

**Delivery and Site Allocations Plan  
Examination  
Supporting Document**



**CD7.18a**  
**Sustainability Appraisal of the Delivery &  
Site Allocations Plan**  
  
**Updated Report**  
  
**March 2013**





# Sustainability Appraisal of the Wycombe Delivery and Site Allocations Plan for Town Centres and Managing Development

Updated Report

March 2013



<b><u>Contents</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
1.0 Introduction: SA Process and the SEA Directive.....	3
2.0 The Wycombe Development Framework and the Delivery and Site Allocations (DSA) Plan. ....	4
3.0 Context and Scoping.....	5
4.0 How the assessment was carried out: the Sustainability Framework.....	8
5.0 The DSA Plan – Selecting the Options .....	16
6.0 The DSA Plan: Outcome of the SA .....	18
7.0 Mitigation.....	19
8.0 Monitoring .....	20
9.0 Information required by the SEA Directive and government guidance on SAs – signposting tables.....	20
10.0 Sustainability Appraisals of District-wide Designations and Policies and individual sites .....	24

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1: SAs of High Wycombe Town Centre Masterplan and topic policies....	
Appendix 2: SAs of High Wycombe Town Centre Site policies.....	
Appendix 3: SAs of Desborough policies .....	
Appendix 4: SAs of Marlow policies .....	
Appendix 5: SAs of Princes Risborough policies .....	
Appendix 6: SAs of District-wide Development Management policies .....	
Appendix 7: SA Scoping Report Update 2011 .....	
Appendix 8: Overview and Audit Trail Report .....	

## **Tables**

Table 1: Sustainability Framework for Strategic Policies and Other Topic Policies	9
Table 2: Sustainability Framework for Site-Specific Policies.....	13
Table 3: Signposting requirements of the SEA Directive (Annex I – Information referred to in Article 5(1)) .....	21
Table 4: Signposting requirements of the CLG Plan-Making Manual – Sustainability Appraisal.....	22
Table 5: List of Options appraised .....	24
Table 6: Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions .....	34

## 1.0 Introduction: SA Process and SEA Directive

1.1 The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process is a way of ensuring that all plans and programmes which relate to land use issues are compatible with the aims of sustainable development. It is a requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and of the National Planning Policy Framework<sup>1</sup>, which states that SA should be “an integral part of the plan preparation process”. Consequently, the Delivery and Site Allocations (DSA) Plan is required to be subject to this process.

1.2 The appraisal is carried out through an evaluation of the social, environmental and economic implications of emerging plans, to ensure that their objectives and policies are in accordance with the underlying principles of sustainable development. As set out in the UK Sustainable Development Strategy, these principles are<sup>2</sup>:

- Living within environmental limits;
- Ensuring a strong, health and just society;
- Achieving a sustainable economy;
- Promoting good governance; and
- Using sound science responsibly.

1.3 The origins of the SA process lie with the European Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive<sup>3</sup>, which acts to ensure that all plans/policies with land use implications take into consideration environmental issues. Through the Directive, an environmental assessment is formally required for all plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment. Again, this means the DSA Plan is required to undergo this process.

1.4 The procedure required by the Directive comprises:

- Preparation of an Environmental Report on the likely significant effects of the draft plan or programme;
- Carrying out consultation on the draft plan or programme and accompanying Environmental Report;
- Taking into account the Environmental Report and the results of consultation in decision-making; and
- Providing information when the plan or programme is adopted and showing how the results of the environmental assessment have been taken into account.

1.5 The detailed requirements of the SEA Directive and how this appraisal meets those requirements are set out in Section 10 of this report.

1.6 Although the requirement to carry out both an SA and SEA is mandatory, it is possible to satisfy the requirements of both pieces of legislation through a single appraisal process, and government guidance illustrates how the two processes can be integrated into one for the purposes of plan-making. The final output of the process is a combined SA and SEA ‘Environmental Report’ which meets the regulatory requirements for SA and

---

<sup>1</sup> NPPF para 165

<sup>2</sup> As set out in the 2005 UK Sustainability Development Strategy

<sup>3</sup> European Directive 2001/42/EC, which is transposed into English law by The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA Regulations)

SEA. For the purposes of the DSA Plan, this document is called the SA Report but constitutes the Environmental Report underpinning the DSA Plan.

1.7 In carrying out the SA of the DSA Plan, the Council has sought to follow the method set out in government guidance. At the start of the plan preparation process this constituted the guidance document 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Frameworks', published by the former ODPM in 2005. This guidance was superseded in 2009 by the CLG's 'Plan-Making Manual', which is on the Planning Advisory Service's website, and which contains a section on carrying out Sustainability Appraisals.

1.8 This report sets out:

- a description of the DSA Plan;
- an outline of the context and scoping work for the SA/SEA process in Wycombe District;
- an outline of the main sustainability issues in the District;
- commentary on the requirements of the SEA Regulations;
- a description of how the assessment was undertaken;
- description of measures for mitigation of significant effects where identified
- a description of monitoring measures; and
- a summary of the elements of the report which meet the requirements of the SEA Directive and of current government guidance on SA respectively and where these can be found in the report.

## **2.0 The Wycombe Development Framework and the Delivery and Site Allocations (DSA) Plan**

2.1 The first plan to be prepared as part of the Wycombe Development Framework was the Core Strategy. Having been submitted in 2006, this was then subject to a series of Proposed Pre-Examination Changes in early 2007, then publicly examined in late 2007. Following receipt of the Inspector's Report which found the DPD sound subject to a number of recommended changes, the Core Strategy was formally adopted by the Council in July 2008.

2.2 Following this, attention turned to the document to allocate and designate sites. This was originally intended to form a Site Allocations Development Plan Document, but its scope evolved over the course of its preparation, and in particular following significant changes to the national and regional planning context resulting from the formation of the Coalition Government in 2010, including the aspiration to revoke Regional Strategies. This led to the decision to review housing targets at the local level (i.e. in Wycombe District) and feed these into a future Local Plan document, encompassing a new housing target plus key housing and employment allocations.

2.3 For this reason, the Site Allocations DPD evolved into a document focused on town centres, and was renamed the Delivery and Site Allocations (DSA) Plan. This plan does not include such strategic allocations, but does include radical plans for transformational change in High Wycombe town centre as part of the Town Centre Masterplan project. It also includes a series of site allocations within the District's town centres, as well as some generic and District-wide development management topic policies.

2.4 So, in summary, amongst the key proposals in the DSA Plan are the following:

- The High Wycombe town centre masterplan proposals to regenerate and improve the town centre, including changes to the town centre road network, public realm improvements and new development sites;
- Proposals for a range of other mixed use sites in the town centres of High Wycombe, Marlow and Princes Risborough;
- Proposals for addressing open space deficiency in the Desborough area;
- A series of 'development management' policies aimed at delivering more sustainable forms of development. These include policies relating to:
  - Sustainable transport requirements and transport improvement lines;
  - Retail issues, including the definition of town and district centres;
  - Scattered business sites;
  - Green infrastructure including policies for green space, biodiversity, and river corridors;
  - Carbon reduction;
  - Infrastructure and viability.

