

Salford City Council
Supplementary Planning Document
Ellesmere Park
Sustainability Appraisal Final Report
May 2006

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Components that make up the SEA Environmental Report	1
1. SUMMARY AND OUTCOMES	2
Non-technical Summary	2
Difference the process has made	5
How to comment	5
2. APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY	6
Approach adopted	6
Timetable and responsibility	6
Consultation arrangements	7
3. BACKGROUND	8
Purpose of Sustainability Appraisal	8
Plan objectives and content	8
Compliance with the SEA Directive/Regulations	8
4. SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES, BASELINE AND CONTEXT	9
Links to other strategies, plans and objectives	9
Baseline characteristics and the future baseline	10
Data collection limitations	11
The Sustainability Appraisal framework	11
Key sustainability issues and problems	11
5. APPRAISAL OF STRATEGIC OPTIONS	13
Characteristics of the options	13
Summary of the appraisal of strategic options	14
6. APPRAISAL OF PLAN'S EFFECTS	15
Potential overall effects of the draft SPD	15
Secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects	15
Difference the SA process has made	15
7. IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING	17
Next Steps	17

APPENDICES

Appendix 1:	Sustainability Appraisal Framework
Appendix 2:	Appraisal of Strategic Options
Appendix 3:	Summary of the Effects of the Draft SPD

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	SEA Directive Signpost Table	1
Table 2:	Sustainability Appraisal Stages and Tasks	6
Table 3:	Timetable of SA Outputs and Tasks	7
Table 4:	List of all Plans, Programmes and Strategies reviewed	9
Table 5:	Comparison of Crime Rates in Salford and England	10
Table 6:	Key Sustainability Issues	11
Table 7:	Potential Indicators	17

Components that make up the SEA Environmental Report

This Sustainability Appraisal report incorporates the requirements for an Environmental Report under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. These Regulations transpose the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (European Directive 2001/42/EC) into English law.

The places in the Sustainability Appraisal Report where the components which are required in relation to the Environmental Report are signposted in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Signpost of where in this report the different aspects of SEA Directive have been satisfied

Information to be included in an Environmental Report under the SEA Regulations	Relevant Sections in the SA Report
An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan and its relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.	3.4 - 3.6 4.1 - 4.3
The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan.	4.4 - 4.10
The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected.	4.4 - 4.10 4.16
Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan, including in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC.	4.4 - 4.10 4.16
The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation.	4.1 - 4.3
The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soils, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage, landscape, and the interrelationship between the above factors.	Section 6 Appendix 3
The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan.	Section 6 Appendix 3
An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties.	Section 2 Section 4 Section 5
A description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring.	Section 7
A non-technical summary of the information provided above.	Section 1

1. SUMMARY AND OUTCOMES

- 1.1 This section provides a non-technical summary of the Sustainability Appraisal report, setting out the process and the difference that this process has made. Contact details are also provided, with information about how to comment on the report during the consultation period.

NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

- 1.2 The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): Ellesmere Park Design Guide will advise people who wish to undertake new development in Ellesmere Park about what design principles should be considered and are likely to be acceptable. It will also ensure consistent and transparent decision-making.
- 1.3 The purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is to promote sustainable development through the integration of sustainability considerations into the preparation and adoption of the SPD. The SA considers the SPD's implications, from a social, economic and environmental perspective, by assessing options and the draft SPD against available baseline data and sustainability objectives.
- 1.4 SA is mandatory for SPDs under the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004). SAs of SPDs should also fully incorporate the requirements of the European Directive 2001/42/EC, known as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive. This Directive is transposed into English law by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 – the SEA Regulations.

THE APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY

- 1.5 The approach adopted to undertake the SA was based on the process set out in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) Guidance Paper "Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents" November 2005.
- 1.6 The level of detail and the scope that the SA covered was agreed by key stakeholders involved in the SA process as part of consultation on a SA Scoping Report. This report was produced to set out the initial context and findings of the SA and the proposed approach to the appraisal process.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PLANS, PROGRAMMES AND OBJECTIVES

- 1.7 The purpose of reviewing other plans and programmes and sustainability objectives is to ensure that the relationship between these Documents and the draft SPD has been fully explored. This will in turn ensure that Salford City Council is able to act on any identified inconsistencies between international, national, regional and local objectives.
- 1.8 A range of national, regional and local strategies were reviewed as part of the SA process and no major inconsistencies were found between policies. The key links identified were with Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1): Delivering Sustainable Development; North West Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS13); North West Regional Assembly's Regional Sustainable Development Framework – 'Action for Sustainability' (Afs); and the City of Salford Unitary Development Plan - Revised Deposit Draft Replacement Plan 2003–2016.

BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS

- 1.9 The collection and assessment of information and data about the current and likely future state of the policy area (City of Salford) was used within the SA to help identify sustainability problems and predict the SPD's effects. Where available, comparators, key trends and targets were identified.

- 1.10 Sources for the baseline data included: Health Inequalities in Salford – a local strategy for action (2004); Salford PCT Annual Report (2003/2004); Neighbourhood Statistics website (<http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk>); Indices of Deprivation (2004); Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plan (2000); Salford City Council Resident's Survey (2003/2004); and the Salford Annual Baseline Review (2004).
- 1.11 Issues and trends identified included that the population of the City has decreased rapidly since 1992 and that many parts of Salford are amongst the most deprived in the country. Also, the general health of the population is below the national average and crime is much higher than the national average. Average earning levels are also below the national average. However, the City is well endowed with natural and cultural assets.

THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK

- 1.12 The establishment of SA objectives and criteria is central to the SA process and provides a way in which sustainability effects can be described, assessed and compared. The sustainability objectives used for the SA of the SPD were drawn from the sustainability issues identified through analysis of the baseline data and review of other plans and strategies.
- 1.13 There were 16 objectives used in total, organised under the three dimensions of sustainability: social, environmental and economic. The objectives covered a broad range of issues, including: to improve the health of the population; to improve safety and security for people and property; to reduce deprivation within the city; to ensure that everyone has access to a good home that meets their needs; to improve accessibility for all the community; to maintain and improve biodiversity, flora and fauna; to reduce vulnerability to climate change; and to maximise economic growth.

APPRAISAL OF STRATEGIC OPTIONS

- 1.14 A key requirement of the SA is to consider reasonable alternatives as part of the assessment process. The options that were assessed were formulated from the Unitary Development Plan process and the Council's intention to provide transparent guidance for people who wish to undertake new development in Ellesmere Park about what design principles are likely to be considered acceptable. The options assessed were thus:
- **Do nothing / business as usual (option A):** This option would result in a lack of clear and specific design guidance for people who wish to undertake new development in Ellesmere Park. It would result in less consistent decision-making, and a lack of transparency in decision-making. This could have a detrimental impact on health and well-being, accessibility, climate change, the quality of the townscape, economic growth and would remove an opportunity for people to be involved in the decision making process.
 - **Provide clear design guidance for Ellesmere Park by way of SPD (option B):** This option would strike the right balance between the needs of developers and the impact of any development on the character of the area. This ensures that all people who may be affected by a development are given equal consideration without prejudice. It would allow an opportunity for specific issues to be addressed, such as design and special circumstances without being overly restrictive. This could have positive benefits for the SA objectives identified in Option A above.
 - **Provide clear design guidance for Ellesmere Park by way of a more restrictive SPD (option C):** This option could benefit some existing residents by preserving rather than conserving the area. However, it could result in a more socially and economically exclusive area that may not meet the changing residential needs and requirements of the wider community. It may also put the potential re-use of some properties in jeopardy, and possibly lead to decay and

dereliction of buildings and the area's landscape and street-scene setting to the detriment of the character of the area. This option could have a positive impact on some SA objectives but this is likely to be counter-balanced by negative local and citywide impacts.

- **Provide clear guidance for Ellesmere Park by way of a more relaxed SPD (option D):** This option would be a lowest common denominator option. Having achieved a good level of community involvement in the initial processes of considering the draft SPD, a more relaxed SPD would probably have little more impact than Option D "Do Nothing / Business as Usual". As a result, the existing Ellesmere Park Development Control Policy would not be updated to take account of new social, environmental and economic conditions. It is likely that this option would not be well received by the local community and would not provide an effective tool to guide and encourage good design in the Ellesmere Park area. This option could have similar impacts on the SA objectives as Option A but negative impacts on community involvement and engagement.

