under the SA of the Settlement Strategy.]</p>	<b>SP10: Sustainable Design and Construction</b> – requires sustainable urban drainage to reduce flood risk; <b>SP11: Critical Environmental Assets</b> requires development to avoid Flood Zones 2 and 3.
<b>Long-term Objective 3: Good Citizenship</b>				
3.1: Encourage involvement of the public in the planning process				
<b>Long-term Objective 4: Improving the Environment</b>				
4.1: Significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions from built development?	--	--	By delivering a significant amount of built development, both options will result in significantly greater energy use within the borough. To the extent that this energy comes from non-renewable sources, it will therefore result in increased greenhouse gas emissions.	<b>SP10: Sustainable Design and Construction</b> – requires development to maximise energy efficiency and incorporate renewable and/or low carbon technologies, in

SA Objective	Likely Effects		Commentary	Mitigation recommendations (focussing on significant adverse effects)
	Option C: additional village growth	Option D: proportional village growth		
				accordance with the energy hierarchy.
4.2: Significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transport?	--	--	Concentrating development in and around towns and villages should minimise travel distances to jobs and services and encourage people to walk, cycle or use public transport, reducing the otherwise likely negative effects. Greater housing levels will also lead to greater traffic generation during construction which would have adverse implications for GHG emissions from transport. Whilst Option C would result in more development allocations that are generally further from existing employment opportunities, Symondshyde is not currently well served by public transport. Development at Symondshyde is likely to attract a bus service in the long term, but it is unknown if and when this would come forward, as this would require joint working with bus operators.	<b>SP1: Delivering Sustainable Development &amp; SP3: Settlement Strategy and Green Belt Boundaries</b> – Development will be directed to those areas with good transport networks and well served with jobs, services and facilities.
4.3: Avoid and reduce air pollution	--	--	By delivering a significant amount of built development, all Options are likely to result in significant increases in road and rail travel, with road transport in particular producing potential increased emissions to air of pollutants such as NOx and particulates. See also objective 4.2 above.	As per objective 4.2.
4.4: Protect and enhance open space and landscape character, retaining local distinctiveness?	+/--?	+/--?	<p>The development of higher levels of housing has the potential to lead to greater opportunities for enhancing open space provision across the council area. However, this could lead to increased pressure being placed on existing green infrastructure in and surrounding towns and villages. Whilst this would be applicable to both options, Option C has potential to result in more pressure on existing open space due to the higher level of growth in villages, whereas development at Symondshyde in Option D is expected to provide new open space within the plan period.</p> <p>Both options are likely to have minor positive effects on retaining local distinctiveness by avoiding settlement coalescence on the assumption that all options would be delivered in and around town and villages (except for development at Symondshyde), however effects would be dependent individual proposals.</p>	<p><b>SP9: Place making and high quality design -</b> Proposals should relate well to their surroundings, local distinctiveness, wider townscape and landscape.</p> <p><b>SP12: Strategic Green Infrastructure and SP13: Infrastructure Delivery</b> – requirement for additional green infrastructure and provision of open space would</p>

SA Objective	Likely Effects		Commentary	Mitigation recommendations (focussing on significant adverse effects)
	Option C: additional village growth	Option D: proportional village growth		
			Both options would result in the loss of significant areas of greenfield land which could have significant negative effects due to the loss of previously undeveloped land, detracting from the existing settlement pattern and the qualities of more sensitive landscapes. Due to maximising growth around villages, Option C may lead to development less in keeping with the existing development pattern. Growth at Symondshyde under both options will result in substantial urbanisation of this rural location.	help to reduce negative effects.
4.5: Conserve and enhance the Borough's character, sense of place and local distinctiveness, historic environment, heritage and cultural assets, and their settings?	+?/--?	+?/--?	Development in or surrounding towns and villages has potential to conserve and enhance local character and distinctiveness, but larger developments will require significant investment in masterplanning to achieve this. Higher levels of development may put pressure on particularly sensitive heritage assets within towns and villages leading to adverse effects on their settings. Higher levels of development could also lead to settlements losing their distinct character and becoming much larger settlements or urban extensions. This would be particularly relevant to Option C due to higher housing levels and/or higher potential loss of greenfield land in villages. All effects are uncertain and would depend on the exact locations and design of individual development proposals.	<b>SP1: Delivering Sustainable Development-</b> heritage assets should be protected and enhanced.
4.6: Protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, taking into account the impacts of climate change?	+?/--?	+?/--?	The development of relatively high levels of housing and the loss of greenfield land has the potential to lead to adverse impacts on biodiversity. However, the development of housing also has the potential for increased opportunities for biodiversity enhancement through the provision of biodiversity net gain, green infrastructure and open space. All effects would be uncertain and dependent on the exact location of individual sites in relation to sensitive biodiversity areas, whether brownfield land would be used and design and mitigation employed.	<b>SP 10: Sustainable design and construction-</b> Existing habitat should be incorporated into the design with sound ecological principles.

SA Objective	Likely Effects		Commentary	Mitigation recommendations (focussing on significant adverse effects)
	Option C: additional village growth	Option D: proportional village growth		
				<b>SP 11: Protection and enhancement of critical environmental assets</b>
4.7: Reduce water consumption, and provide for reliable sources of water supply even in drought conditions	--	--	Both options will result in significantly increased water consumption by both residential and employment uses.	<b>SP10: Sustainable design and construction</b> – water sensitive design principles will address water supply, consumption and quality. <b>SP11: Protection and enhancement of critical Assets</b>
4.8 Avoid water pollution	-?	-?	Impacts on water quality should be largely avoidable, by provision of adequate infrastructure alongside new development in the form of SUDS and necessary upgrades to sewage infrastructure (e.g. Maple Lodge WwTW and at Rye Meads WwTW and their networks), and good practice during construction. However, the risks of contamination are increased with a greater volume of development (Option 4). SUDS is not always technically feasible and major sewage infrastructure upgrades can take a number of years and could impact on the timing of housing delivery.	<b>SP 10: Sustainable design and construction</b> -water sensitive design principles should be integrated into development proposals to sustainably address water quality.
4.9: Minimise the amount of waste generated and maximise the re-use, recycling or				