2.5 Notwithstanding this evolution in the scope of the DSA, the Council has already carried out extensive consultation on some of these site allocations and policies over the past few years, which are detailed in the section on consultation. The SA framework has helped inform the evolution of these policies at each stage of consultation.

### **3.0 Context and scoping**

3.1 The SA work on the Site Allocations DPD began in autumn 2004 with the preparation of the scoping work which fed into the draft SA Scoping Report. This work involved collecting baseline information, identifying the issues and setting the appraisal objectives against which alternative options could be tested.

3.2 The scoping exercise sets out the framework for how the SA is carried out for documents within the Wycombe Development Framework. The original Scoping Report was published in 2005, and due to the evolution in the scope of the DSA Plan, an updated Scoping Report was published in 2011.

3.3 The 2011 Scoping Report Update again set out the methodology for the SA process, but also provided a review of the baseline information and, given the different context of 2011, took a fresh look at the issues for consideration and whether there was a need to modify the framework, objectives and indicators. This Scoping Report Update forms Appendix 7 of this document. See below for a discussion of what had changed in the 2011 Scoping Report Update in terms of sustainability issues and the Sustainability Framework.

#### Other plans, policies and programmes

3.4 The SA process has taken into account the relationship between the DSA Plan and other relevant policies, plans and programmes. Further detail on these is provided in the Scoping Report Update at Appendix 7. In summary, they include those produced at:

- national level (including the NPPF and, previously, planning policy guidance and planning policy statements),
- regional level (prior to the moves to abolish regional planning),

- local level (such as the Core Strategy, adopted in 2008), and
- non-planning documents such as the Council's Sustainable Community Strategy 2009-26, which sets out a vision and key themes for the District.

### Baseline Information

3.5 The baseline information collected as part of the scoping work provided the standard against which performance was to be measured and compared with future performance to help identify the main issues and trends within the District. Information was taken from a range of policies, plans and programmes produced by various bodies. This included a wide range of sources, including the Land Registry, government statistics, Census data and information from government agencies such as the Environment Agency and English Heritage.

3.6 In addition, much of the key baseline information about the District was assimilated by the Council into a series of Fact Files covering different geographical parts of the District and topics affecting the District or different segments of the population (resulting in Fact Files on health issues, youth issues and rural issues).

3.7 This information-gathering process enabled the Council to set out, in the SA Scoping Report, a picture of what the situation is like in the District in relation to sustainability issues, and how it compares with elsewhere.

### Sustainability Issues

3.8 The collection of baseline information has enabled an assessment of the issues present in the District, both those which involved positive characteristics and also those which threw up issues of concern. In summary the main sustainability issues facing the District, as uncovered by an analysis of this information, are as follows:

#### Positive Issues

##### 3.9 Social Issues:

- An increased level of housing delivery, including affordable housing
- Good access to healthcare
- Large percentage of people who live and work in the District
- Higher than national average of those educated to GNVQ Level 2 or above

##### 3.10 Environmental Issues:

- A high proportion of development on previously-developed land
- Large amount of high quality landscapes
- Good proportion of District covered by woodland and ancient woodland
- Large number of listed buildings including 19 grade I listed buildings

##### 3.11 Economic Issues:

- Slightly higher than regional average number of economically active residents within the District
- Levels of unemployment lower than the national average (albeit increased in recent years)
- Average increase in earnings higher than average



### Issues of concern

#### 3.12 Social Issues:

- Need for additional housing
- High average house price/average earnings ratio

#### 3.13 Environmental Issues:

- High level of car ownership and car dependency
- Low levels of recycling and composting
- Air quality in some areas an issue of concern

#### 3.14 Economic Issues:

- Lower than regional average increase in the number of VAT registered businesses
- Decrease in the overall number of jobs in recent years
- Levels of long-term unemployment have risen (although they are lower than regional and national levels)
- Continuing decline in manufacturing, including the historic furniture industry – regeneration of older industrial areas is therefore a key issue

3.15 The Scoping Report Update at Appendix 7 contains a full overview of the current state of the environment in Wycombe District, within the review of Baseline Information at Annex 2. The key environmental issues, both positive and negative, are outlined in paragraphs 4.7-4.8 of Appendix 7.

3.16 In producing the Scoping Report Update, it was concluded that generally there had not been any substantive change to the issues summarised above. The reasons for this were:

- The economic downturn since 2008 has resulted in falling house prices but they are still at high levels, resulting in affordability problems;
- Affordable housing completions have increased in recent years but there is still a high need for affordable housing;
- The economic downturn has resulted in increasing levels of unemployment – although these are still similar to the regional level and below the national average – and a decrease in the number of jobs in the District.

3.17 It was therefore not considered necessary to make any substantive changes to the framework, objectives or indicators, except for a small number of detailed changes which are explained in the Scoping Report Update in Appendix 7.

3.18 In addition to the various sustainability issues identified, a number of issues were identified through the various stages of consultation on the DSA. These included a number of site-specific issues and sustainability issues including house prices and limited affordable housing, and increasing unemployment (although this is still close to the regional average and below the national average). These are outlined in Section 5 of Appendix 7.

### Information required by SEA Regulations

3.19 The SEA Regulations set out a series of requirements for the information which should be contained in Environmental Reports regarding aspects of the environment and

how the plan affects it. These are signposted in full at Table 3 in Section 9 of this report (and Table 4 similarly signposts to where the report meets the requirements of the government SA guidance), but the following text outlines commentary on some of the key environmental issues:

3.20 Environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected: As explained above, the plan now largely focuses on town centres in the District. Currently, the town centres vary in terms of their environmental characteristics. The plan aims to enhance the environment across these town centres by supporting businesses locating within these areas and providing for development sites to support the regeneration of these locations.

3.21 Relevant aspects of the current state of the environment: It can be seen from the summary of environmental and sustainability issues set out above (and set out in full in Annex 2 of the Scoping Report Update) that the District enjoys many positive characteristics, such as high quality landscapes and a good proportion of woodland cover. However, the generic topic policies in the DSA Plan are commonly focused on delivering further safeguards and improvements for the environmental characteristics, such as the measures to protect biodiversity and green spaces, the encouragement the development of green networks and planning for flood risk management and carbon reduction.

3.22 Existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan: The analysis of particular environmental problems facing the District, including those relating to the Birds Directive and the Habitats Directive, has been built in to the Sustainability Framework and objectives. Furthermore, the Council has produced a Screening Assessment of the DSA Plan to assess the impacts of the plan against the conservation objectives of European sites in or close to the District, and to ascertain that the plan would not, even in combination with the other plans and projects, adversely affect the integrity of any of these sites.