1.15 The key changes and the sustainability strengths and weaknesses of each option were identified. This concluded that the preferred option was to provide clear design guidance for people who wish to undertake new development in Ellesmere Park about what design principles should be considered and are likely to be acceptable. It will also ensure consistent and transparent decision-making. This is the option delivered by the draft SPD (option B in this appraisal).

APPRAISAL OF THE PLAN'S EFFECTS

1.16 The SA provides a record of the prediction and assessment of the potential effects of the preferred option (provide SPD) and the 'do nothing' option. These were assessed against each of the 16 sustainability objectives and were given a score based on a five-point scale with one uncertain category:

++	MAJOR POSITIVE
+	MINOR POSITIVE
0	NEUTRAL
-	MINOR NEGATIVE
--	MAJOR NEGATIVE
?	UNCERTAIN

In addition, the effects of the plan were described in terms of the time period over which they will occur, whether they are probable or improbable, their geographical scale, and whether effects are permanent or temporary.

1.17 Generally the draft SPD performed very well against the sustainability objectives and the majority of effects identified were very positive. For example, the draft SPD was identified as striking the right balance between the needs of people who wish to undertake new development in Ellesmere Park and the impact of that development on the character of the area. This in turn can have positive effects on health and energy use. Furthermore, production of the policies within the SPD allows for extensive consultation to take place, which ensures ownership of the policies for residents and refinement of those policies so that they are representative of the views of residents. This promotes more vibrant communities.

1.18 No negative effects of the SPD have been identified. However, there are linkages from to other SPDs that clarify detailed design issues (e.g. Sustainable Design and Construction, Design and Crime, Trees and Design).

IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

1.19 A key part of the SA process is establishing how any significant sustainability effects of implementing the SPD will be monitored. Some potential indicators have been

2. APPRAISAL METHODOLOGY

APPROACH ADOPTED

- 2.1 The approach adopted to undertake the SA was based on the process set out in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) Guidance Paper "Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents" November 2005.
- 2.2 Table 2 below sets out the SA stages and tasks, based on those listed in the Government guidance. This SA Report represents the completion of up to Stage C of the SA process.

Table 2: Sustainability Appraisal stages and tasks

PRE-PRODUCTION
<p>Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding the scope.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and review other relevant plans, programmes and sustainable development objectives that will affect or influence the SPD. Collect relevant social, environmental and economic baseline information. Identify key sustainability issues for the SA to address. Develop the SA framework, consisting of the sustainability objectives, indicators and targets. Test the SPD objectives against the sustainability objectives and whether the SPD objectives are consistent with one another. Produce Scoping Report and carry out necessary consultation with key stakeholders on the scope of the appraisal and the key issues and possible options for solutions.
PRODUCTION
<p>Stage B: Developing and Refining Options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carry out appraisal of the SPD options and make recommendations for improvement.
<p>Stage C: Appraising the effects of the draft SPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Predict the effects and carry out detailed assessment of the effects of the draft SPD. Propose measures to maximize beneficial effects and mitigate adverse effects. Develop proposals for monitoring. Prepare the final SA Report along with the draft SPD.
<p>Stage D: Consultation on the SA Report and Draft SPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consult on the final SA Report along with the draft SPD. Carry out, where necessary, appraisal of any significant changes made as a result of representations.
ADOPTION AND MONITORING
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inform consultees that SPD has been adopted. Issue statement summarizing information on how the SA results and consultees' opinions were taken into account, reasons for choice of options and proposals for monitoring, including in relation to any recommended changes. Make SPD and SA Report available for public viewing.
<p>Stage E: Monitoring implementation of the SPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor significant effects of the SPD to identify at an early stage any unforeseen adverse effects. Undertake appropriate remedial action where necessary.

TIMETABLE AND RESPONSIBILITY

- 2.3 The timing of key SA outputs and tasks is set out in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Timetable of SA outputs and tasks

TASK	TIMETABLE
Preparation of the SA Scoping Report	November 2005
Consultation on SA Scoping Report	January / February 2006
Appraisal of strategic options	March / April 2006
Preparation of responses to comments from consultees	March / April 2006
Preparation of SA Report	April / May 2006

2.4 A team of planning officers from Salford City Council undertook the SA.

CONSULTATION ARRANGEMENTS

2.5 In November 2005 an SA Scoping Report was produced to set out the initial context and findings of the SA and the proposed approach to the rest of the appraisal. The aim was to ensure that the SA was comprehensive and would address all relevant issues and objectives, by enabling input from key stakeholders and consultation bodies at an early stage in the process.

2.6 The Scoping Report set out an initial assessment of:

- The relationship between the SPD and other relevant plans and programmes.
- Relevant sustainability objectives established at the national, regional and local level.
- The current environmental, social and economic baseline and any trends.
- The likely key sustainability issues.

2.7 The Report also set out the proposed methodology for the SA, giving details of its proposed level of detail and scope.

2.8 Comments on the Scoping Report were invited from the four consultation bodies required by the SEA Regulations (English Nature, English Heritage, Environment Agency, Countryside Agency) together with other key consultees representing social, economic and environmental interests in the City of Salford, namely CABE, GONW and NWRA.

3. BACKGROUND

PURPOSE OF SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

- 3.1 The purpose of SA is to promote sustainable development through better integration of sustainability considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans. The objective of this SA is to inform the development of the *Supplementary Planning Document: Ellesmere Park*. The SA considers the SPD's implications from a social, economic and environmental perspective, by assessing options and the draft SPD against available baseline data and sustainability objectives.
- 3.2 SA is mandatory for Local Development Documents (LDD) under the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. These Documents include Development Plan Documents (DPD) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD).
- 3.3 This SA Report is the key output of the SA process, documenting the work carried out during the appraisal of the SPD.

PLAN OBJECTIVES AND CONTENT

- 3.4 The City Council recognises that the landscape, street-scene and built environment of the Ellesmere Park area has a special character, and that new development in the area needs to be well designed in order to conserve and enhance the area's character. Part of the area is a designated Conservation Area and much of the mature tree and shrub cover is protected by Tree Preservation Orders. Specific design guidance for the area will assist designers and developers to prepare high quality new projects, help the Council in making decisions on planning applications for new development, and ensure that the local community is actively engaged in the planning processes in the area. To ensure consistency and fairness the draft Ellesmere Park SPD has been produced.
- 3.5 The draft Ellesmere Park SPD has three key objectives:

1. To ensure that the character of Ellesmere Park's buildings and environment is conserved and enhanced.
2. To ensure that new development in the Ellesmere Park area is designed and built to the highest standard.
3. To ensure that residents, property owners, designers and developers are clear about what the Council will expect from new developments in the area.

- 3.6 The draft Ellesmere Park SPD is organised into five sections:
- Introduction.
 - The Special Character of the Area.
 - Issues Facing Ellesmere Park.
 - Design Policies.
 - Implementation, Monitoring and Review.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE SEA DIRECTIVE/REGULATIONS

- 3.7 In accordance with the Government's draft guidance on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), SAs of SPDs should also fully incorporate the requirements of the European Directive 2001/42/EC, known as the SEA Directive. This Directive is transposed into English law by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 – the SEA Regulations. While SEA and SA are distinct processes, the intention of this SA is to adopt an approach to appraisal, which also meets the requirements of the SEA Directive and Regulations.

4. SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES, BASELINE AND CONTEXT

LINKS TO OTHER STRATEGIES, PLANS AND OBJECTIVES

- 4.1 The purpose of reviewing other plans and programmes and sustainability objectives is to ensure that the relationship between these documents and the draft SPD has been fully explored. This will in turn ensure that Salford City Council is able to act on any identified inconsistencies between international, national, regional and local objectives.
- 4.2 Table 4 below shows a list of the plans and strategies that were reviewed as part of the SA.