SA Objective	Likely Effects		Commentary	Mitigation recommendations (focussing on significant adverse effects)
	Option C: additional village growth	Option D: proportional village growth		
composting of waste that cannot be reduced.				
4.10: Promote conservation and sustainable use of productive agricultural land and maximise the sustainable use of previously developed land	-	-	Concentrating development in and around towns and villages (both options) would help to maximise the opportunities to re-use previously developed land and alleviate pressures on prime agricultural land. However, the planned scale of development means that a significant proportion of it will have to take place on greenfield land. Both options largely avoid best and most versatile agricultural land, with the exception of site Hat1.	<b>Policy SP 11: Protection and enhancement of critical environmental assets-</b> protect the best and most versatile agricultural land.
<b>Long-term Objective 5: Decent Housing</b>				
5.1: Provide the right amount, type and tenure of housing to meet identified local needs?	++	++	Both options will deliver a significant amount of additional housing across the plan period 2016-2036 and will meet the FOAHN. The housing requirement is for at least 15,200 new homes over this period, so Option C would provide 145 more homes than this target and Option D would deliver 406 homes more than this target. It is assumed that both options would provide a proportionate contribution of affordable homes and homes for older people.  It is also noted that both options would respond to local housing needs, as WHBC used natural growth data to inform the level of growth at villages. Both options would meet local needs and Option C would exceed this.	Not required but <b>Policy SP1: Delivering Sustainable Development</b> requires new development to contribute to the creation of mixed and sustainable communities.
<b>Long-term Objective 6: A Thriving Economy</b>				
6.1 ensure the supply, location				



SA Objective	Likely Effects		Commentary	Mitigation recommendations (focussing on significant adverse effects)
	Option C: additional village growth	Option D: proportional village growth		
and quality of business and employment sites reflects the needs of local businesses and encourages a mixed and greener economy?				
6.2: Encourage economic investment in those areas most in need of regeneration, in a way that will benefit those most in need of rewarding employment.				
6.3 Enhance the vitality and attraction of Welwyn Garden City and Hatfield town retail centres?	++	++	The large scale of housing and employment growth in and around the main towns has the potential to have significant positive effects on Welwyn Garden City and Hatfield town centres by delivering new customers within their catchments and supporting a revitalised retail offering, alongside complimentary town centre uses including housing and employment.	Not required, but <b>Policy SP1: Delivering Sustainable Development</b> requires growth to be undertaken in a way which supports economic growth.

SA Objective	Likely Effects		Commentary	Mitigation recommendations (focussing on significant adverse effects)
	Option C: additional village growth	Option D: proportional village growth		
6.4: Sustain rural communities and their economies, small businesses and other rural diversification, while protecting rural character.	++/?	+/?	Providing for more homes in and around villages is expected to have a positive effect in sustaining rural communities. This will be greater for Option C due to the greater level of growth around villages. Uncertainty relates to the protection of rural character which will depend on the exact location and design of development.	Not required, but <b>Policy SP1: Delivering Sustainable Development</b> requires growth to be undertaken in a way which supports economic growth.
6.5 Avoid sterilisation of mineral resources	0	0	None of the site allocations would result in sterilisation of mineral resources earmarked for extraction or safeguarding.	Not required.
6.6 Provide access to training, skills development and lifelong learning to meet identified needs	+	++	Development focused in or surrounding towns and villages (both options) would help to ensure existing and new residents have good access to a range of services and facilities, including education. Option C has potential to put more pressure on existing facilities due to the greater level of growth at villages, whereas Option D is expected to provide new services and facilities, to some extent, during the plan period in order to serve new development at Symondshyde.	Not required, but <b>Policy SP1: Delivering Sustainable Development</b> requires growth to be undertaken in a way which supports economic growth.

# Chapter 6

## Summary and Conclusions

### Overview

**6.1** This document presents an Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal of the Proposed Submission Local Plan (2016), Errata Sheet and 2020 Addendum, following the requirement for the Council to re-consider the overall housing need for Welwyn Hatfield and to consider two additional reasonable alternative sites. It includes an assessment of those additional reasonable alternative sites (Dig1 and OMH6), re-assessment of site options previously considered based on a change to SA objective 5.1 (housing) and an assessment of two strategic growth options.

### Additional Sites

**6.2** The additional site options are both expected to have positive with regards to social objectives, particularly health and housing. Dig1 performs well with regards to access to employment, services and public transport, whereas OMH6 has negligible effects for these objectives, as it is not located so close to public transport links, employment and services. Both options are expected to have generally negative effects with regards to environmental objectives, although these are generally minor, except for significant negative effects in relation to GHG emissions, air pollution and water consumption. Both options are likely to have generally negligible effects with regards to economic objectives, with the exception of learning and skills, for which positive effects are expected.

### Reassessment of Previously Assessed sites

**6.3** The change in the FOAHN only results in a change in SA conclusions for one site: SB1, Land South of Swanley Bar Lane. This site was previously assessed as having negligible effects with regards to the amount of housing to be delivered (SA objective 5.1), but this has now changed to a minor positive effect, as the site will now provide between 1 and 5% of the FOAHN.

### Strategic Growth Options

**6.4** The Strategic Growth Options perform similarly as they will result in growth in many of the same areas. Both perform well with regards to provision of housing and contributing to the vitality and viability of Welwyn Hatfield's towns and villages

(although Option C is expected to contribute to the vitality and viability of villages more than Option D) and both perform less well with regards to environmental objectives. Nevertheless, both may present opportunities for environmental enhancement. **Overall, Option D performs slightly better than Option C.** This is because Option C may put more pressure on services and facilities in the villages, due to the greater amount of growth there, whereas Option D is likely to provide new services and facilities at Symondshyde during the plan period, and put less pressure on services and facilities in villages. It is noted that other policies, particularly SP 13: Infrastructure Delivery, are likely to mitigate potential adverse effects on existing services and facilities, providing supporting infrastructure is provided in good time. In addition, Option C presents a higher risk of settlements losing their distinct character and becoming much larger settlements or urban extensions.

## Cumulative Effects

**6.5** The Local Plan (as proposed to be amended) allocates around 3,600 additional new homes when compared with the Proposed Submission Local Plan (2016). This increases the total housing provision from around 12,000 to 15,606 homes over the plan period. Whilst the scale of change will be greater with the additional allocated development, due to the large scale of development already set out in the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the cumulative effects identified in the 2016 SA are generally considered to remain valid. Whilst the 2020 SA Addendum amended the cumulative effects on SA objective 5.1 (housing) to a minor positive effect, this is now considered to be a **significant positive effect** as the plan will provide for the full FOAHN.