3.23 Evolution of the current state of the environment without the implementation of the plan: It is considered that without the plan, the environmental issues identified in the Baseline information will either not be addressed, or opportunities to improve these issues (such as through the development of Green Networks or encouraging Carbon Reduction) will not be optimised. As set out in Appendix 7, one of the key characteristics of the District is the high proportion of development on previously developed land; the DSA Plan is likely to further entrench this trend by encouraging development from the various allocations it puts forward, and through regeneration activities arising from the High Wycombe Town Centre Masterplan.

#### **4.0 How the assessment was carried out: the Sustainability Framework**

4.1 The Sustainability Framework is the framework upon which policies and proposals of the respective planning documents are assessed to ensure their compatibility with the aims of sustainable development. The framework is intended to allow policies and proposals to be assessed against social, environmental and economic objectives and to monitor the success of the policies in achieving it.

4.2 From the analysis of the baseline information and the issues arising, as described above, a Sustainability Framework was drawn up for the purposes of appraising the plans forming the Wycombe Development Framework. This was taken forward to carry out the

Sustainability Appraisal of the various sites and policies in the DSA Plan (and its previous iterations).

### Setting of Objectives and Indicators

4.3 A key part of the process of drawing up the Sustainability Framework is the setting of objectives and indicators, to enable the appraisal to be made. For the appraisal of the DSA Plan, 20 objectives were developed, including 10 environmental, 5 social and 5 economic. These various objectives do not necessarily have the same weighting – whilst all the objectives illustrate concepts of sustainability, some will be more important than others in considering the overall impact of an option.

4.4 The sustainability objectives and indicators have been drawn from a number of sources, to reflect the issues identified through the early SA work. Two levels of input have influenced the objectives selected for the framework:

- Local input has been through the issues raised from the collection of baseline data, as described above, and the various consultations which have taken place during the DSA process.
- Higher-level information has been obtained from the SEA Directive and accompanying guidance, and the government guidance on SA.

4.5 In order to measure the plan against these SA objectives, a number of indicators are identified for each policy. It is through the use of the indicators that the plan's performance against the SA objectives is appraised and monitored. Indicators are used to measure the effect of a policy, and this includes secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects.

4.6 For a further explanation of the development of the framework and the reasons for selecting the objectives and indicators, see section 6 of the Scoping Report Update (which forms Appendix 7 of this document).

### DSA Plan Sustainability Framework and Objectives

4.7 Table 1 below sets out the Sustainability Framework for strategic policies and other topic policies. In most cases these expand upon the sustainability assessment framework for policies of the Adopted Core Strategy and the Council has had regard to the chain of conformity to avoid unnecessary duplication of assessment that has already been carried out. However, because the DSA Plan is developing policies further and in greater detail, it is considered necessary in most cases to undertake a separate SA of the policies. Effects against objectives are predicted for the short, medium and long-term period.

**Table 1 –Sustainability Framework for Strategic Policies and Other Topic Policies**

Theme	Objectives	Indicators
	<b>SOCIAL OBJECTIVES</b>	
Homes	1. To provide the residents of Wycombe District with the opportunity to live in a quality home	1. House price/earnings affordability Ratio 2. Housing completions, allocations & commitments 3. Amount of affordable housing (including key worker housing) delivered, or amount of new affordable

Theme	Objectives	Indicators
		housing per annum 4. No of households on the housing register and need for affordable housing assessed through the housing needs survey
Crime	2. To reduce crime, fear of crime & anti-social activity through the creation of safer places to live & work	1. Recorded crimes per 1,000 pop.- domestic burglaries, violent offences, vehicle crimes
Services/ Facilities	3. To improve accessibility to essential services & facilities to provide opportunities to obtain good access to high quality health, education, recreation & other community facilities & services	1. % of residents defined as within a distance of 500m of key local services incl.: PO, food shop, primary school, child care & hospital
Community Identity & Welfare	4. Encourage a sense of community identity & welfare & reduce social deprivation	1. Proportion of population who live in the worst Super Output Areas* in England in relation to barriers to housing & services, crime & living environment & health & disability 2. % of people who feel that their local area is a place where people from different backgrounds & communities can live together Harmoniously
Health	5. Improve & maintain health & well-being of the population & reduce inequalities in health	1. Death rate by cause 2. Number of GPs per 1,000 head of Population 3. Green space per 1,000 of pop  4. Life expectancy at birth
<b>Theme</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL OBJECTIVES</b>	
Sustainable construction	6. To reduce contributions to climate change through: a) Sustainable building practices b) Maximising the potential for renewable energy & energy	1. Number of sites with on-site renewables to meet carbon reduction targets. 2. % improvement in energy efficiency achieved for dwellings

Theme	Objectives	Indicators
	conservation	3. Energy use per household (gas & electricity) 4. Installed capacity for energy generated from renewable sources: a) total b) as a result of the planning process
Transport	7. To encourage the use of sustainable methods of transport to reduce negative effects on the environment	1. Annual average nitrogen dioxide (NO2) concentration 2. Modal split 3. Residential and non-residential development by accessibility zone 4. % of children travelling to secondary school by different modes of transport 5. Annual average flow of principal Road
Water	8. To provide for sustainable levels of water use supply, .& management including quality of water sources.	1. Rivers of good chemical and ecological status  2. Water use & availability 3. Water conservation 4. Use of 'grey water' 5. Control of effluent 6. No of incidents of major & significant water pollution occurring In a particular year in each of the District 7. Quality & quantity of Groundwater
Biodiversity	9. To maintain & enhance biodiversity, flora and fauna and avoid irreversible losses	1. Area & condition of SSSIs 2 Area of ancient woodland in District 3. Area of new BAP habitats created
Landscapes & Townscapes	10. To protect & enhance the landscape and townscape character of the District and in particular, those areas of designated importance	1. Area of designated open space lost to development per annum (ha) 2. Area of open space created as a result of development
Historic Environment	11. To conserve & where appropriate enhance the historic environment	1. Number of Listed Buildings lost or at risk of decay 2. Loss or damage to scheduled ancient monuments & historic parks & gardens 3. % of Conservation Area Character Surveys completed
Waste	12. Minimise waste & then re-use it through recycling or composting or	1. % of the tonnage of household waste arising which have been a)