Table 4: List of all Plans, Programmes and Strategies reviewed as part of the SA

INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EC Directive - Conservation of Natural Habitats of Wild Fauna and Flora 92/43/EEC. • EC Directive - Establishing a framework for the Community action in the Field of Water Policy • Sustainable Communities: People, Places and Prosperity (A 5-year Plan from the ODPM) 2005. • PPG 2 Green Belts. • PPG3 Housing. • PPG 13 Transport. • PPG 15 Planning and the Historic Environment. • PPG 25 Development and Flood Risk. • PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development. • PPS6 Planning for town centres • PPS 7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas. • PPS9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. • PPS12 Local Development Frameworks. • PPS 22 Renewable Energy. • Safer Places: The Planning System and Crime Prevention. • Waste Strategy for England and Wales 2000. • Air Quality Strategy for England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland 2000. • Climate Change: The UK Programme. • Community Leadership and Climate Change – Guidance for Local Authorities. • The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. • Environment Act 1995. • Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). • Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. • Securing The Future: delivering UK Sustainable Development Strategy 2005. • Quality of Life Counts: Indicators for a Strategy for Sustainable Development for the United Kingdom. • UK Biodiversity Action Plan. • Working with the Grain of Nature: A Biodiversity Strategy for England 2002. • Our Energy Future – Creating a Low Carbon Economy.
REGIONAL
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Strategy towards 2020 (The Regional Economic Strategy for the NW). • Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) (RPG13) • NWRA's Regional Sustainable Development Framework – 'Action for Sustainability' (Afs). • North West Regional Housing Strategy 2003. • Regional Waste Strategy for the North West 2004.

LOCAL

- City of Salford Unitary Development Plan - Revised Deposit Draft Replacement Plan 2003–2016.
- Making the Future Happen: Our Strategy for Housing in Salford 2004-2006.
- City of Salford 2003 Housing Market Demand Study.
- Community Plan – Our Vision for Salford 2001-2006.
- Salford Community Safety Strategy 2005-2008

- 4.3 No inconsistencies between policies were found. The key links identified were with Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development; North West Regional Spatial Strategy; North West Regional Assembly's Regional Sustainable Development Framework – 'Action for Sustainability' (AfS); and the City of Salford Unitary Development Plan - Revised Deposit Draft Replacement Plan 2003–2016.

BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS AND THE FUTURE BASELINE

- 4.4 According to the latest mid-2003 population statistics, there were 216,400 people living in Salford of whom 49.7% were male and 50.3% were female. Children under five accounted for approximately 6% of the population. Between 1992 and 2002 the population of Salford decreased by 12.6%. This was the 2nd greatest decrease in the UK. In Salford, 6 out of 20 of the wards are in the 5% most deprived wards and 9 are in the 10% most deprived wards. In 2003, the Gross weekly wage rate for Salford was £424, which is marginally lower than the average for the northwest (£437) and the national average (£438). The level of unemployment in the City (3.9%) is also above the national average (3.3%).
- 4.5 Life expectancy in Salford is the lowest in the whole of Greater Manchester. Male life expectancy in Salford is on average 2.9 years less than the national average. For women, the difference is 2.4 years. The main killers are heart disease and cancers. With regard to other health considerations, according to a 1998 survey, there were approximately 6,500 diabetics in Salford. It was thought that this figure may double by 2008. In 2001, 27,846 (22.8%) of people suffered with a limiting long term illness.
- 4.6 Crime in the City is significantly higher than the national average. Table 5 below, which relates to crimes recorded by the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships across the country, compares the crime rates in Salford to the national average. In particular, it highlights that burglary rates are more than double the national average.

Table 5: Comparison of Crime rates in Salford and England

Key Offences	England (2002/2003)	Salford (2002/2003)
Violence against the person (per 1000 population)	16.0	18.3
Sexual offences (per 1000 population)	0.9	1.1
Robbery offences (per 1000 population)	2.1	4.7
Burglary offences (per 1000 population)	20.2	43.7
Vehicle crime offences (per 1000 population)	18.7	33.4

- 4.7 The City of Salford is made up of a number of diverse landscapes. To the east of the City is central Salford, which forms part of the regional centre. This area is largely urbanised. The western fringes of the City are more rural in character and include large areas of green belt. The majority of this green belt also forms the city's mosslands area, which is a valuable conservation and nature resource of

international importance. Habitats across the city are also highly diverse and include wet woodlands, lowland hay meadow, lowland dry acid grassland, lowland heath, and lowland raised bog. Within Salford there are 32 Sites of Biological Importance (SBIs), some of which include priority habitats as identified in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan.

4.8 Pollutant levels in Salford (ozone, nitrogen dioxide, sulphur dioxide, carbon monoxide) are all classified as being low, meaning that their effects are unlikely to be noticed by individuals with sensitivity to air pollution. With regard to the River Irwell, its chemistry and biology is classed as poor with fish largely absent.

4.9 With regard to the city's cultural and landscape heritage, there are 273 Listed Buildings, 3 Scheduled Ancient Monuments, 2 Historic Parks, 16 Conservation Areas and over 300 Tree Preservation Orders in Salford.

4.10 Sources for the baseline data included: Health Inequalities in Salford – a local strategy for action (2004); Salford PCT Annual Report (2003/2004); Neighbourhood Statistics website (<http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk>); Indices of Deprivation (2004); Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plan (2000); Salford City Council Resident's Survey (2003/2004); and the Salford Annual Baseline Review (2004).

DATA COLLECTION LIMITATIONS

4.11 The collection of some of the baseline data is infrequent or is not specific to the City, which can distort slightly the baseline situation. Also, the collection of baseline data is ongoing. New information may emerge, therefore, with relevance to the appraisal.

THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK

4.12 The establishment of SA objectives and criteria is central to the SA process. The SA framework, based on these objectives provides a way in which sustainability effects can be described, assessed and compared. Sustainability objectives are distinct from those of the SPD, but in some cases will overlap.

4.13 The sustainability objectives used for the SA of the SPD were drawn from the sustainability issues identified through analysis of the baseline data and review of other plans and strategies.

4.14 There were 16 objectives used in total, organised under the three dimensions of sustainability: social, environmental and economic. The objectives covered a broad range of issues, including: to improve the health of the population; to improve safety and security for people and property; to reduce deprivation within the city; to ensure that everyone has access to a good home that meets their needs; to improve accessibility for all the community; to maintain and improve biodiversity, flora and fauna; to reduce vulnerability to climate change; and to maximize economic growth.

4.15 The SA Framework can be found at appendix 1.

KEY SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

4.16 The Issues and trends identified are summarized in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Key Sustainability Issues

KEY ISSUES
Social
The City's population has decreased rapidly since 1992. According to the Indices of Deprivation, 2004, Salford has 45% (9 out of 20) of Salford's wards are in the lowest 10% of wards for deprivation.
As a City, Salford's population generally suffers from poor health with both men and

women having a lower life expectancy than others in Greater Manchester.
Crime in Salford is significantly higher than the national average. In particular, burglary is more than double the national average and vehicle crime is close to double the national average.
There are a significant number of people in Salford who are temporarily or permanently disabled.
Environmental
Salford has a significant number of natural environmental assets including vast areas of Greenbelt and Mosslands, SBIs, TPOs and water resources such as lakes, rivers and ponds. These natural assets must be protected and enhanced for the benefit of the City and local biodiversity.
The level of water pollution in Salford is significant and restricts the development of biodiversity. In addition the UK has pledged to reduce its emissions of greenhouse gases by 15% below 1990 levels by 2010.
Salford also has an impressive array of cultural heritage assets, which must be preserved and enhanced. These assets include Listed Buildings, Ancient Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Historic Parks.
Large parts of Salford are susceptible to flooding (0.5% - 1.3% chance of flooding, except in extreme conditions).
Economic
Earning levels in Salford are marginally lower than the national average. However, unemployment is higher (3.9% in Salford, 3.3% national average).

5. APPRAISAL OF STRATEGIC OPTIONS

- 5.1 One of the key requirements of SA is to consider reasonable alternatives as part of the assessment process. During the development of the draft SPD, a range of options were considered, assessed and debated.
- 5.2 The aim of options appraisal is to assess the sustainability of all options against the sustainability framework. This process enables comparison between options, highlighting any potential implications on sustainability. The appraisal of options also enables recommendations for mitigation of negative impacts and suggestions for modifications to the preferred option, as presented by the draft SPD.
- 5.3 The preferred approach, presented by the draft SPD, is to provide transparent guidance to advise people who wish to undertake new development in Ellesmere Park about what design principles should be considered and are likely to be acceptable. Clearly within this option, there are a number of sub-options around its detailed implementation, for example, what types development should be considered unacceptable by reason of the impact on neighbours or the street scene. However, given the specificity and number of potential options, it is considered more appropriate to consider these matters as part of the discussion and consultation on the policy document, and not as part of the SA process. However, three alternative options were also considered: “do nothing / business as usual” (i.e. have no guidance); produce an SPD that provides more restrictive and prescriptive guidance (i.e. only allows limited development that preserves rather than conserves the character of the area); produce an SPD that provides more relaxed guidance (i.e. is specific to the area but lacking in much prescription or positive guidance).