LUC

September 2021

**Appendix A**  
**Updated SA Framework and Assumptions**

## Housing

### Welwyn Hatfield Options for Site Allocations SA: Assumptions for Housing Sites

SA Question: Will the policy...	Assumptions for SA of Housing Sites
<b>Long-term Objective 1: Health Improvement</b>	
<p>...lead to reduced health inequalities, and in particular improve the health of those living in communities characterised by relatively poor health? (1.1)</p>	<p>Sites that are within straight line walking distance (720 m)<sup>4</sup> of three or more different types of the following service/facility/asset:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GP surgery;</li> <li>• food/convenience store;</li> <li>• post office;</li> <li>• pharmacy;</li> <li>• future neighbourhood centre within strategic allocations if required by policy<sup>5</sup>.</li> </ul> <p>...and/or within 1,400 m<sup>6</sup> of two or more of the following types of service/facility/asset:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sports/recreation facility or an area of open space;</li> <li>• hospital;</li> <li>• education establishment (including nurseries, primary school, secondary school and colleges)<sup>7</sup>;</li> </ul>

<sup>4</sup> Adapted from target distances in Welwyn Hatfield Community Facilities Study, October 2012

<sup>5</sup> assuming the neighbourhood centre is in the centre of the broad location

<sup>6</sup> For the purpose of the appraisal, walking distance will be measured as the straight line distance from the edge of the site option to existing services and facilities, and therefore actual walking distances are likely to be greater (depending on the house location within a larger site and the availability of a direct route). It is considered that a straight line walking distance of 720m typically equates to a walking distance of 1200m or 15 minutes' walk, and a straight line walking distance of 1400m typically equates to a walking distance of 2400m or 30 minutes' walk.

<sup>7</sup> The University of Hertfordshire has not been included as it is assumed that sites are not being developed for student housing.

SA Question: Will the policy...	Assumptions for SA of Housing Sites
...lead to improved health for all? (1.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment Site or Town Centre.</li> </ul> <p>...are assumed to have a minor positive (+) effect on this aspect of the SA objective because of the potential to use these facilities. Allocations which are also located in an area within one of the 20% most deprived areas within the District (<del>'access to services' domain of English Indices of Deprivation</del>) are assessed as having a significant positive (++) effect on this aspect of the objective.</p> <p>Other allocations are assessed as having a negligible (0) effect.</p> <p>(Sources required: GIS mapping of GP surgeries, hospitals, sports/recreation facilities, open spaces, post offices, local shopping centres, primary schools, secondary schools, Employment Sites, Town Centres, Convenience Stores, English Indices of Deprivation)</p>
<b>Long-term Objective 2: Safer Communities</b>	
...reduce opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour, and reduce fear of crime? (2.1)	<p>The effects of new development on safety, crime and fear of crime will depend on design proposals for the allocated sites and factors such as the inclusion of open spaces that are overlooked by buildings to improve safety and security and sufficient lighting. Generally, these issues will not be influenced by the location of development and will instead be determined through the detailed proposals for each site. This SA objective does not, therefore, form part of the SA of options for Site Allocations.</p> <p>(Sources required: none)</p>
...ensure there is no increase in flood risk to people or property, taking into account climate change? (2.2)	<p>Development on sites that are within areas of high fluvial flood risk may have negative effects on this SA objective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites having a significant proportion of land (&gt;=25%) within flood zones 3a or 3b, have an 'extreme' flood hazard rating in the SFRA, and/or include flood storage areas are assumed to have a significant negative (--)effect.</li> <li>• Sites having as significant proportion of land (&gt;=25%) within flood zone 2 or that are 5-25% within flood zone 3 are assumed to have a minor negative (-) effect. Sites that include a very small part of a flood storage area would also have a minor negative effect.</li> <li>• Sites with less than 5% of their land within flood zone 3, less than 25% of their land within flood zone 2 and do not include flood storage areas are assumed to have a negligible (0) effect.</li> </ul> <p>The opportunity to incorporate SuDS to mitigate the risks of surface water flooding and surface water contamination is a design issue and does not form part of the SA of options for Site Allocations.</p> <p>(Sources required: EA flood zones; SFRA; flood storage areas)</p>
<b>Long-term objective 3: Good Citizenship</b>	

SA Question: Will the policy...	Assumptions for SA of Housing Sites
...encourage involvement of the public in the planning process? (3.1)	Not applicable to appraisal of options for site allocations.
<b>Long-term objective 4: Improving the environment</b>	
...significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions from built development? (4.1)	<p>While any additional development is likely to increase <u>total</u> energy consumption in the District, it is likely to be built to a higher energy efficiency standard than existing housing stock as a result of increasingly stringent Building Regulations requirements and the Government's 2016 zero carbon target for new dwellings, thereby helping to improve energy efficiency. It may also offer opportunities for incorporating local renewable energy generation.</p> <p>However, these issues will not be determined by the location of the development and will, instead, be determined through the detailed proposals for each site. Therefore, this aspect of the SA objective is not assessed in the SA of the options for Site Allocations.</p>
...significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transport? (4.2)	<p>In terms of location, greenhouse gas emissions are most closely linked to emissions from vehicles. Vehicles are more likely to be used as distances to destinations increase or travel by alternative more sustainable modes become less attractive. As an indication of effects on this aspect of the SA objective, the following is assumed:</p> <p><b>Proximity to employment and services:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where an allocation is within straight line walking distance (1,400 m) of an Employment Site or Town Centre there is a significant positive (++) effect on this aspect of the SA objective due to minimising travel distances and car use related greenhouse gas emissions, and enabling easier access to employment opportunities.</li> <li>• Where an allocation is within 720 m of a food/convenience store, and/or a future neighbourhood centre within a strategic allocation if required by policy <sup>8</sup> a minor positive (+) effect is assumed.</li> <li>• Where a site is within walking distance of a site or centre but there are potential barriers to access for all ages and abilities (e.g. topography, major road), the score is downgraded to the next lowest score (e.g. ++ score becomes + or + becomes 0).</li> </ul> <p><b>Proximity to transport services:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites within walking distance of a rail station (1,400 m) or bus stop on a route providing a six day a week service (400 m) are assumed to have a significant positive (++) effect on this aspect of the SA objective.</li> </ul>

<sup>8</sup> assuming the neighbourhood centre is in the centre of the broad location



SA Question: Will the policy...	Assumptions for SA of Housing Sites
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other housing sites will be assessed as having a negligible (0) effect on this aspect.</li> </ul> <p>(Sources required: GIS mapping of Employment Sites, Town Centres and Convenience Stores; train stations; bus stops on routes providing a six day a week service)</p>
<p>...avoid and reduce air pollution? (4.3)</p>	<p>In terms of location, air pollution is most closely linked to emissions from vehicles. Vehicles are more likely to be used as distances to destinations increase or travel by alternative more sustainable modes become less attractive. As an indication of effects on this aspect of the SA objective, the following is assumed:</p> <p><b>Proximity to employment and services:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where an allocation is within straight line walking distance (1,400 m) of an Employment Site or Town Centre there is a significant positive (++) effect on this aspect of the SA objective due to minimising travel distances, air pollution and enabling easier access to employment opportunities.</li> <li>Where an allocation is within 720 m of a food/convenience store, and/or a future neighbourhood centre within a strategic allocation if required by policy<sup>9</sup> a minor positive (+) effect is assumed.</li> <li>Where a site is within walking distance of a site or centre but there are potential barriers to access for all ages and abilities (e.g. topography, major road), the score is downgraded to the next lowest score (e.g. ++ score becomes + or + becomes 0).</li> </ul> <p><b>Proximity to transport services:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites within walking distance of a rail station (1,400 m) or bus stop on a route providing a six day a week service (400 m) are assumed to have a significant positive (++) effect on this aspect of the SA objective.</li> <li>Other housing sites will be assessed as having a negligible (0) effect on this aspect.</li> </ul> <p>(Sources required: GIS mapping of Employment Sites, Town Centres and Convenience Stores; train stations; bus stops on routes providing a six day a week service)</p>