Theme	Objectives	Indicators
	recovering energy from waste that has not been recycled or composted	recycled b) composted c) used to recover heat, power & other energy Sources 2. % of construction & demolition waste going to landfill
Soil	13. To conserve soil resources & quality	1. Areas of contaminated land 2. Loss of best & most versatile agricultural land to development
Use of Land	14. To improve the efficiency of land use through the re-use of previously developed land	1. % of new homes built on previously developed land/ greenfield Land 2. Density of housing completions on sites of 10 dwellings or more 3. % of commercial development on previously developed land/ greenfield Land
Flooding	15. To reduce the risk of flooding (in relation to both new & existing development)	1. New development in Flood Zones 2 & 3 2. No of properties affected by Fluvial, groundwater and localised flood events 3. Frequency of fluvial flood events
<b>ECONOMIC OBJECTIVES</b>		
Economic Growth	16. To encourage economic growth & competitiveness	1. % change in the total of VAT registered businesses in the District 2. % increase/ decrease in number of local jobs 3. Output of the Local Economy/Gross Value Added per Worker 4. No. of K1 Businesses in the District as identified through the European Regions in the Knowledge Economy work being carried out on behalf of Wycombe District Council
Balance	17. To achieve a broad balance in the growth of housing, population & employment	1. Jobs: labour force ratio
Diverse Economy	18. To encourage a diverse economy including a vibrant and sustainable tourism sector	1. Diversity of economic sectors 2. % of jobs in tourism sector
Skills	19. To develop & maintain a skilled workforce to support long-term competitiveness of the District & contribute towards Wycombe becoming	1. % of the population with no qualifications at NVQ Level 2 equivalent or above

Theme	Objectives	Indicators
	a 'learning community'	
Deprivation	20. To reduce levels of economic polarisation & levels of deprivation	1. Proportion of population who live in the worst Super Output Areas* in England in relation to income, education, skills & training, and employment deprivation 2. Proportion of working age population in employment 3. Proportion of people of working age, out of work for more than a Year

\* Super Output Areas are areas used to improve reporting on small area statistics. The areas are smaller than Wards with a minimum population of 1,000 and allow for ease of comparison as well as being small enough to identify smaller pockets of deprivation.

4.8 Table 2 (below) sets out the Sustainability Framework for assessing the site-specific policies. This is slightly different because it is considered that the site-specific land use proposals require a more detailed assessment framework. The site assessment framework in Table 2 is developed from the "higher level" framework set out in Table 1; whilst it uses the same objectives, it seeks to identify a number of more detailed criteria that will be used to assess the sustainability of individual site proposals.

**Table 2 Sustainability Framework for assessing Site Specific Proposals**

Theme	Draft Objectives	Site Assessment Criteria Indicator
<b>SOCIAL OBJECTIVES</b>		
Homes	1. To provide the residents of Wycombe District with the opportunity to live in a quality home	1. Would development contribute towards the provision of affordable housing in the long term to meet identified needs? 2. Would development contribute towards meeting the overall housing requirements
Crime	2. To reduce crime, fear of crime & anti-social activity through the creation of safer places to live & work	1. Would development result in unacceptable potential for noise problems?
Services/ Facilities	3. To improve accessibility to essential services & facilities to provide opportunities to obtain good access to high quality health, education, recreation & other community facilities & services	1. What distance is site from essential services and facilities: PO, Primary School, child care, and food shop
Community Identity & Welfare	4. Encourage a sense of community identity & welfare & reduce social deprivation	1. Would development foster sense of community identity/ Belonging? 2. Would development lead to an

Theme	Draft Objectives	Site Assessment Criteria Indicator
		isolated form of development or coalescence of existing settlements?
Health	5. Improve & maintain health & well-being of the population & reduce inequalities in health	1. Is site within open space deficiency area? 2. What access is there to sport/leisure facilities? 3. Access to GP surgery and hospital
Theme	ENVIRONMENTAL OBJECTIVES	
Sustainable construction	6. To reduce contributions to climate change through: a) Sustainable building practices b) Maximising the potential for renewable energy & energy conservation	1. Would development offer opportunity for energy conservation or renewable energy production? e.g. Combined Heat and Power, use of renewables
Transport	7. To encourage the use of sustainable methods of transport to reduce negative effects on the environment	1. Accessibility Zone 2. Distance to nearest bus stop and frequency of service 3. Access to cycle routes? 4. Ability to improve public transport in the long-term? 5. Would development have a negative effect on traffic congestion? 6. Can the site be safely accessed by foot?
Water	8. To provide for sustainable levels of water use, supply & management, including quality of water sources	1. Are there constraints on water supply to site? 2. Are there constraints on the sewerage system that affect the site? 3. Would development have a negative effect on the water quality of water sources?
Biodiversity	9. To maintain & enhance biodiversity, flora and fauna and avoid irreversible losses	1. Would development have an adverse effect on nationally or locally designated sites (SSSIs, CWS, LNRs or protected species?) 3. Would development have the effect of creating new BAP habitats?
Landscapes & Townscapes	10. To protect & enhance the landscape and townscape character of the District and in particular, those areas of designated importance	1. Would development have adverse effect on designated sites: AONB, LLAs and AALs. 2. Would the proposal result in the loss of designated green space or other open space of value?



Theme	Draft Objectives	Site Assessment Criteria Indicator
		3. Would development have a negative impact on existing views? e.g. green/treed hillsides in High Wycombe
		4. Would development result in new open spaces being created?
Historic Environment	11. To conserve & where appropriate enhance the historic environment	1. Would development have an adverse Impact on: Listed buildings, Conservation Areas, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and other recognised Archaeological sites, historic parks and gardens
Waste	12. Minimise waste & then re-use it through recycling or composting or recovering energy from waste that has not been recycled or composted	1. Would development adhere to the standards within the Waste Management Requirement for Residential and Retail Developments Advice Note?
Soil	13. To conserve soil resources & quality	1. Does the site include best and most versatile agricultural land? 2. Would contamination exclude potential development or would the proposed land use raise concerns about possible new contamination?
Use of Land	14. To improve the efficiency of land use through the re-use of previously developed land	1. Is the site previously developed land?
Flooding	15. To reduce the risk of flooding (in relation to both new & existing development)	1. Is it within EA Flood Zones 3 or 2
Theme	ECONOMIC OBJECTIVES	
Economic Growth	16. To encourage economic growth & competitiveness	1. Does the proposal provide for higher value employment activities? 2. Does the proposal result in the loss of employment land that has a potential continued economic role? 3. Does the proposal provide for employment as part of a mixed use over Development. (proportion of site given to employment)
Balance	17. To achieve a broad balance in the growth of housing, population & employment	1. Does the proposal add to the labour force (through residential development)
Diverse Economy	18. To encourage a diverse economy including a vibrant and sustainable tourism sector	1. Does the site provide for a range of employment uses and sizes on the site 2. Does the proposal result in the loss of employment land that has a potential continued economic role?

Theme	Draft Objectives	Site Assessment Criteria Indicator
		3. Does the proposal provide for employment as part of a mixed use development. (proportion of site given over to employment) 4. Does the proposal result in the provision of tourism facilities?
Skills	19. To develop & maintain a skilled workforce to support long-term competitiveness of the District & contribute towards Wycombe becoming a 'learning community'	1. Does the proposal provide for or result in the loss of training/ Education facilities?
Deprivation	20. To reduce levels of economic polarisation & levels of deprivation	1. Does the proposal result in the loss of employment land that has a potential continued economic role close to areas of deprivation, or does it provide new employment opportunities close to those areas? 2. Does the proposal provide for employment as part of a mixed use Development? (proportion of site given over to employment)

4.9 To carry out the appraisal, the Council has used a scoring system, whereby positive effects of options on objectives are identified with a '+', neutral with a '0' and negative with a '-'. Significant positive or negative effects can be identified with a '++' or '--' respectively. These are the maximum and minimum scores given for each option to avoid the appearance of a mathematical 'totting up' exercise.