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE OPTIONS

- 5.4 **Option A: Do nothing / business as usual.**
- 5.5 Although Supplementary Planning Guidance exists in the form of Development Control Policy for Ellesmere Park, this will cease to be effective when the Replacement UDP is adopted. Therefore, option A assumes the future scenario when no such guidance will exist. Option A, therefore, would result in a greater degree of uncertainty about the control of design and development in the Ellesmere Park area and would result in the planning process being slowed down significantly due to the lack of clear guidance. Decisions would also be less consistent resulting in a potentially unfair system.
- 5.6 **Option B: Provide clear design guidance for Ellesmere Park.**
- 5.7 Option B would involve the preparation of a document that would provide clear and accountable design guidance to people who wish to undertake new development in the Ellesmere Park area. This document would seek to strike a balanced approach between the needs of people who wish undertake new development in Ellesmere Park and its impact on the character of the area.
- 5.8 **Option C: Provide more restrictive guidance**
- 5.9 This approach would offer more restrictive and prescriptive design guidance than in option A. It may prevent the Ellesmere Park from realising its potential as a high quality residential area, complemented by well designed new buildings and investment into improving of public open space, the public realm and gateways / entrance points to the area.
- 5.10 **Option D: Provide less restrictive guidance**
- 5.11 This approach would offer similar benefits to option A, but may not achieve any specific area related benefits in terms of good design and investment spin-offs. It

would offer more opportunity for developers to provide high-density new development but could erode the character of the area and risk alienating the local community.

SUMMARY OF THE APPRAISAL OF STRATEGIC OPTIONS

- 5.12 The matrix in appendix 2 confirms that Option B performs best in terms of sustainability in comparison with the other options:
- **Do nothing / business as usual (option A):** This option would result in a lack of clear design guidance for people who wish to undertake new development in the Ellesmere Park area. It would result in less consistent decision-making, and a lack of transparency in decision-making. This could have a detrimental impact on health and well-being, accessibility, climate change, the quality of the townscape, economic growth and would remove an opportunity for people to be involved in the decision making process.
 - **Provide clear design guidance for Ellesmere Park by way of SPD (option B):** This option would strike the right balance between the needs of people to undertake new development in the Ellesmere Park area and the impact of any development on the character of the area. This ensures that all people who may be affected by a development are given equal consideration without prejudice. It would allow an opportunity for specific issues to be addressed, such as design and special circumstances without being overly restrictive. This could have positive benefits for the SA objectives identified in Option A above.
 - **Provide clear design guidance for Ellesmere Park by way of a more restrictive SPD (option C):** This option could benefit some existing residents by preserving rather than conserving the area. However, it could result in a more socially and economically exclusive area that may not meet the changing residential needs and requirements of the wider community. It may also put the potential re-use of some properties in jeopardy, and possibly lead to decay and dereliction of buildings and the area's landscape and street-scene setting to the detriment of the character of the area. This option could have a positive impact on some SA objectives but this is likely to be counter-balanced by negative local and citywide impacts.
 - **Provide clear guidance for Ellesmere Park by way of a more relaxed SPD (option D):** This option would be a lowest common denominator option. Having achieved a good level of community involvement in the initial processes of considering the draft SPD, a more relaxed SPD would probably have little more impact than Option D "Do Nothing / Business as Usual". As a result, the existing Ellesmere Park Development Control Policy would not be updated to take account of new social, environmental and economic conditions. It is likely that this option would not be well received by the local community and would not provide an effective tool to guide and encourage good design in the Ellesmere Park area. This option could have similar impacts on the SA objectives as Option A but negative impacts on community involvement and engagement.
- 5.13 The preferred option is thus to provide a document which would provide clear and accountable design guidance to people who wish to undertake new development in the Ellesmere Park area. This option is delivered by the draft SPD (option B).

6. APPRAISAL OF PLAN'S EFFECTS

- 6.1 The appraisal of the plan's effects can be found in the matrix at appendix 3 which provides a record of the prediction and assessment of the potential effects of the draft SPD and the 'do nothing' option. The plan objectives were scored on a five-point scale with one uncertain category against each of the sustainability objectives:

++	MAJOR POSITIVE
+	MINOR POSITIVE
0	NEUTRAL
-	MINOR NEGATIVE
--	MAJOR NEGATIVE
?	UNCERTAIN

- 6.2 In addition, the effects of the plan were described in terms of the time period over which they will occur, whether they are probable or improbable, their geographical scale, and whether effects are permanent or temporary.

POTENTIAL OVERALL EFFECTS OF THE DRAFT SPD

- 6.3 The matrix at appendix 3 shows that the majority of the sustainability objectives are affected either positively or very positively by the implementation of the SPD.
- 6.4 The draft SPD policies would address the balance between the needs of people wishing to undertake new development in the Ellesmere Park area and the impact of that development on the character of the area. This in turn has positive effects on some sustainability objectives (e.g. health, crime and safety, landscape and townscape).
- 6.5 In addition, production of the policies within SPD allows for extensive consultation to take place, which ensures ownership of the policies for the local community and refinement of those policies so that they are representative of the local views.
- 6.6 The draft SPD policies would provide design guidance that is not provided in any other documents (e.g. with regard to building layout, massing, materials etc). Therefore, better quality new development would be secured as a direct result of these policies, which would have knock-on impacts for a number of the sustainability objectives (e.g. health, deprivation, economic growth).

SECONDARY, CUMMULATIVE AND SYNERGISTIC EFFECTS

- 6.7 Secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects were considered during the assessment.
- 6.8 The cumulative, secondary and synergistic impacts of the SPD are limited but generally positive. For example, in maintaining and enhancing the quality of the landscape and townscape the Ellesmere Park Design Guide SPD would prevent the loss of the area's characteristic features to the point where no special character can be justified to be present.

THE DIFFERENCE THE SUSTAINABILTY APPRAISAL PROCESS HAS MADE

- 6.9 The SA process and the preparation of the SPD have been initiated to build upon the Council's stated ambitions in the replacement Unitary Development Plan. Therefore the SA has found that implementing the draft SPD will have overall positive benefits on sustainability.

6.10 However some opportunities for further enhancement have been identified through the SA process and these recommendations have been incorporated in the consultation draft of the SPD. These include:

- The inclusion of guideline standards on car parking provision and private amenity space within developments.
- The identification of further implementation and review mechanisms including the planned preparation of a Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, and the possible preparation of a Public Realm Master-plan to identify a programme of improvement projects that may be funded through developer contributions.

7. IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

- 7.1 The significant sustainability effects of implementing the draft SPD will be monitored to help identify unforeseen adverse effects and to enable remedial action to be taken.
- 7.2 The Council is required to prepare Annual Monitoring Reports to assess the implementation of the Local Development Scheme and the extent to which policies in the Local Development Documents are being achieved. The SPD will be included in this process.
- 7.3 Table 7 below shows the indicators that form part of the SA Framework.

Table 7: Potential Indicators

- | |
|---|
| • “Percentage of people who like the neighbourhood they live in” to act as a proxy. |
| • Burglary offences per 1000 population. |
| • Vehicle crime offences per 1000 population. |
| • Number of jobs available relating to the construction industry. |

NEXT STEPS

- 7.4 The key next steps of the SA once the formal consultation on the SA Report along with the draft SPD is complete will involve:
- Appraisal of any significant changes proposed to the draft SPD not already considered.
 - Publishing a statement following adoption of the SPD setting out the changes to the SPD in response to the SA process, the ways in which responses to consultation have been taken into account and confirmation of monitoring arrangements.
 - Monitoring the significant effects.