<sup>9</sup> assuming the neighbourhood centre is in the centre of the broad location

SA Question: Will the policy...	Assumptions for SA of Housing Sites
<p>...protect and enhance open space and landscape character, retaining local distinctiveness? (4.4)</p>	<p><b>Open Space</b></p> <p>Where a significant proportion (&gt;=25%) of an allocated site is within an existing area of open space<sup>10</sup> a significant adverse (--?) effect is assumed. Where a smaller part (5-25%) of an allocated site is within an existing open space a minor negative (-?) effect is assumed. In both cases uncertainty relates to the extent to which the development will contribute to alternative provision of open space that is lost to development. Sites that are &lt;5% open space are assumed to have a negligible (0) effect.</p> <p><b>Landscape Character</b></p> <p>Potential effects on landscape features and character will be assessed through the sensitivity score given for each landscape area assessed in the <del>Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study, Oct 2012 Assessment (2019):</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites that are within areas that are assessed as being of low sensitivity are likely to have a negligible (0) effect on landscape character and features.</li> <li>• Sites that are within areas that are assessed as being of <del>medium</del> moderate or low-moderate sensitivity could have a minor negative (-?) effect on landscape character and features.</li> <li>• Sites that are within areas that are assessed as being of moderate-high, high or very high sensitivity could have a significant negative (--?) effect on landscape character and features.</li> </ul> <p>All other sites will be assessed as having an uncertain (?) effect on landscape character and features. In all cases, potential negative effects will be uncertain as the exact impacts on the landscape will depend on factors relating to the specific siting, layout and design of the new development.</p> <p><b>Previously Developed Land</b></p> <p>If the Council identifies the site as previously developed land a significant positive effect (++?) will be assumed but with uncertainty relating to the appropriateness of the design of the development. Sites identified as a mix of greenfield and previously developed land are assumed to have a minor positive effect (+?). All other sites not identified as previously developed land are assumed to have a negligible (0) effect.</p> <p><b>Retaining Local Distinctiveness</b></p> <p>With regards to assessing the coalescence of towns and villages the WHBC Green Belt <del>Review Stage 2 (in preparation August/September 2014) report</del> Study Stage 3 (2019) will be used. <del>Looking at A 'significant' score presented for the 'local Green Belt</del></p>

<sup>10</sup> Categories include natural green space, amenity green space, outdoor sports facilities, parks and gardens, green corridors and civic spaces

SA Question: Will the policy...	Assumptions for SA of Housing Sites
	<p>purpose' (to Maintain the Existing Settlement Pattern) <del>in the Green Belt review, a 'significant' contribution will be assumed to equate to a significant negative (--) SA effect, and a 'partial' contribution score presented for the 'local Green Belt purpose' in the Green Belt review will be assumed to equate to a minor negative (-) SA effect.</del> All other sites not within the Green Belt, or scoring 'limited/or no' effect contribution in the Green Belt review, are considered to have negligible effects (0). <u>Where there is a 'limited/or no' contribution score, we will also check the score for Purpose 2 (Prevent neighbouring towns from merging), and take whichever is the greater contribution. This is because the Green Belt Study records 'limited/no effect' for the local purpose, where Purpose 2 applies, to avoid duplication (because the local purpose is effectively an extension of Purpose 2).</u></p> <p>Three scores will be assigned to this objective to reflect the different types of effects outlined above.</p> <p>Other townscape, design and green infrastructure aspects of this SA objective are not relevant to SA of the location of housing site options.</p> <p>(Sources required: settlement boundaries; landscape sensitivity study, Green Belt study, open space boundaries)</p>
<p>...conserve and enhance the Borough's character, sense of place and local distinctiveness, historic environment, heritage and cultural assets, and their settings? (4.5)</p>	<p>English Heritage bases its definition of the setting of a heritage asset on the previous national Planning Policy Statement 5, as <i>"the surroundings in which [the asset] is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance, or may be neutral"</i><sup>11</sup>. Therefore, it is not possible to precisely determine effects on the setting of heritage assets during a desk-based strategic SA exercise such as this.</p> <p>As an indication of potential effects on heritage assets from housing development, the following is assumed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A significant negative effect (--?) may occur where the development location is adjacent to or includes a designated heritage asset (e.g. listed building, Scheduled Monument, Registered Park and Garden or Conservation Area).</li> <li>• Where development is between 250 m and 1 km from heritage assets, a minor negative (-?) effect may occur.</li> <li>• Where sites are more than 1 km from any heritage designations, or the development involves the conversion of an existing building, a negligible (0) effect on this objective is assumed.</li> <li>• Where sites contain Areas of Archaeological Significance an uncertain minor negative effect is assumed (-?). The effect on archaeological finds is considered permanent.</li> </ul> <p>All potential negative effects are assumed to be uncertain as the actual effects on historic assets will depend on the exact siting, scale and type of development and opportunities which may exist to enhance the setting of heritage features (e.g. where sympathetic</p>

<sup>11</sup> English Heritage. The Setting of Heritage Assets REVISION NOTE June 2012.