4.10 An overall summary is given for the effects of each objective under a particular option, but it should be stressed that SA is not intended to be an arithmetical exercise of adding up pluses and minuses for each option, but is rather to inform the development and refining of different options with an overview of sustainability considerations, in addition to other factors guiding the decision-making process such as consultation responses. A summary and explanation of how each option was arrived at can be found in the Overview and Audit Trail Report (which forms Appendix 8 of this report), and is summarised in Table 2.

4.11 The SA Scoping Report was updated in 2011 to reflect the revised scope of the DSA Plan, as described in Section 2. The Scoping Report update included some minor changes to the SA Framework:

- Minor alterations to three of the indicators
- Time periods adjusted to reflect the likely adoption date of the DSA Plan
- New indicators regarding flooring a biodiversity to reflect stakeholder responses from the Environment Agency and Natural England.

## 5.0 The DSA Plan - Selecting the options

5.1 In terms of the alternatives considered for the DSA Plan, a range of options have been assessed for each site/policy, as set out below:

5.2 **Site policies:** different uses or mixes of use were explored and, in some cases, varying scales of development. Over 200 sites were identified as potential sites for allocation in the Preferred Options Site Allocations DPD and the formal appraisal of these sites was undertaken in 2006. Section 8 of the report accompanying the 2007 SA sets out the processes which identified these sites. However, due to the evolution of the scope of the document, the final number of site policies subject to appraisal in this document is 21.

5.3 **Topic policies:** greater or lesser degrees of flexibility in terms of development requirements or level of protection proposed (such as environmental protection) were considered and appraised. Where appropriate, 'no policy' options were appraised, which would relate to a 'business as usual' scenario where existing policies continue to apply, such as those in the Council's Adopted Local Plan.

5.4 **High Wycombe Town Centre Masterplan:** the Council, supported by the Highway Authority, undertook significant option testing and technical assessment work to ensure that the proposals are justified, effective and capable of being delivered. A series of options were tested in terms of the scenarios for the Masterplan, ranging from 'do nothing' to 'full implementation'. The thematic policies were also subject to options testing.

5.5 In all cases, the aim was to assess a range of options sufficient to allow for meaningful results to be obtained, to inform the decision-making process. In some cases, consultation responses and other input from stakeholders led to new options being appraised. However, it was always borne in mind that alternatives had to be reasonable given the situation on the ground and the policy context.

5.6 In a very few cases there were considered to be no reasonable alternatives, due to the situation on the ground or the higher tier policy context such as the NPPF. These included:

- Policy MR3 (Riley Road): this policy is the site allocation for Riley Road, where development has already progressed on the site, limiting the reasonable options available for the remainder of the site;
- Policy DM12 (Conservation and Enhancement of Sites, Habitats and Species of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Importance): this policy follows the requirements as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (para 113);
- Policy HW1 (Desborough Delivery and Design Framework): no alternative option was appraised as the policy is derived from Core Strategy Policy CS4.1.

### Consultation

5.7 The Council consulted on the scope of the SA in 2005, and carried out consultation on the updated scoping report in 2011. In addition, the DSA has been subject to a lengthy preparation process with extensive public and stakeholder consultation at a number of different stages. At each key consultation stage, updates to the evidence base and the sustainability appraisal have been fully exposed. The key stages were:

- Autumn 2004 – work on preparation of scoping work began, feeding into the Draft Scoping Report
- Introduction of SA process and consultation on draft sustainability objectives: 25<sup>th</sup> October-6<sup>th</sup> December 2004 (consultation with statutory bodies and other local and regional stakeholders) – included draft SA objectives
- Consultation on Draft SA Scoping Report: 14<sup>th</sup> January-11<sup>th</sup> February 2005 (consultation with statutory bodies and other local and regional stakeholders): identified relevant plans, policies and programmes to be considered in the appraisal

and highlighting the existing sustainability issues through the baseline information. From this, a draft sustainability framework was produced to form the basis for assessments.

- As a result of the consultation the Scoping Report was revised and a final version published in April 2005.
- SA Report on the Site Allocations DPD Issues and Options: September 2005 (full public consultation including statutory bodies)
- SA Report on the Preferred Options Site Allocations DPD: February-March 2007 (full public consultation including statutory bodies)
- SA Report on the 2009 Delivery and Site Allocations Update Consultation DPD: June 2009 (full public consultation including statutory bodies)
- SA Report on the Delivery and Site Allocations Update Report DPD: June 2010 (full public consultation including statutory bodies)
- SA Report on the Draft Delivery and Site Allocations Document for Town Centres and Managing Development: July 2011 (full public consultation including statutory bodies)
- Consultation on Draft SA Scoping Report Update: 2011 (May-June 2011) (consultation with statutory bodies).
- A final version of the SA Scoping Report Update was published in September 2011.
- SA Report on Delivery and Site Allocations Plan Proposed Submission Document: June 2012

## **6.0 The DSA Plan: Outcome of the SA**

6.1 The aim of the DSA Sustainability Appraisal work has been to inform the identification of specific sites and the generation of related policies to be included in the document. The findings of the appraisal have acted to inform the formulation and refinement of the options and the process has allowed for the sustainability impacts of all the options considered to be highlighted, so that full consideration of the impacts can be had when taking wider policy decisions.

6.2 Appendices 1-6 set out the detailed results of the appraisals for each policy and site. These results are summarised in Table 6 of this report, along with a summary of the reasons for progressing with preferred options and rejecting alternative options. The SA process has allowed for all of the potentially negative and positive sustainability effects of the options to be highlighted through the appraisal. The process has allowed for an open account of the effects of the policies to be produced and published alongside the ongoing consultation with the DSA. In this way, it has enabled decisions to be taken in an informed manner. The consultation on the SA work has also allowed the public to raise any sustainability issues that it feels have not been highlighted through the SA work already undertaken.

6.3 Therefore, it can be seen that the appraisal methodology has informed the decision-making process by highlighting the sustainability effects of each option. The Overview and Audit Trail Report in Appendix 8 and the various technical and background papers detail the evolution of the various policies. The tables in this appendix, which are also summarised in Tables 6, set out the reasons for rejecting and accepting options for each policy and at what stage. The tables in the appendix also set out why the various alternatives were chosen, at what point the preferred option was accepted and whether

any subsequent changes in circumstances led to this approach being altered or a different option being selected instead.

6.4 Sometimes it has proved difficult to predict precise effects of options for particular site or topic policies where they may apply to a range of sites. Moreover, in a document such as this which is largely taking forward a series of site allocations, it is difficult to generalise about the effects of the document. Similarly, given the fact that the SA is part of the evidence feeding into the plan-making process rather than the decision-making process itself, it is impossible to outline a list of changes or additions which have been made directly as a result of the SA.