**APPENDIX 1:
SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK**

Sustainability Appraisal Framework

Topic Area	Objective	Key Criteria	Indicators	Data Source
Social				
Human Health	To improve the health of the population	Does the EPSPD encourage high quality developments that make a positive contribution to the local environment, which in turn will make a contribution to the health and well-being of the population?	"% of people who like the neighbourhood they live in" to act as a proxy	Quality of Life Survey
Education	To improve the education and skills of the population	Will the EPSPD provide opportunities for skills development?	No significant Impact	
Crime & Safety	To improve safety and security for people and property	Does the EPSPD encourage safety and security for people, buildings and vehicles?	Burglary in Ellesmere Park (per 10,000 properties) Vehicle Crime in Ellesmere Park (per 10,000 properties) Juvenile nuisance in Ellesmere Park (per 10,000 properties)	Information Team, Spatial Planning, Salford City Council.
Deprivation and Poverty	To reduce deprivation within the city	Does the EPSPD support an increase in household incomes/wealth?	No significant Impact	
Housing	To ensure that everyone has access to a good home that meets their needs	Will the EPSPD maximise the quality and design of the existing and new housing stock by promoting good design principles?	"% of people who like the neighbourhood they live in" to act as a proxy	Quality of Life Survey
Neighbourhoods and Community	To promote vibrant communities which participate in decision making	Will all sections of the local community have the opportunity to be involved in the preparation of the EPSPD? Will it improve neighbourhood satisfaction?	"% of people who like the neighbourhood they live in" to act as a proxy	Quality of Life Survey
Accessibility	To improve accessibility for all the community	Does the EPSPD improve access for disabled persons? Does the EPSPD encourage access by more sustainable forms of transport? Does the EPSPD support the creation of better linkages between key public spaces?	"% of people who like the neighbourhood they live in" to act as a proxy	
Environmental				
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna	To maintain and improve biodiversity, flora and fauna	Will the EPSPD help conserve and enhance biodiversity, flora and fauna?	Net change in the number of trees resulting from planning permissions within the Ellesmere Park area.	Development Control Uniform database
Water	To improve the quality of waterways	Will the EPSPD make a positive contribution towards the improvement of the City's	No significant impact.	

Topic Area	Objective	Key Criteria	Indicators	Data Source
		waterways? Will the EPSPD minimise the amount of surface water runoff? Will the EPSPD minimise the level of pollution entering the water table?		
Climatic Factors	To reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality To reduce vulnerability to climate change	Will the EPSPD make a positive contribution towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions? Will the EPSPD minimise the risk of flooding? Will the EPSPD minimise the amount of surface water runoff?	No significant impact.	
Material Assets	Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources	Does the EPSPD encourage energy efficiency for new developments? Does the EPSPD maximise the use of recycled materials?	No significant impact.	
Cultural Heritage	To protect and enhance the historic environment	Will the EPSPD protect and enhance sites, features, buildings and areas of historical interest? Will the EPSPD enhance the setting of sites, features, buildings and areas of historical interest?	N/A	
Landscape and Townscape	To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Will the EPSPD protect and enhance sites, features, buildings and areas of architectural interest and their setting?	The above indicator on “% of people who like the neighbourhood they live in” acts as proxy	Quality of Life Survey
Economic				
Economic Health	To maximise sustainable economic growth To ensure good quality employment opportunities are available to all	Will the EPSPD improve the image of the area as a place to invest? Will the EPSPD encourage local employment opportunities?	No significant impact.	Salford Baseline Review

**APPENDIX 2:
APPRAISAL OF STRATEGIC OPTIONS**

SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVE	OPTION A (Do nothing)		OPTION B (Balanced approach SPD)		Option C (More Restrictive SPD)		Option D (Less restrictive approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation
Human Health To improve the health of the population	-	Having no EPSPD could lead to the erosion or loss of Ellesmere Park's character. The UDP control the area's development in a general manner but may not be able to satisfactorily enhance the area. This could contribute to negative perceptions of Salford as a place that does not value the contribution of the quality of the built environment to the general well-being of the community.	+	The EPSPD would provide a balanced framework for controlling the design and impact of new development in Ellesmere Park, and conserving and enhancing its character. This would demonstrate that the Council is serious about protecting the quality of City's built environment for the general well-being of the community, and for local residents and interest groups.	0	More extensive planning and design policy restrictions would control most change and development, leading to less new development and fewer, more limited building extensions in Ellesmere Park. The balance in this case could favour limited numbers of residents and groups that seek to preserve rather than conserve and enhance Ellesmere Park through encouraging high quality design and investment in the area. A higher degree of restriction could lead to lack of investment and maintenance that could erode the area's character, and create a less dynamic, less mixed neighbourhood to the detriment of community well-being.	0	The balance in this case would favour developers of inappropriate higher density redevelopment projects of variable design quality. This could lead to the erosion or complete loss of the special buildings, landscapes, and design features that contribute to the Ellesmere Park area's character. It would be detrimental to occupants, interest groups, and to Salford generally as the attractiveness of a built environment asset that contributes to the City's wider appeal would be diminished.
Education To improve the education and skills of the population	0	Having no EPSPD could lead to the erosion of Ellesmere Park's character. The loss of interesting buildings, landscapes, and features and inability to satisfactorily control the style and scale of new development would be detrimental as people would not be able to experience and learn about attractive built environment qualities that add value to city living.	0/+	The EPSPD seeks to conserve and enhance the area allowing people to learn about and experience the quality of an important part of the built environment of the City.	0	A more restrictive EPSPD could result in the creation of a "museum piece". Whilst this would be of interest to historians its general education impact is limited.	0	A less restrictive EPSPD may achieve limited success in conserving and enhancing the area allowing people to learn about and experience the quality of an important part of the built environment of the City.
Crime and Safety To improve safety and security for people and property	0	Having no EPSPD would not impact on the principle of "Designing Out Crime" as this issue is covered by other policies in the UDP and the Design and Crime SPD.	+	This issue is covered by other policies in the UDP and the Design and Crime SPD. Reducing crime is not the principle purpose of the EPSPD. The GMP ALU will be involved in the consultation processes of the draft SPD. The implementation of elements of high quality design proposed in the EPSPD should lead to reductions in burglaries, vehicle crime, and juvenile nuisance.	+	This issue is covered by other policies in the UDP and the Design and Crime SPD. Including a more restrictive / less balanced approach to "Designing Out Crime" in the EPSPD could give the lead to the creation of a "fortress-like" quality to the buildings, and this could diminish the civilized feel and character of the area. Reducing crime is not the principle purpose of the EPSPD, though reference is made to involving the GMP ALU in the building design process. The EPSPD will reference an emerging specific SPD on Design and Crime.	0	This issue is covered by other policies in the UDP and the Design and Crime SPD. Reducing crime is not the principle purpose of the EPSPD, though reference is made to involving the GMP ALU in the building design process. A less restrictive EPSPD could fail to emphasise the importance of holistically conserving and enhancing key features in the area (such as mature landscaping). This could encourage an over-zealous approach to "Designing Out Crime" which could result in the loss of key features that contribute to the character of the area.

SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVE	OPTION A (Do nothing)		OPTION B (Balanced approach SPD)		Option C (More Restrictive SPD)		Option D (Less restrictive approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation
Deprivation and Poverty To reduce deprivation within the city	-	Having no EPSPD could lead to the implementation of new development of indeterminate quality in Ellesmere Park. The potential erosion of the quality and character of the area could result in the failure to attract an element of new residents to the City, who may instead choose to live in different parts of Greater Manchester or beyond. This may impact negatively on wider perceptions of Salford as a good place to live.	+	The EPSPD provides a framework for good design in Ellesmere Park. Well-designed new development in the area will be attractive to a broad range of new residents who will help to balance the City's demographic profile and add to the general economic well-being of the City.	+	A more restrictive approach to development and design in Ellesmere Park could reduce the area's potential to accommodate a wide range of new residents in quality surroundings. This could appear to positive for some residents but the City could lose out from failure to house potentially dynamic new residents who can contribute to the City's future economic prosperity and reductions to broader deprivation and poverty.	-	A less restrictive SPD could result in a reduction of quality and character in Ellesmere Park, potentially making it a less attractive place for new residents live. A failure to attract a wide range of new residents could result in a lesser contribution to the City's economic success and may hinder programmes to tackle deprivation and poverty.
Housing To ensure that everyone has access to a good home that meets their needs	0	Having no EPSPD would place reliance on the UDP and related policy documents to deliver new housing in Ellesmere Park. Whilst this approach could deliver a range of new homes it is possible that the quality of building design could be variable and have a cumulatively negative effect on the character of the area. This approach could diminish the role of Ellesmere Park as an asset to the built environment of Salford.	++	The EPSPD will provide balanced, deliverable design guidance that conserves and enhances the character and quality of Ellesmere Park. This will maximize the quality and design of the existing and new housing stock.	+	A more restrictive EPSPD could deliver some elements of very high quality design within Ellesmere Park but may also restrict the ability to create an appropriate range of quality new housing in the area.	+	A less restrictive EPSPD could fail to ensure that the quality of new housing design in Ellesmere Park conserves and enhances the character of the area satisfactorily. This could be beneficial for developers seeking to implement inappropriately high-density developments, but negative impacts for the residents and on the character of the area.
Neighbourhood and Communities To promote vibrant communities which participate in decision making	--	Having no EPSPD would miss an opportunity to involve a broad section Ellesmere Park's community in considering the parameters for the design of new development in their neighbourhood. The local community would not be enabled to take a degree of ownership and responsibility for ensuring high quality design and they would need to rely on more general UDP and related policies in considering planning applications in the area. This could lead to ongoing dissatisfaction with the results of the planning process. Although, the planning process would allow an opportunity for people to comment on applications when they are submitted, the production of an SPD would give people a further opportunity to shape the policies that guide decisions.	++	The process for preparing the EPSPD is designed to be inclusive of the local community, which has requested that a specific design and development policy framework for Ellesmere Park should be formulated. Community involvement in the process should lead to a wide degree of satisfaction as the local community will help to shape the planning policy framework for their area. This is likely to increase the percentage of people who like the neighbourhood they live in.	+	Involvement that leads to a more restrictive EPSPD may be satisfactory for some but not all members of the community. Community involvement needs to reflect the views of a broad and balanced range of people to ensure that new design and developments requirements are reasonable and deliverable, for the wider benefit of the area and all who live there.	-	Involvement that leads to a less restrictive EPSPD may be satisfactory for some but not all members of the community. Community involvement needs to reflect the views of a broad and balanced range of people to ensure that new design and developments requirements are reasonable and deliverable, for the wider benefit of the area and all who live there. The risk is that the wider community may not be satisfied that a less restrictive EPSPD could effectively conserve the character and quality of Ellesmere Park, and this could lead to general disinterest in the becoming involved in the process.

SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVE	OPTION A (Do nothing)		OPTION B (Balanced approach SPD)		Option C (More Restrictive SPD)		Option D (Less restrictive approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation
Accessibility To improve accessibility for all the community	0	Having no EPSPD removes an opportunity to highlight specific requirements of individuals / groups in the design of new development in Ellesmere Park. These issues are generally covered in the UDP and related planning policies but there would not be specific guidance related to Ellesmere Park and this may lead to inconsistent approach.	0	Having an EPSPD provides an opportunity to highlight and include specific requirements of individuals / groups in the design of new development in Ellesmere Park. Design guidance related to accessibility issues in the EPSPD could enable developers to sensitively design accessibility features that respect and enhance the character of the area.	0	Having a more restrictive EPSPD could limit the design and implementation of accessibility improvements to new buildings and within the street-scene. This could restrict accessibility for a broad range of people including young and older people, disabled people, and people wanting to use more sustainable forms of transport to access services and facilities through and beyond the area.	0	Having an EPSPD provides an opportunity to highlight specific requirements of individuals / groups. A less restrictive SPD could provide greater allowances for people to extend so that they can improve their accessibility but this may have negative impacts on the character of Ellesmere Park.
Environmental Objectives								
Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna To maintain and improve biodiversity, flora and fauna	0	New development proposals in Ellesmere Park would be determined in relation to the UDP and related planning policy documents, including an extensive TPO and an emerging Trees and Development SPD. These offer a good general range of protection for biodiversity, flora and fauna but do not offer specific guidance related to the Ellesmere Park Area. However, any negative impact is likely to be negligible. The loss of garden area may reduce habitats within the system.	+	The EPSPD will provide a framework for design guidance on the siting and layout of buildings to ensure that they respect the characteristics of the site and broader street scene and landscape. The framework will provide a context for conserving biodiversity, flora and fauna by protecting garden areas, existing mature tree and shrub planting and ensuring that new trees are planted and landscapes created. These natural features are an integral aspect of the character of Ellesmere Park. The EPSPD will provide a context for ensuring that trees protected under the EP TPO and existing areas of open space including the Three Sisters SBI are protected and enhanced. The EPSPD will relate to an emerging specific SPD on Trees and Development.	0	A more restrictive EPSPD could maintain existing biodiversity, flora and fauna because it is likely that less new development would happen, and if it did it would be more strictly controlled. However, biodiversity, flora and fauna may not be improved because tighter development controls may restrict the number of additional trees, habitats and natural features provided or enhanced.	0	A less restrictive SPD could impact negatively on maintaining and improving biodiversity, flora and fauna as it may not contain adequate controls over site layout design and the protection of trees, shrubs and gardens. It may not provide a satisfactory framework for developing mechanisms to achieve additional tree planting and enhancements to habitats and natural features.
To improve the quality of waterways To improve the quality of watercourses	0	New development proposals in Ellesmere Park would be determined in relation to the UDP and related planning policy documents. These will eventually reference an emerging specific SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction. Technical drainage matters will be dealt with through the Building Regulations. There will be no significant impact on the City's waterways.	0	The EPSPD will not make any direct contribution to the improvement of the City's waterways and any impact on waterways is likely to be negligible. It will contain initial guidance on sustainable construction principles and will relate to an emerging specific SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction. Buildings will need to be constructed in line with the Building Regulations.	0	A more restrictive EPSPD might contain detailed guidance and requirements for features such as sustainable urban drainage systems. However, these technical solutions are best dealt with through more specifically themed guidance such as the emerging SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction and the provisions of the Building Regulations. Any impact on the City's waterways is likely to be negligible.	0	A less restrictive EPSPD would probably have no more effect or influence on these issues than the general implementation of established and emerging UDP and related planning policy documents. Any impact on the City's waterways is likely to be negligible.

SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVE	OPTION A (Do nothing)		OPTION B (Balanced approach SPD)		Option C (More Restrictive SPD)		Option D (Less restrictive approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation
Climatic Factors To reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality	0	No guidance could allow residents to extend and adapt their homes to meet their needs more freely, which could reduce the need to build new houses and reduce energy use. It could also lead to the unnecessary demolition of reusable properties and their replacement with larger new buildings requiring new materials, increasing energy use.	0	The EPSPD will not have any significant impact on reducing greenhouse gas emissions, aside from guiding the area's role as a generally more sustainable neighbourhood.	-	A more restrictive EPSPD to require a greater range of environmental requirements and restrictions for new development in the area. This could result in the need to build new houses in other locations.	-	Employing a less restrictive approach could allow residents to extend and adapt their homes to meet their needs more freely, which could reduce the need to build new houses and reduce energy use. It could also lead to the unnecessary demolition of reusable properties and their replacement with larger new buildings requiring new materials, increasing energy use.
Climatic Factors To reduce vulnerability to climate change	0	Development within flood risk areas may increase vulnerability to climate change. Having no guidance could allow more development, which could increase the vulnerability to flooding. However, it is unlikely that there will be any significant impact from flooding or drainage issues in Ellesmere Park. Planning policy covering these issues is contained in national PPG / PPS and the UDP and its related documents including the emerging Sustainable Design and Development SPD.	0	The EPSPD will have no direct impact on the minimisation of flood risks as there are no potential development areas within Ellesmere Park that would constitute significant flood risks. Guidance that seeks the retention of significant areas of green space within developments will reduce surface water run, and the excess will go to main drains through appropriately designed drainage systems. The EPSPD will guide good design in the area but technical construction issues including drains will be dealt with through the Building Regulations. Planning policy covering these issues is contained in national PPG / PPS and the UDP and its related documents including the emerging Sustainable Design and Development SPD.	0	A more restrictive EPSPD may contain further guidance on measures to minimize climate change, but these are contained in more specific existing and emerging planning policy documents and controlled through the Building Regulations. Employing more restrictive guidance would limit the amount of development that takes place, which in turn would limit the impact on flooding.	0	Having less restrictive guidance could allow more inappropriate development, which could increase the vulnerability to flooding.
Material Assets Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources	0	No guidance could allow residents to extend and adapt their homes to meet their needs more freely, which could reduce the need to build new houses and reduce energy use. It could also lead to the unnecessary demolition of reusable properties and their replacement with larger new buildings requiring new materials, increasing energy use.	++	The EPSPD seeks to guide appropriate new development in the area, which respects and in many cases re-uses exiting buildings. It identifies existing features that should be retained and conserved, for example buildings, boundary walls, and sash windows. This approach, akin to recycling, will contribute to reducing the burden on raw materials required for new buildings and conversions. The Building Regulations deal with energy efficiency in construction projects.	-	Employing a more restrictive approach would limit the opportunities people have to adapt their homes to meet their needs. It is possible that fewer new homes would be built in the area, resulting in the need to build new houses to meet changing needs in other locations.	-	Employing a less restrictive approach could allow residents to extend and adapt their homes to meet their needs more freely, which could reduce the need to build new houses and reduce energy use. It could also lead to the unnecessary demolition of reusable properties and their replacement with larger new buildings requiring new materials, increasing energy use.

SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVE	OPTION A (Do nothing)		OPTION B (Balanced approach SPD)		Option C (More Restrictive SPD)		Option D (Less restrictive approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation
Cultural Heritage To protect and enhance the historic environment	0	Although covered by other policies in the UDP and related planning policy documents, having no guidance would remove an opportunity to highlight the importance of design and cultural heritage, and deliver enhancements to the Ellesmere Park area.	++	The EPSPD will provide design guidance for new development in the Ellesmere Park area. The area contains a Conservation Area and one listed building. One of the main purposes of the SPD is to ensure that Ellesmere Park is conserved and enhanced, and the design guide will be of use in protecting and enhancing the setting of the listed building.	0	A more restrictive EPSPD could prevent the positive re-use of existing buildings and possibly lead to their decay. Conversely it could turn Ellesmere Park into a more socially and economically exclusive area as limited numbers of people would be able to afford to there. However, this may not be beneficial with regards to creating sustainable communities.	-	A less restrictive EPSPD would have little more impact than the controls available through existing and emerging policies in the UDP and related planning policy documents, and would limit opportunities to highlight the importance of design and cultural heritage, and deliver enhancements to the Ellesmere Park area.
Landscape and Townscape To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	0	Having no detailed guidance removes the opportunity to give specific design guidance for conserving and enhancing the character of new development in Ellesmere Park. New development proposals in Ellesmere Park would be determined in relation to the UDP and related planning policy documents, including an extensive TPO and an emerging Trees and Development SPD. These offer a good general range of protection but do not offer specific guidance related to the Ellesmere Park Area. However, any negative impact is likely to be negligible.	++	The EPSPD will provide a balanced framework for protecting and enhancing sites, features buildings and areas of architectural interest and their setting in Ellesmere Park. A balanced approach provides strong opportunities for design control.	++	A more restrictive EPSPD could provide a greater degree of design control in the area, more specifically related to preserving rather than conserving and enhancing the area, and accepting that high quality well designed new development can be beneficial.	+	A less restrictive EPSPD could still contribute to design control but its outcomes could be unsatisfactory.
Economic Objectives								

SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVE	OPTION A (Do nothing)		OPTION B (Balanced approach SPD)		Option C (More Restrictive SPD)		Option D (Less restrictive approach)	
	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation	Effect	Comments/ Mitigation
Economic Health To maximise sustainable economic growth	0	Design control would be based on the UDP and other related planning policy documents. It is possible that the design quality of new development approved under this framework may not be satisfactory enough to encourage new economically active residents to locate in the area, and this could deter investment into the City.	+	The EPSPD covers a predominantly residential area where there are limited opportunities for business investment. It will not directly contribute to maximizing sustainable economic growth, but will indirectly through ensuring that Ellesmere Park contributes to balancing the quality and range of Salford's housing stock, and remains as a place where economically active residents choose to live.	-	A more restrictive EPSPD would limit the opportunities for new development in the area, and this could deter wider sustainable economic growth in the City.	0	It is possible that the design quality of new development approved under a more restricted EPSPD may not be satisfactory enough to encourage new economically active residents to locate in the area, and this could deter investment into the City.
Economic Health To ensure good quality employment opportunities are available to all	0	Any impact is likely negligible. There may be construction employment opportunities (but not necessarily for local people).	0	Any impact is likely negligible. There may be construction employment opportunities (but not necessarily for local people).	0	Any impact is likely negligible. There may be construction employment opportunities (but not necessarily for local people).	0	Any impact is likely negligible. There may be construction employment opportunities (but not necessarily for local people).
SUSTAINABILITY SUMMARY	<p>Adopting a balanced approach (option B) to preparing design guidance for Ellesmere Park appears to be the most sustainable choice for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It strikes the right balance between conserving and enhancing the existing features that contribute to the character of Ellesmere Park, and allowing high quality well designed new development in line with guidance. It would allow an opportunity for specific issues and opportunities to be addressed, such as design of the public realm, the potential for extra controls in the Conservation Area, and scope for improving the natural environment without being overly restrictive. <p>Do nothing / business as usual (option A): This option would result in a lack of clear design guidance specifically focused on Ellesmere Park for developers, designers, the local community. Council. It could result in less consistent decision-making and be frustrating for all involved – but especially the local community. This could have a detrimental impact on health and well-being, accessibility, climate change, the quality of the townscape, economic growth and would remove an opportunity for people to be involved in the decision making process.</p> <p>Provide design guidance by way of a more restrictive SPD (option C): This option could benefit existing residents of Ellesmere Park, but could also result in the area becoming more socially and economically exclusive. Conversely, overly restrictive design guidance could lead to the decay of some properties as conversion, redevelopment and re-use could prove unviable.</p> <p>Provide design guidance by way of a more relaxed SPD (option D): This option could benefit most the residents and developers in the area as the scope of the design guidance would be relatively limited, with a “broad brush” effect. However, this could be seen as the lowest common denominator approach, and may well be ineffective in meeting the aspirations raised through involving the local community.</p>							

**APPENDIX 3:
SUMMARY OF THE EFFECTS OF THE DRAFT SPD**

Do Nothing option

SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent?	Secondary, cumulative, synergistic	Comments	Mitigation
	0-3 years	3-10 years	10+ years						
Social Objectives									
To improve the health of the population	-	-	-	High	Local	Long term		Having no EPSPD could lead to the erosion or loss of Ellesmere Park's character. The UDP controls the area's development in a general manner but may not be able to satisfactorily enhance the area. This could contribute to negative perceptions of Salford as a place that does not value the contribution of the quality of the built environment to the general well-being of the community. Ellesmere Park contains a range of mature trees that as part of a spacious landscape environment. Access to such areas can help maintain mental and physical health as they are pleasant place to walk. Mature landscapes also support biodiversity and may be a counter to climate change.	Control development through preparation of design guidance. Ensure that the wooded landscape is retained, maintained and enhanced.
To improve the education and skills of the population	0	0	0	High	N/A	N/A		Having no EPSPD could lead to the erosion of Ellesmere Park's character. The loss of interesting buildings, landscapes, and features and inability to satisfactorily control the style and scale of new development would be detrimental as people would not be able to experience and learn about attractive built environment qualities that add value to city living.	
To improve safety and security for people and property	0	0	0	High	N/A	N/A		Having no EPSPD would not impact on the principle of "Designing Out Crime" as this issue is covered by other policies in the UDP and the Design and Crime SPD. However, reference to design and crime principles in the SPD can help to remind developers in the locality of the importance of taking these issues into account.	
To reduce deprivation within the city	-	-	--	High	Local	Long term		Having no EPSPD could lead to the implementation of new development of indeterminate quality in Ellesmere Park. The potential erosion of the quality and character of the area could result in the failure to attract an element of new residents to the City, who may instead choose to live in different parts of Greater Manchester or beyond. This may impact negatively on wider perceptions of Salford as a good place to live.	
To ensure that everyone has access to a good home that meets their needs	0	0	0	High				Having no EPSPD would place reliance on the UDP and related policy documents to deliver new housing in Ellesmere Park. Whilst this approach could deliver a range of new homes it is possible that the quality of building design could be variable and have a cumulatively negative effect on the character of the area. This approach could diminish the role of Ellesmere Park as an asset to the built environment of Salford.	
To promote vibrant communities which participate in decision making	-	0	0	High	Local	Medium term		Having no EPSPD would miss an opportunity to involve a broad section of Ellesmere Park's community in considering the parameters for the design of new development in their neighbourhood. The local community would not be enabled to take a degree of ownership and responsibility for ensuring high quality design and they would need to rely on more general UDP and related policies in considering planning applications in the area. This could lead to ongoing dissatisfaction with the results of the planning process.	Develop further opportunities for the community to maintain involvement in producing the SPD and monitoring its effects.