Appendix A  
Updated SA Framework and Assumptions

Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal for Welwyn Hatfield Local Plan  
September 2021

SA Question: Will the policy...	Assumptions for SA of Housing Sites
	<p>development replaces a derelict brownfield site which is currently having an adverse effect). Scores may therefore need to be moderated depending on local circumstances.</p> <p>Development locations that will bring 'at risk' heritage assets (e.g. listed buildings) back into productive use will be assumed to have a significant positive effect (++?) on the basis that the fabric of the asset will therefore be restored and maintained but with uncertainty relating to whether the restoration/maintenance will be sympathetic to the asset's historic significance.</p> <p>(Sources required: GIS mapping of listed buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens and Conservation Areas, 'at risk' heritage assets to be brought back into use)</p>
<p>...protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, taking into account the impacts of climate change? (4.6)</p>	<p>Similar to heritage assets, there is not a fixed distance at which biodiversity sites may be affected by new development, as the habitats and species for which biodiversity sites are designated are different, and different types of effects can be transmitted across different distances (e.g. air or water pollution may travel much further than noise or disturbance from physical presence of humans or dogs). Therefore, it is not possible to determine actual effects on the structure and function of habitats and populations of species during a desk-based strategic SA exercise such as this.</p> <p>As an indication of potential effects on biodiversity assets from housing site options, the following assumptions are made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where allocated sites overlap with an internationally (SAC, SPA, Ramsar), nationally (SSSI, NNR) or locally (Local Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve) designated wildlife site or area of Ancient Woodland, significant adverse(--) effects are assumed.</li> <li>• Where allocated sites are within 500m of the boundary of an internationally (SAC, SPA, Ramsar), nationally (SSSI, NNR) or 250m of a locally (Local Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve) designated wildlife site or area of Ancient Woodland, uncertain significant adverse (--?) effects are assumed.</li> <li>• Where allocated sites are between 500m and 1,000m from the boundary of an internationally (SAC, SPA, Ramsar), nationally (SSSI, NNR) or between 250m and 500m from a locally (Local Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve) designated wildlife site or area of Ancient Woodland, uncertain minor adverse (-?) effects are assumed.</li> <li>• Where allocated sites have a significant proportion of undesignated greenfield land (&gt;=25%) an uncertain (?) effect is assumed due to the potential for impacts on undesignated biodiversity interest.</li> </ul> <p>Where sites are within the remainder of the Plan area, the effect on this SA objective is assessed as negligible (0). The potential for previously developed land to support biodiversity is reflected under Objective 4.10.</p> <p>(Sources required: boundaries of designated wildlife sites)</p>

Appendix A  
 Updated SA Framework and Assumptions

Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal for Welwyn Hatfield Local  
 Plan  
 September 2021

SA Question: Will the policy...	Assumptions for SA of Housing Sites
<p>...reduce water consumption, and provide for reliable sources of water supply even in drought conditions? (4.7)</p>	<p>Development standards in relation to water efficiency are not related to site location therefore the SA of site allocations does not assess this; potential effects of water efficient design are instead dealt with in the SA of DM policies.</p> <p>(Sources required: None)</p>
<p>...avoid water pollution? (4.8)</p>	<p>The location of housing allocations may affect water quality due to spatial variations in the capacity of existing WwTWs and the foul and combined sewer network to accommodate additional demand from new development as well as variations in the sensitivity of groundwater and surface water receptors.</p> <p>The Water Cycle Study Scoping Report (2010) classifies each settlement in the Borough into categories relating to constraints to development. Required improvements to potable water and sewage treatment infrastructure don't constrain the amount of development going ahead but do affect timing of delivery (sites within settlements identified as requiring extensive infrastructure improvements to allow development will take longer to deliver). It is assumed that sites will not be developed until suitable infrastructure improvements have been implemented to ensure potable water supply and waste water are managed properly to avoid adverse effects on water quality and as such scores have not been assigned as a result of the Water Cycle Study.</p> <p>Groundwater Source Protection Zones represent where there is a risk of contamination of groundwater resources from certain activities. Housing construction within the inner or outer impact zones is assessed as having a minor adverse effect on the SA objective but with uncertainty (-?) relating to the construction activities (e.g. dewatering) and mitigation that would be employed. All other sites are considered to have negligible effects (0).</p> <p>Pollution risks to surface waters from construction of housing are assumed to be fully addressed by compliance with Environment Agency pollution prevention guidance and do not form part of the SA of options for Site Allocations.</p> <p>(Sources required: groundwater Source Protection Zones, EA groundwater Principles and practice (GP3) document).</p>
<p>...minimise the amount of waste generated and maximise the re- use, recycling or composting of waste that cannot be reduced? (4.9)</p>	<p>Waste generation is not related to site location therefore the SA of options for site allocations does not assess this; potential effects of resource use and minimising waste are instead dealt with in the SA of DM policies.</p> <p>(Sources required: None)</p>

SA Question: Will the policy...	Assumptions for SA of Housing Sites
<p>...promote the conservation and sustainable use of productive agricultural land and maximise the sustainable use of previously developed land? (4.10)</p>	<p>Where allocated sites are on high quality (grade 1, 2 or 3*) agricultural land there is assumed to be a negative effect on preserving soil quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites with a significant proportion (&gt;=25%) of grade 1 or 2 agricultural land are assumed to have a significant negative (--) effect.</li> <li>• Sites that are between 10% and 25% on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land are assumed to have a minor negative (-) effect.</li> <li>• Sites with a significant proportion (&gt;=25%) of grade 3 agricultural land are assumed to have a minor negative(-) effect.</li> </ul> <p>All other sites are considered to have a negligible effect (0) on high quality agricultural land. In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites with a significant proportion (&gt;=25%) of brownfield land are assumed to have an uncertain minor positive effect (+?). The effect is considered to be uncertain at this stage until more information is known about the potential for the brownfield land to support habitats and species of biodiversity importance. The biodiversity value of brownfield land will be fully assessed and development would progress where adverse effects can be satisfactorily mitigated.</li> <li>• Sites with a significant proportion (&gt;=25%) of greenfield land are assumed to have a minor negative (-)effect.</li> <li>• ...resulting in overall mixed effects when taken together with effects on agricultural land.</li> </ul> <p>If the site is known to be contaminated and remediation would be a condition of housing development then assess as having a significant positive effects on this aspect of the objective (++); if contamination status is unknown assess effect as uncertain (?); if site is not thought to be contaminated assess effect as negligible (0).</p> <p>Note: Agricultural Land Classification maps do not distinguish between grade 3a, which is considered to be best and most versatile agricultural land, and grade 3b, which isn't.</p> <p>(Sources required: GIS mapping of agricultural land classifications, brownfield land)</p>
<p><b>Long-term Objective 5: Decent Housing</b></p>	
<p>...provide the right amount, type and tenure of housing to meet identified local needs? (5.1)</p>	<p><b>Amount of housing</b></p> <p>To contribute towards a housing target need of around <del>16,000</del>15,200 homes (against a Full Objectively Assessed Housing Need (FOAHN) of 15,200 <del>16,000</del>), allocated sites that provide capacity for at least 5% of the housing target (in this instance at least <del>800</del>760 homes) are assumed to have a significant positive effect (++) . Sites that provide capacity for up to 5% of the housing target (1-5% which equates to <del>160-800</del>152-759 homes) are assumed to have a minor positive effect (+). All other sites with a capacity of less than 1% of the housing target are assumed to have a negligible effect (0).</p> <p>For Gypsy and Traveller sites the figure for pitch need is 68 (net). Therefore any site that provides capacity for at least 5% of the pitch need (in this instance at least 4 pitches), are assumed to have a significant positive effect (++) . Sites that provide capacity for up to 5% of</p>