6.5 Nevertheless, it can be seen from the summary of SA conclusions in Table 6 that the effects of the preferred options which have been taken forward in the DSA are overwhelmingly positive, and in many cases significantly positive. Every policy shows a positive or significant environmental effect and all but two policies show positive or significant positive social effects. In terms of economic effects, a number of the policies have neutral or no effects (either where the policy is geared towards environmental protection or where sites are proposed for developments which do not include employment). Only one policy shows a negative economic effect, and this is Policy DM4 (Scattered Business Sites) where the greater flexibility for changes of use will result in a potential loss of employment land but a corresponding potential for new homes and community facilities.

#### Limitations

6.6 Whilst Sustainability Appraisal is a valuable process in terms of feeding into and informing the decision-making process, it does not constitute the only ingredient in the plan-making process. Factors which can emerge beyond the SA process are changes in government policy, consultation feedback on particular issues and the likelihood of implementation of particular schemes, projects or funding streams to help deliver development. Such factors can therefore lead to an option being selected which performs less well against the SA than others. Such considerations are highlighted in the Overview and Audit Trail Report and are presented in detail in the various technical and background reports.

#### Technical difficulties in collecting data

6.7 As Annex 2 of the SA Scoping Report Update shows, a vast and varied amount of baseline data was collected through the SA Scoping work. The Council was fortunate to have a significant amount of baseline information already collected and illustrated in the Wycombe Fact File series. However, a large amount of information was still required to illustrate the baseline situation within the District and highlight any sustainability issues which existed.

6.8 Collecting all the necessary baseline information was often difficult and for a number of reasons not all the information sought could be gathered. There were occasions where the baseline information sought was simply not available, such as the geological characteristics of the District. In these cases the Council has endeavoured to identify a related indicator that would provide some information on the topic area but this has not always been possible.

6.9 In some cases the baseline sought was not available at a District level. For example the amount of waste going to landfill or soil lost to development measured on a District level and therefore no baseline data was available to put forward.

6.10 On other occasions there was difficulty in gathering data which reflected the District boundary. For instance information from the water and sewerage companies was not consistent with local authority boundaries. In Wycombe's case the District was covered by two water suppliers and therefore the baseline information on water use/leakage was presented from Thames Water which is the main supplier of the District.

6.11 Some of the baseline information that was not available is information that the Council could produce itself through the monitoring of planning applications in future. There will be additional data that emerges through future modelling and assessment work that adds to the current evidence base.

## **7.0 Mitigation**

7.1 The SA process is an ongoing process and the detailed appraisals set out where measures can be adopted to minimise or mitigate negative effects identified against individual indicators. The policies within the DSA Plan also set out appropriate mitigation measures to offset negative effects against SA indicators where appropriate. Furthermore, an important role still exists at the individual planning application stage with the more detailed analysis of individual proposals and, where appropriate, the use of Environmental Impact Assessments to ensure that potentially negative effects are avoided or mitigated.

## **8.0 Monitoring**

8.1 The Council's Monitoring Report will be used to assess the effectiveness of all planning documents through reporting against key targets. It will monitor the impact of the DSA Plan and sites against some core national indicators and some local indicators. The indicators which allow environmental issues to be monitored in the report include those set against Core Strategy Policy CS17 (Environmental Assets):

- Implementation of Biodiversity Action Plans
- Changes in areas and populations of biodiversity importance including:
  - Changes in priority habitats and species (by type)
  - Changes in areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value including sites of international, national and local importance
  - Net gains/losses in green space designations
  - Net gains/losses of designated heritage assets considered at risk
  - Percentage of conservation area appraisals updated in the last 5 years.

8.2 Several of the topic policies will contribute towards the achievement of the targets based under this policy, as well as any such effects arising as a result of the site policies (as set out in Appendix E of the DSA Plan).

8.3 Monitoring the success of policies should help to provide an indication of whether the significant effects predicted as part of the SA are consistent with the actual effects, once the plan is being implemented. As such, monitoring will facilitate an assessment as to whether the predictions of the SA were accurate, whether the plan is contributing towards the achievement of the desired sustainability objectives, and whether the mitigation measures are performing as well as expected, as well as whether any appropriate remedial action needs to be taken.

8.4 Similarly to plan-making itself, SA is an ongoing process and will be refined when we come to review our plans and policies. This will include monitoring the emergence of new related plans, policies and programmes, including by statutory bodies, to assess their impact on the baseline information, indicators and other aspects of plan-making. The SA of

subsequent planning documents will therefore take into account of any new sustainability issues emerging as a result of any such changes in the context of the plan-making process.

## **9.0 Information required by the SEA Directive and government guidance on SAs – Signposting Tables**

9.1 This report contains the elements which are required by the SEA Directive, and government guidance on SAs, as set out in the table below. The right hand column in the table points the reader to the section in this report where the respective requirement can be found.

**Table 3: Signposting requirements of the SEA Directive (Annex I – Information referred to in Article 5(1))**

**NB These are also the requirements which are listed in Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations 2004**

Requirement	Where this is found in the document
An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 2 and 3</li> </ul>
The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 3</li> <li>• Appendix 7: SA Scoping Report Update (Section 4 and Annex 2)</li> <li>• Commentary in detailed appraisals (appendices 1-6) includes observations on ‘do nothing’ options where appropriate</li> </ul>
The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 3</li> <li>• Appendix 7: SA Scoping Report Update (Annex 2: Key Baseline Information and Issues).</li> <li>• Also see detailed appraisals of site and policy options in appendices 1-6</li> </ul>
Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 3</li> <li>• Incorporated into the SA objectives (eg see Objective 9 regarding Biodiversity). Also see detailed appraisals of policies and sites for environmental issues</li> <li>• Appendix 7: SA Scoping Report Update (p13 and Annex 2: Key Baseline Information and Issues – see in particular ‘Issues and Actions’ column).</li> </ul>
The environmental protection objectives, established at international, community or member state level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sections 3 and 4</li> <li>• Appendix 7: SA Scoping Report Update (para 6.16-6.20 and Annex 3: Selection of Objectives – see ‘Issue for LDF SA Objectives?’ column)</li> </ul>
The likely significant effects* on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summarised in Table 6</li> <li>• See detailed appraisals for prediction of effects (appendices 1-6)</li> </ul>



interrelationship between the above factors. * - these effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects.	
The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 7 and detailed appraisals (appendices 1-6) for commentary on mitigation measures where appropriate</li> <li>• Also see policies in the DSA for mitigation measures where appropriate</li> </ul>
An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sections 5 (reasons for selecting the alternatives), section 4 (description of how the assessment was undertaken), section 6 (difficulties including technical deficiencies)</li> <li>• Reasons for selecting the alternatives set out in the Overview and Audit Trail Report (Appendix 8) for individual policies.</li> </ul>
A description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Article 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 8</li> </ul>
A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Non-Technical Summary</li> </ul>