								Although, the planning process would allow an opportunity for people to comment on applications when they are submitted, the production of an SPD would give people a further opportunity to shape the policies that guide decisions.	
To improve accessibility for all the community	0	0	0	High				Having no EPSPD removes an opportunity to highlight specific requirements of individuals / groups in the design of new development in Ellesmere Park. These issues are generally covered in the UDP and related planning policies but there would not be specific guidance related to Ellesmere Park and this may lead to inconsistent approach.	
Environmental Objectives									
To maintain and improve biodiversity, flora and fauna	0	0	0	High				New development proposals in Ellesmere Park would be determined in relation to the UDP and related planning policy documents, including an extensive TPO and an emerging Trees and Development SPD. These offer a good general range of protection for biodiversity, flora and fauna but do not offer specific guidance related to the Ellesmere Park Area. However, any negative impact is likely to be negligible. The loss of garden area may reduce habitats within the system.	
To improve the quality of watercourses	0	0	0					New development proposals in Ellesmere Park would be determined in relation to the UDP and related planning policy documents. These will eventually reference an emerging specific SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction. Technical drainage matters will be dealt with through the Building Regulations. There will be no significant impact on the City's waterways.	
To reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality	0	0	0					No guidance could allow residents to extend and adapt their homes to meet their needs more freely, which could reduce the need to build new houses and reduce energy use. It could also lead to the unnecessary demolition of reusable properties and their replacement with larger new buildings requiring new materials, increasing energy use.	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	0	0	0					Development within flood risk areas may increase vulnerability to climate change. Having no guidance could allow more development, which could increase the vulnerability to flooding. However, it is unlikely that there will be any significant impact from flooding or drainage issues in Ellesmere Park. Planning policy covering these issues is contained in national PPG / PPS and the UDP and its related documents including the emerging Sustainable Design and Development SPD. Having no guidance may also result in erosion of the wooded character of the area, and this may have implications on climate change.	Increase protection to trees and ensure that they are replaced at a greater ratio than loss (more than current 2 for 1 policy).
Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources	0	0	0					No guidance could allow residents to extend and adapt their homes to meet their needs more freely, which could reduce the need to build new houses and reduce energy use. It could also lead to the unnecessary demolition of reusable properties and their replacement with larger new buildings requiring new materials, increasing energy use.	
To protect and enhance the historic environment	-	-	--	High	Local	Long term		Although covered by other policies in the UDP and related planning policy documents, having no guidance would remove an opportunity to highlight the importance of design and cultural heritage, and deliver enhancements to the Ellesmere Park area.	
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and	-	-	--	High	Local	Long term	There is a break point when an area has no	Having no detailed guidance removes the opportunity to give specific design guidance for conserving and	Increase the restrictiveness of the guide or other policy interventions in some areas such as the Conservation

townscapes							special character left. The absence of the SPD could result in erosion of the character of the area.	enhancing the character of new development in Ellesmere Park. New development proposals in Ellesmere Park would be determined in relation to the UDP and related planning policy documents, including an extensive TPO and an emerging Trees and Development SPD. These offer a good general range of protection but do not offer specific guidance related to the Ellesmere Park Area.	Area (e.g. through considering an Article 4 Direction).
Economic Objectives									
To maximise sustainable economic growth	0	0	-	Medium	City wide	Long term		The EPSPD covers a predominantly residential area where there are limited opportunities for business investment. It will not directly contribute to maximizing sustainable economic growth, but will indirectly through ensuring that Ellesmere Park contributes to balancing the quality and range of Salford's housing stock, and remains as a place where economically active residents choose to live.	
To ensure good quality employment opportunities are available to all	0	0	-	Medium	City wide	Long term		Any impact is likely negligible. There may be construction employment opportunities (but not necessarily for local people).	
SUSTAINABILITY SUMMARY	The Do Nothing option would mean that planning and development decisions would be reliant on the UDP and other more generic policy documents. Whilst these would continue to give the area a degree of control, this may not satisfactorily conserve and enhance the character of the area for and miss out on wider social, environmental and economic benefits.								

Ellesmere Park SPD option

SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVE	Timescale			Certainty	Scale	Permanent?	Secondary, cumulative, synergistic	Comments	Mitigation
	0-3 years	3-10 years	10+ years						
Social Objectives									
To improve the health of the population	+	+	++	High	City wide	Long term		Ensure that the SPD reflects the character of the area's architecture, landscape, and public realm. This can health by promoting exercise and outdoor leisure activities.	The document provides a context for using developer contributions to improve the public realm and areas of open space.
To improve the education and skills of the population	0/+	0/+	+	Medium	City wide	Long term		The consultation process is enhancing knowledge of the planning process, consultation and communication skills, and knowledge of the characteristics of the built environment.	More and continued community consultation and involvement to maintain interest and build knowledge and skills further.
To improve safety and security for people and property	+	+	+	High	Local	Long term		The SPD incorporates references to designing out crime and other planning policies in the UDP and the Design and Crime SPD, whilst ensuring that the character of the area is maintained.	The SPD could include more information on crime prevention measures. Highlighting public realm and lighting improvement related to public realm improvements.
To reduce deprivation within the city	+	+	+	High	City wide	Long term		Tenuous link between deprivation and built environment.	
To ensure that everyone has access to a good home that meets their needs	+	+	++	High	City wide	Long term		Design is key element of quality housing, and the SPD provides a framework for ensuring that new housing development in Ellesmere Park is of a quality that meets the needs of new residents. General planning policy is contained in the UDP and related SPDs and the guidance in the EPSPD complements these.	Inclusion of detailed standards to ensure quality homes. These may include standards for parking provision and amenity space.
To promote vibrant communities which participate in decision making	+	+	+	High	Local	Long term	Process of involvement develops closer ties with the community and encourages future involvement.	Frontloading of consultation and community involvement generating long term interest in the development process	More extensive consultation and involvement to retain community interest and enthusiasm.
To improve accessibility for all the community	+	+	+	High	Local	Long term		Improving accessibility for all sectors of society will help in promoting use of more sustainable movement modes.	Identify a programme of public realm improvements.
Environmental Objectives									
To maintain and improve biodiversity, flora and fauna	+	+	++	High	Local / beyond	Long term	Diversifies the range of species present in the area.	Improvements to public realm, retaining and maintaining trees, new planting, open spaces.	Consider offering detailed advice on the appropriate tree standards and species for the area.
To improve the quality of watercourses	0	0	0	High	N/A	N/A		No direct impact but relates to other council policy (including the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD) and refers to the importance of building regulations in controlling the technical aspects of development.	Include advice on Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and water recycling or linkage to other SPDs.
To reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality	0	0	0	Low	N/A	N/A		No direct impact but relates to other council policy (including the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD) and refers to the importance of building regulations in controlling the technical aspects of development. The retention, maintenance and planting of new trees and improvement of public and private open spaces may contribute to better air quality.	Incorporate a requirement to create further natural features to counter-balance the air quality effects of new development.
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	0	0	0	Low	N/A	N/A		No direct impact but relates to other council policy (including the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD) and refers to the importance of building regulations in controlling the technical aspects of development.	Incorporate a requirement to create further natural features to counter-balance the effects on climatic change of new development.
Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources	+	+	+	High	Local	Long term		The SPD provides more detailed local policy context to ensure that existing buildings and landscapes are conserved and enhanced – resulting in recycling sites and buildings for more intensive uses.	Promote use of sustainable materials, recycled materials, encourage use of renewable energy sources.
To protect and enhance the	+	+	++	High	Local	Long term		The main purpose of the SPD is to provide design	More prescriptive / descriptive guidance e.g. 35 degree

historic environment								guidance that will help to conserve and enhance the character of the Ellesmere Park area, which, in parts, is of historic interest.	roof pitches, Victorian characteristics. Different prescriptive design codes for the distinct areas.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	+	+	++	High	Local	Long term		The main purpose of the SPD is to provide design guidance that will help to conserve and enhance the character of the Ellesmere Park area.	More prescriptive / descriptive guidance.
Economic Objectives									
To maximise sustainable economic growth	0	0	+	Medium	City wide	Long term	Sustains demand for local services and facilities (e.g. at Monton and Eccles).	Ellesmere Park is a relatively affluent area. The SPD provides design guidance that will enable appropriate sustainable development. This will bring more people into the area who will be able to choose to use nearby services and facilities, thereby enhancing their future viability. New dwellings in this area are likely to be targeted towards employed people who may choose to relocate to Salford and contribute towards its economic growth. New residents will also help to break down negative perceptions of the city and may help to encourage new investment.	Include SPD in marketing information for the city as a location for new residents and businesses.
To ensure good quality employment opportunities are available to all	0	0	+	Low	City wide	Long term		Little direct impact, but may help to improve the image of the city in the long term and have consequent impacts on future economic development in the city.	
SUSTAINABILITY SUMMARY	The provision of an Ellesmere Park SPD would help to conserve and enhance the special character of the area through complementing other planning policies in the UDP, and other SPDs. The Sustainability Appraisal scores indicate that the SPD would have a beneficial effect on Ellesmere Park and the broader City area over a 10 year period.								