SA Question: Will the policy...	Assumptions for SA of Housing Sites
	<p>the housing target (1-5% which equates to 1-3 homes) are assumed to have a minor positive effect (+). All other sites with a capacity of less than 1% of the housing target are assumed to have a negligible effect (0).</p> <p><b>Affordable housing</b></p> <p>Policy SP 7 requires that, subject to viability,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• development within Hatfield proposing 11 or more dwellings or land with an area of 0.5 ha or more should provide 25% affordable dwellings.</li> <li>• development within Welwyn Garden City proposing 11 or more dwellings or land with an area of 0.5 ha or more should provide 30% affordable dwellings</li> <li>• development within Excluded Villages proposing 11 or more dwellings or land with an area of 0.5 ha or more should provide 35% affordable dwellings</li> </ul> <p>Sites of this size are assessed as having a significant positive (++) effect on this aspect of the SA objective. Sites below these thresholds and Gypsy and Traveller sites are not required to make affordable provision due to viability evidence. They will therefore be assessed as having a negligible (0) effect.</p> <p><b>Dwellings for older people</b></p> <p>Emerging <del>Core Strategy</del> <del>Local Plan</del> policy <del>CSP</del> 7 requires that, subject to viability and design restrictions, development proposing 5 or more dwellings should include 20% of <del>market dwellings to meet Building Regulations Part M4(2) standards for 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' (or updated equivalent) meeting Lifetime Homes standards.</del> Sites identified with potential to provide 5 dwellings or more will therefore be assessed as having a significant positive (++) effect on this aspect of the SA objective. Sites below this threshold and Gypsy and Traveller sites are not required to <del>make Lifetime Homes provision meet this standard.</del> They will therefore be assessed as having a negligible effect (0).</p>
<p>...ensure the supply, location and quality of business and employment sites reflects the needs of local businesses and encourages a mixed and greener economy? (6.1)</p>	<p>For any site located within an Employment Site the loss of employment land could result in a negative effect for this objective. This would be a significant negative effect (-) if all of the employment land is lost or a minor negative effect (-) if less than 50% of the employment land is lost.</p> <p>All other sites would be negligible (0).</p>

Appendix A  
Updated SA Framework and Assumptions

Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal for Welwyn Hatfield Local  
Plan  
September 2021

SA Question: Will the policy...	Assumptions for SA of Housing Sites
...encourage economic investment in those areas most in need of regeneration, in a way that will benefit those most in need of rewarding employment? (6.2)	Not applicable to housing sites.
...enhance the vitality and attraction of Welwyn Garden City and Hatfield town retail centres? (6.3)	<p>Housing sites within straight walking distance (1,400 m) of Welwyn Garden City or Hatfield town centres are assumed to provide support for their vitality, and will result in a minor positive (+) effect. Sites within the town centres will result in a significant positive effect (++).</p> <p>All other sites are likely to have a negligible effect (0). (Sources required: town centre boundaries).</p>
...sustain rural communities and their economies, small businesses and other rural diversification, while protecting rural character? (6.4)	Not applicable to housing sites.
...avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources? (6.5)	<p>Some areas of Hertfordshire have been identified as Preferred Areas for mineral extraction in the Hertfordshire Minerals Local Plan, 2007. This does not mean that development could not occur in these locations, but that the County Council would need to be consulted to determine whether prior extraction of the mineral resource was required before development. Since the outcome of this consultation will be unknown at the time the site is allocated, an uncertain effect is identified on this SA objective.</p> <p>Sites that overlap a Preferred Area are assumed to have an uncertain minor negative effect (-?). (Sources required: Minerals Preferred Areas)</p>
...provide access to training, skills development and lifelong learning to meet identified needs? (6.6)	<p>The effects of housing development on this objective will depend on the availability of school and college places to serve the new residents.</p> <p>Where sites are within straight line walking distance (1,400 m) of existing education establishments (nurseries, schools or</p>



Appendix A  
 Updated SA Framework and Assumptions

Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal for Welwyn Hatfield Local  
 Plan  
 September 2021

SA Question: Will the policy...	Assumptions for SA of Housing Sites
	<p>colleges<sup>912</sup>), a potential significant positive (++) effect may occur because it could be easier and more resource/cost efficient to expand those existing facilities to accommodate new residents as required, rather than building new schools to serve the new residents.</p> <p>Where a site is within walking distance (1,400 m) of existing education establishments (nurseries, schools or colleges<sup>9</sup>) but there are potential barriers to access for all ages and abilities (e.g. topography, major road), or a strategic allocation where a new school is required, a minor positive uncertain (+?) rather than a significant positive score is given.</p> <p>All other sites are assumed to have a negligible effect (0).</p> <p>(Sources required: GIS mapping of education facilities; OS base map)</p>

<sup>12</sup> The University of Hertfordshire has not been included as it is assumed that sites are not being developed for student housing

Appendix A  
Updated SA Framework and Assumptions

Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal for Welwyn Hatfield Local Plan  
September 2021

## Appendix B

### Appraisal Matrices for Additional Site Options

#### Land at 2 New Road – Dig1

<b>Site – Land at 2 New Road</b>	Dig1	<b>Potential Capacity</b>	25 - 130	<b>Policy</b>	General Development Management Policies
----------------------------------	------	---------------------------	----------	---------------	---

SA Objective	Likely Effects	Commentary	Mitigation recommendations (focussing on significant adverse effects)
<b>Long-term Objective 1: Health Improvement</b>			
1.1 ...lead to reduced health inequalities, and in particular improve the health of those living in communities characterised by relatively poor health? 1.2 ...lead to improved health for all?	+	<p>The site is within straight line walking distance of several types of community facilities including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Within 720m of Welwyn North Stores,</li> <li>- Within 1,400m: Welwyn Garden City Industrial Area Employment Area, Digswell Playing Field, Digswell Pre-School, St. John's Church of England School, and Cricket Pitch.</li> </ul> <p>The site is not within an area classified as being within 20% of the most deprived areas nationally.</p> <p>Overall a minor positive effect is expected as new residents would have access to a range of existing services.</p>	Not required, but SP 1: Sustainable Development promotes the increased supply of housing and contributes to the reduction of social and health inequalities.
<b>Long-term Objective 2: Safer Communities</b>			
2.2 Ensure there is no increase in flood risk to people or property, taking into account climate change?	0	The site is not within Flood Zones 2 or 3 and does not contain flood storage areas; therefore a negligible effect is expected.	Not required, but <b>SADM 14: Flood Risk and Surface Water Management</b> Supporting text-some allocations will need to consider fluvial and surface water flood risk, albeit of limited extent.
<b>Long-term Objective 4: Improving the Environment</b>			
4.2 Significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transport?	++	Proximity to employment and services: This site is within walking distance (1,400m) of Welwyn Garden City Industrial Area Employment Site but it is not within 720m of a food/convenience store. A significant positive effect is expected.	Not required.
	++	Proximity to transport services: This site is within 400m of a bus stop on a route providing a six day a week service. A significant positive effect is therefore expected.	Not required.
4.3 Avoid and reduce air pollution	++	Proximity to employment and services: This site is within walking distance (1,400m) of Welwyn Garden City Industrial Area Employment Site and within 720m of a food/convenience store. A significant positive effect is therefore expected.	Not required.
	++	Proximity to transport services: This site is within 400m of bus stops on a route providing a six day a week service and within 1,400m of Welwyn North Railway Station. A significant positive effect is therefore expected.	Not required.