In addition, the table below signposts to information required by the CLG's Plan-Making Manual, which constitutes the current government guidance on Sustainability Appraisal

**Table 4: Signposting requirements of the CLG Plan-Making Manual – Sustainability Appraisal**

Requirement	Where this is found
<b>SA Report</b>	
Set out how the appraisal was carried out	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sections 3 and 4</li> <li>• Summarised in Non-Technical Summary</li> <li>• Set out in detail in Appendix 7 (SA Scoping Report Update: Section 6 – Sustainability Framework)</li> </ul>
Set out how the options were assessed and carried forward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sections 4 and 5</li> <li>• See Table 5 for summary of options appraised; see appendices 1-6 for detailed appraisals</li> <li>• See Overview and Audit Trail Report (Appendix 8) for explanation of selection of preferred option and reasons for options being rejected)</li> </ul>
Explain the relationship between the SA and the plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sections 1-3</li> <li>• Summarised in Non-Technical Summary</li> </ul>

<b>Signposting and options not taken forward</b>	
SA Report should signpost where it provides information required by the SEA Directive.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 3</li> <li>• Section 9 (see Tables 3 and 4)</li> <li>• See environmental effects in detailed appraisals (appendices 1-6)</li> </ul>
Set out, in table or other format, how the SA has influenced the content of the plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 6 for overview; detailed appraisals in Appendices 1-6</li> <li>• See also Appendix 8 (Overview and Audit Trail Report)</li> </ul>
SA Report should indicate clearly which options were not taken forward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Tables 5 and 6 and Appendix 8 (Overview and Audit Trail Report)</li> </ul>
Should draw on the evidence base and appraisals to show why they were not pursued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summarised in Table 6</li> <li>• See detailed appraisals in appendices 1-6</li> <li>• See detailed policy tables in Overview and Audit Trail Report (Appendix 8)</li> </ul>
Must indicate the more favourable appraisals in support of the options that have been taken forward to form the draft document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summarised in Table 6</li> <li>• See detailed appraisals in appendices 1-6</li> <li>• See detailed policy tables in Overview and Audit Trail Report (Appendix 8)</li> </ul>
<b>Must also issue a non-technical summary of the SA Report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Non-Technical Summary</li> </ul>

## 10.0 Sustainability Appraisals of District-wide Designations and Policies and individual sites

**Table 5: List of Options Appraised**

### High Wycombe Town Centre Masterplan and topic Policies (contained in Appendix 1)

<b><i>Policy No Name</i></b>	<b><i>Options appraised</i></b>
<b>Sustainability Appraisal of the High Wycombe Town Centre Masterplan Delivery Scenarios</b>	<p>Scenario A: Full Implementation</p> <p>Scenario B: Comprehensive Implementation</p> <p>Scenario C: Interim Approach (Preferred Policy)</p> <p>Scenario D: Do Minimum</p> <p>Scenario E: Do Nothing</p> <p>Scenario F: At-grade Abbey Way</p> <p>Scenario G: Cross-town route via Lily's Walk</p>
<b>HWTC1 Delivering the Town Centre Vision</b>	<p>Preferred option – All development within the town centre contributes to, and does not prejudice, the delivery of the town centre vision</p> <p>Alternative Option 1 – Development contributes to the town centre vision through financial contributions</p> <p>Alternative Option 2 – No strategic vision policy. Delivery of vision sought through individual site specific policies</p>
<b>HWTC2 Town Centre Environment</b>	<p>Preferred Option – Improved public space network encompassing new and existing public spaces</p> <p>Alternative Option – Improvements to existing public spaces only (Frogmoor). No new public spaces created.</p>
<b>HWTC3 Connections, Movement and Access</b>	<p>Preferred Option – Changes to highway network including downgrading of Abbey Way Flyover – designed to Manual for Streets standards.</p> <p>Alternative Option 2 – Changes not designed to Manual for Streets standards.</p>
<b>HWTC4 Economy</b>	<p>Preferred Option – Town centre is the focus for retail activity and other main town centre uses; central role for quality office development, particularly at defined locations.</p> <p>Alternative Option: No policy.</p>



**HWTC11  
Wycombe General Hospital**

consisting of education or cultural/entertainment use. Also scope for office or hotel development  
Alternative Option 2 – Mixed use predominantly office development with scope for other uses including cultural/entertainment, retail, hotel and residential.  
Preferred Option: Continuing Hospital Use with flexibility for residential and office uses on parts of the site.  
Alternative Option: Continuing Hospital Use but no flexibility for other uses (i.e. status quo).

**HWTC12  
Chilterns Shopping Centre and  
Frogmoor East**

Preferred Option: Mixed-use allocation comprising retail, restaurants, hotels, pubs, commercial leisure. Residential acceptable (on upper floors and on ground floor where no loss of retail frontages)  
Alternative Option 1: Mixed-use allocation comprising retail and restaurants, hotels, pubs and commercial leisure.  
Alternative Option 2: Stricter approach to uses – strict adherence to retail-only rules

**HWTC13 Lily's Walk (Former Gas  
Works Site)**

Preferred Option – Mixed-use development of main town centre uses (retail and other) and residential development. Includes provision of land for link road connecting Desborough Road and Queen Alexandra Road.  
Alternative Option 1 – Retail allocation (not including residential as in Preferred Option). Includes provision of land for link road described in preferred option.  
Alternative Option 2 – Car Parking. Includes provision of land for link road.  
Alternative Option 3 – Mixed-use development of main town centre uses and residential development. No requirement to provide land for link road connecting Desborough Road and Queen Alexandra Road.

**HWTC14  
Buckingham House and Castle House**

Preferred Option – Mixed use development of town centre uses (all forms of retail and other town centre uses) and residential development on upper floors. Includes contribution to provision of new link road connecting Desborough Road and Queen Alexandra Road.  
Alternative Option 1 – Mixed Use development - Ground floor retail (limited to retail warehousing selling bulky goods only), commercial leisure, community uses, hotel, offices, with residential on upper floors. Includes contribution to new link road as described in preferred option.  
Alternative Option 2 – Allocation of site for business use. Includes contribution to new link road.

Alternative Option 3 – Mixed use development of town centre uses on ground floor and residential development on upper floors. No contribution to provision of new link road connecting Desborough Road and Queen Alexandra Road.

**HWTC15  
Collins House/Corner of Bridge  
Street/Desborough Road**

Preferred Option – Mixed-Use development of main town centre uses and residential development on upper floors

**HWTC16  
Oxford Road Roundabout**

Alternative Option 1 – Site allocated for B1 Offices  
Preferred Option – Mixed-use development including main town centre uses and residential on upper floors; new public space and removal of Oxford Road Roundabout. Any proposals should not prejudice the removal of Abbey Way Flyover Western Ramp.  
Alternative Option 1 – Mixed-use development but no new public space and no change to existing highway network.