SA Objective	Likely Effects	Commentary	Mitigation recommendations (focussing on significant adverse effects)
4.4 Protect and enhance open space and landscape character, retaining local distinctiveness?	0	Open Space: Less than 5% of the site is located within an existing open space and therefore, this site is assumed to have a negligible effect on open space.	Not required, but <b>SP 13: Infrastructure Delivery</b> - Developers will be required to contribute to the reasonable costs of providing new green infrastructure, required as a result of their proposals.
	-?	Landscape character: The site is assessed as having a moderate landscape sensitivity and therefore could have a minor negative effect on landscape character.	<b>SP9: Place making and high quality design</b> - Proposals should relate well to their surroundings, local distinctiveness, wider townscape and landscape.
	0	Previously Developed Land: This site not identified as previously developed land are assumed to have a negligible effect.	Not required
	0	Retaining local distinctiveness: The WHBC Green Belt Study Stage 3 (2019) scored the site as having a limited to no contribution to maintaining the existing settlement pattern (Local Purpose) and a limited to no contribution to preventing neighbourhood towns from merging (Green Belt Purpose 2) and therefore this site is assumed to have a negligible effect against this specific issue.	Not required but <b>SP9: Place making and high quality design</b> states that proposals should relate well to their surroundings, local distinctiveness, wider townscape and landscape.
4.5 Conserve and enhance the Borough's character, sense of place and local distinctiveness, historic environment, heritage and cultural assets, and their settings?	--?	The site is adjacent to Tewin Water Registered Park and Garden and is within 250m – 1000m of 15 Grade II Listed Buildings and one Grade II* Listed Building; therefore, a significant negative effect is expected, although this is uncertain as the actual effects on historic assets will depend on the exact siting, scale and type of development and opportunities which may exist to enhance the setting of heritage features, or protect their settings through screening.	<b>SP1: Delivering Sustainable Development</b> - heritage assets should be protected and enhanced.  <b>SADM 15: Heritage</b> – proposals should sustain and enhance heritage assets and respect the character, appearance and setting of the asset in terms of design, scale, materials and impact on key views.
4.6 Protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, taking into account the impacts of climate change?	-?	The site is between 250m and 500m of Tewin Water Mimram Valley LWS, Digswell Lake LWS, Digswell Meadows South LWS, Scrub Slope East of Digswell LWS, Lockleys Wood LWS, Lockleys Wood Meadow LWS, and Harmer Green Area LWS; therefore a minor negative uncertain effect is expected. The uncertainty is also expected as the site is on more than 25% of greenfield land which could result in the loss of undesignated biodiversity interests.	<b>SP 11: Protection and enhancement of critical environmental assets</b> - Appropriate protection, enhancement and management of ecological assets.  <b>SADM 16: Ecology and Landscape</b> - Conserve and enhance the borough's natural and historic landscape.
4.8 Avoid water pollution	-?	The site is within an outer source protection zone, therefore a minor negative effect is expected, although this is uncertain and dependent on the type of construction activity and mitigation that will be employed.	<b>SP 10: Sustainable design and construction</b> - water sensitive design principles should be integrated into development proposals to sustainably address water supply, consumption and quality.
4.10 Promote conservation and sustainable use of productive agricultural land and maximise the sustainable use of previously developed land	-	Majority of the site is not classified as agricultural land (it is classified as 'urban'), and predominantly greenfield land, and as such a minor negative effect is expected.	<b>Policy SP 11: Protection and enhancement of critical environmental assets</b> - protect the best and most versatile agricultural land.
<b>Long-term Objective 5: Decent Housing</b>			

SA Objective	Likely Effects	Commentary	Mitigation recommendations (focussing on significant adverse effects)
5.1 Provide the right amount, type and tenure of housing to meet identified local needs?	0	Amount of housing: The site provides capacity for 130 homes which is less than 1% of the Borough's housing target (around 15,200) and therefore is assumed to have a negligible effect.	Not required but <b>SP1 Delivering Sustainable Development</b> requires new development to contribute to the creation of mixed and sustainable communities.
	++	Affordable housing: The site provides the capacity for 25-130 homes and therefore it is assumed the site would accommodate 35% affordable dwellings. A significant positive effect is expected.	Not required.
	++	Dwellings for older people: The site provides the capacity for 25-130 homes and therefore it is assumed the site would include 20% of dwelling to meet Building Regulations Part M4(2) standards for 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' (or updated equivalent) . A significant positive effect is expected.	Not Required.
<b>Long-term Objective 6: A Thriving Economy</b>			
6.1 Ensure the supply, location and quality of business and employment sites reflects the needs of local businesses and encourages a mixed and greener economy?	0	This site is not located within an Employment Site. A negligible effect is therefore expected.	Not required.
6.3 Enhance the vitality and attraction of Welwyn Garden City and Hatfield town retail centres?	0	This site is not within 1,400m of a town centre; therefore a negligible effect is expected.	Not required.
6.5 Avoid sterilisation of mineral resources	0	According to the Minerals Local Plan 2007 the site is not within a preferred area for mineral extraction, therefore a negligible effect is expected.	Not required.
6.6 Provide access to training, skills development and lifelong learning to meet identified needs	++?	The site is within straight line walking distance (1,400 m) of local education facilities; therefore an uncertain significant positive effect may occur because it could be easier and more resource/cost efficient to expand those existing facilities to accommodate new residents as required, rather than building new facilities to serve the new residents.	Not required.

## Land to the east of Danesbury Park Road –OMH6

<b>Site – Land to the east of Danesbury Park Road</b>	OMH 6	<b>Potential Capacity</b>	25	<b>Policy</b>	General Development Management Policies
---	-------	---------------------------	----	---------------	---

SA Objective	Likely Effects	Commentary	Mitigation recommendations (focussing on significant adverse effects)
<b>Long-term Objective 1: Health Improvement</b>			
1.1 ...lead to reduced health inequalities, and in particular improve the health of those living in communities characterised by relatively poor health? 1.2 ...lead to improved health for all?	+	The site is within straight line walking distance of three community facilities including:  - Within 1,400m: Oaklands Primary School, Woods of Roman Road Amenity Green Space, and Guessens, Codicote Road.  The site is not within an area classified as being within 20% of the most deprived areas nationally.  Overall a minor positive effect is expected as new residents would have access to a range of existing services.	Not required, but <b>SP 1: Sustainable Development</b> promotes the increased supply of housing and contributes to the reduction of social and health inequalities.
<b>Long-term Objective 2: Safer Communities</b>			
2.2 Ensure there is no increase in flood risk to people or property, taking into account climate change?	0	The site is not within Flood Zones 2 or 3 and does not contain flood storage areas; therefore a negligible effect is expected.	Not required, but <b>SADM 14: Flood Risk and Surface Water Management</b> Supporting text-some allocations will need to consider fluvial and surface water flood risk, albeit of limited extent.
<b>Long-term Objective 4: Improving the Environment</b>			
4.2 Significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transport?	0	Site is not within a walking distance (1400m) away from an Employment Centre, nor a Town Centre. There are no food/convenience stores within a close proximity to the site, therefore, a negligible effect was identified.	Not required.
	0	Proximity to transport services: This site is more than 400m of the nearest bus stop. A negligible effect is therefore expected.	Not required.
4.3 Avoid and reduce air pollution	0	Site is not within a walking distance (1400m) to any Employment Centre, therefore a negligible effect is identified.	Not required.
	0	Proximity to transport services: This site is more than 400m of the nearest bus stop. A negligible effect is therefore expected.	Not required.
4.4 Protect and enhance open space and landscape character, retaining local distinctiveness?	0	Less than 5% of the site is located within an existing open space and therefore a negligible effect is expected.	Not required, but <b>SP 13: Infrastructure Delivery-</b> Developers will be required to contribute to the reasonable costs of providing new green infrastructure, required as a result of their proposals.
	-?	Landscape character: The site is assessed as having a low-moderate landscape sensitivity and therefore could have a minor negative effect on landscape character.	<b>SP9: Place making and high quality design-</b> Proposals should relate well to their surroundings,

SA Objective	Likely Effects	Commentary	Mitigation recommendations (focussing on significant adverse effects)
			local distinctiveness, wider townscape and landscape.
	0	Previously Developed Land: This site not identified as previously developed land are assumed to have a negligible effect.	Not required
	0	Retaining local distinctiveness: The WHBC Green Belt Study Stage 3 (2019) scored the site as having a limited to no contribution to maintaining the existing settlement pattern (Local Purpose) and a limited to no contribution to preventing neighbourhood towns from merging (Green Belt Purpose 2) and therefore this site is assumed to have a negligible effect against this specific issue.	Not required but <b>SP9: Place making and high quality design</b> states that proposals should relate well to their surroundings, local distinctiveness, wider townscape and landscape.
4.5 Conserve and enhance the Borough's character, sense of place and local distinctiveness, historic environment, heritage and cultural assets, and their settings?	-?	The site is not adjacent to any heritage assets, however it is within 250m – 1000m to Welwyn Conservation Area and 12 Grade II Listed Buildings; therefore, a minor negative effect is expected although this is uncertain as the actual effects on historic assets will depend on the exact siting, scale and type of development and opportunities which may exist to enhance the setting of heritage features, or protect their settings through screening.	<b>SP1: Delivering Sustainable Development-</b> heritage assets should be protected and enhanced.  <b>SADM 15: Heritage</b> – proposals should sustain and enhance heritage assets and respect the character, appearance and setting of the asset in terms of design, scale, materials and impact on key views.
4.6 Protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, taking into account the impacts of climate change?	--?	The site is adjacent to the Grassland E of Danesbury Hospital LWS and within 250m of Danesbury Park LWS and LNR. Therefore a significant negative uncertain effect is expected. The uncertainty is also expected as the site is on more than 25% of greenfield land which could result in the loss of undesignated biodiversity interests.	<b>SP 11: Protection and enhancement of critical environmental assets-</b> Appropriate protection, enhancement and management of ecological assets.  <b>SADM 16: Ecology and Landscape-</b> Conserve and enhance the borough's natural and historic landscape.
4.8 Avoid water pollution	0	Site is located outside inner and outer water protection zones, therefore the development should have a negligible effect.	Not required.
4.10 Promote conservation and sustainable use of productive agricultural land and maximise the sustainable use of previously developed land	-	Majority of the site is not classified as agricultural land (it is classified as 'urban'), and predominantly greenfield land, and as such a minor negative effect is expected.	<b>Policy SP 11: Protection and enhancement of critical environmental assets-</b> protect the best and most versatile agricultural land.
<b>Long-term Objective 5: Decent Housing</b>			
5.1 Provide the right amount, type and tenure of housing to meet identified local needs?	0	The site has the capacity to deliver 25 dwellings, which accounts for less than 1% of the housing target, and therefore the development will have a negligible effect.	Not required but <b>SP1 Delivering Sustainable Development</b> requires new development to contribute to the creation of mixed and sustainable communities.
	++	Affordable housing: The site provides the capacity for 25 homes and therefore it is assumed the site would accommodate 35% affordable dwellings. A significant positive effect is expected.	Not required.
	++	Dwellings for older people: The site provides the capacity for 25 homes and therefore it is assumed the site would include 20% of dwelling to meet Building Regulations Part M4(2) standards for 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'	Not Required.

SA Objective	Likely Effects	Commentary	Mitigation recommendations (focussing on significant adverse effects)
		(or updated equivalent) . A significant positive effect is expected.	
<b>Long-term Objective 6: A Thriving Economy</b>			
6.1 Ensure the supply, location and quality of business and employment sites reflects the needs of local businesses and encourages a mixed and greener economy?	0	This site is not located within an Employment Site. A negligible effect is therefore expected.	Not required.
6.3 Enhance the vitality and attraction of Welwyn Garden City and Hatfield town retail centres?	0	This site is not within 1,400m of a town centre; therefore a negligible effect is expected.	Not required.
6.5 Avoid sterilisation of mineral resources	0	According to the Minerals Local Plan 2007 the site is not within a preferred area for mineral extraction, therefore a negligible effect is expected.	Not required.
6.6 Provide access to training, skills development and lifelong learning to meet identified needs	++?	The site is within straight line walking distance (1,400 m) of local education facilities therefore an uncertain significant positive effect may occur because it could be easier and more resource/cost efficient to expand those existing facilities to accommodate new residents as required, rather than building new schools to serve the new residents.	Not required.