**HWTC17  
Bridge Street**

Preferred Option – Mixed-use development of main town centre uses and residential development on upper floors. Improved pedestrian linkages through site. Site to cover entire block stretching westwards to Westbourne Street.

Alternative Option 1: As above but smaller site area

Alternative Option 2 – No Change

Alternative Option 3: Large format retail

Alternative Option 4: Residential and Offices

Alternative Option 5 – Mixed-Use redevelopment - ground level retail (street front), additional student accommodation, with some scope for commercial leisure, offices and potential for limited conventional residential

**HWTC18  
Baker Street**

Preferred Option: Mixed-use development, consisting of B1 business and residential uses. Includes provision of land for link road linking West Wycombe Road and Desborough Road.

Alternative Option 1: Mixed-use development, consisting of B1 business and residential uses.

Includes direct provision of link road linking West Wycombe Road and Desborough Road.

Alternative Option 2: No change

Alternative Option 3: Large-format retailing and car parking. Provision of link road.

Alternative Option 4: Retail and leisure (with residential component). Provision of link road.

Alternative Option 5: Short-term: Surface-level car parking and road link. Medium and long-term:

Business, residential and open space with potential for multi-storey car park. Provision of road link.

	Alternative Option 6: Mixed-use business and residential. No provision of link road.
<b>HWTC19 Rapid House</b>	Preferred Option: Mixed-use development consisting of main town centre uses and residential uses. No net loss of existing employment floorspace. Designed to take into account Sikh temple Take into account design requirements of new link road, Alternative Option 1: Residential Alternative Option 2: Offices only (as currently <i>in situ</i> )
<b>HWTC20 Oxford Road (West)</b>	Preferred Option: Offices Alternative Option: Residential
<b>HWTC21 Central Business Centre</b>	Preferred Option: Light Industrial Alternative Option: Residential
<b>Desborough Policies (Appendix 3)</b>	
<b><i>Pol. No</i></b>	<b><i>Options appraised</i></b>
<b><i>Name</i></b>	
<b>HW1</b>	Preferred Option as set out in policy
<b>Desborough Delivery and Design Framework</b>	(No Alternative Option appraised as policy is derived from Core Strategy policy CS4.1)
<b>HW2</b>	Preferred Option: Allow redevelopment of employment land for mix of uses to provide open space
<b>Delivering New Open Space and River Corridor Improvements</b>	Alternative Option: No policy – continue protection for existing employment uses
<b>HW3</b>	Preferred Option: Residential and community/open space
<b>Green Street School</b>	Alternative Option: Residential only
<b>Marlow Policies (Appendix 4)</b>	
<b><i>Pol. No</i></b>	<b><i>Options appraised</i></b>
<b><i>Name</i></b>	
<b>MR1</b>	Preferred Option: Some flexibility for changes of use away from A1, especially to A3.
<b>Primary Shopping Frontages: Marlow</b>	Alternative Option 1: No net loss of A1 frontage length – exceptions for preservation or rehabilitation of listed buildings Alternative Option 2: Maximum flexibility for any changes of use away from A1 (maintenance of active ground floor frontage required) Alternative Option 3: Less flexibility – allow no exceptions for changes of use so no change to non-

A1 uses

**MR2**  
**Secondary Shopping Frontages:**  
**Marlow**

Preferred Option: No net loss of frontage lengths in Class A use  
Alternative Option 1: No net loss of frontage lengths in Class A use + only stipulated proportion of non-A1  
Alternative Option 2: More flexible - allow some changes of use away from A uses  
Alternative Option 3: Less flexible - no loss of A1 shop uses

**MR3**  
**Riley Road**

Preferred Option: Retail led mixed use  
Only one option appraised as construction of development progressing

**MR4**  
**Portlands**

Preferred Option: Predominantly residential: smaller site area to exclude West Street Car Park. This option contains no requirement relating to the provision of the Portlands Link Road.  
Alternative Option 1: Retail-led mixed-use  
Alternative Option 2: Residential– this option includes provision for the delivery of the Portlands Link Road and, therefore, includes West Street Car Park in the site area

**MR5**  
**Liston Road Car Park**

Preferred Option: Decked Parking and Residential  
Alternative Option: Retail with residential development

**Princes Risborough Policies (Appendix 5)**  
**Policy No**  
**Name**

**Options appraised**

**PR1**  
**Primary Shopping Frontages: Princes**  
**Risborough**

Preferred Option: Some flexibility for changes of use away from A1 – especially to A3 uses.  
Alternative Option 1: No net loss of A1 frontage length – exceptions for preservation or rehabilitation of listed buildings  
Alternative Option 2: Maximum flexibility for any changes of use away from A1 (maintenance of active ground floor frontage required)  
Alternative Option 3: Less flexibility – allow no exceptions for changes of use so no change to non-A1 uses

**PR2**  
**Secondary Shopping Frontages:**  
**Princes Risborough**

Preferred Option: No net loss of frontage lengths in Class A use  
Alternative Option 1: No net loss of frontage lengths in Class A use + only stipulated proportion of non-A1



Alternative Option 2: More flexible - allow some changes of use away from A uses  
Alternative Option 3: Less flexible - no loss of A1 shop uses

**PR4**  
**Land Fronting New Road**

Preferred Option: Small-scale mixed-use development  
Alternative Option: Radical redevelopment of the site encompassing large development sites along the frontage

**PR5**  
**Land South of Horns Lane**

Preferred Option: Small-scale mixed-use development  
Alternative Option 1: Retail use only  
Alternative Option 2: Residential/Business

## **District-Wide Development Management Policies (Appendix 6)**

***Policy No***  
***Name***

***Options appraised***

**DM1a**  
**Presumption in favour of sustainable development**

One option - Policy approach reflecting the presumption in favour of sustainable development encompassed in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, para 15) (NB No other options appraised; as this policy is a government requirement, no alternatives considered to be reasonable).

**DM1**  
**Transport Requirements of Development Sites**

Preferred Option – Policy with menu of transport requirements of development sites  
Alternative Option: No policy

**DM2**  
**Transport Improvement Lines**

One Option – list of transport improvement lines (No alt option required – routes either derived from BCC or from other policies which have been appraised elsewhere)

**DM3**  
**Former Bourne End to High Wycombe Railway Line**

Preferred Option – Walking and cycle route  
Alternative Option 1 – Protect the rail line for future heavy rail use  
Alternative Option 2 – Protect the rail line for future guided public transport use e.g. light rail/ultra light rail use  
Alternative Option 3 – Cease to protect the former railway alignment for any potential transport reuse

**DM4**  
**Scattered Business Sites**

Preferred Option - Retain in business use, allow community facilities, main town centre, residential (the latter subject to meeting tests).  
Alternative Option – More flexible approach

**DM5 Mixed-Use Development**

Preferred Option: Option specifying site-specific requirements to be met; comprehensive approach delivered; and delivery of B uses secured through legal agreement.  
Alternative Option: No policy

**DM6**  
**Town Centre Boundaries**

Preferred Option: Extended Town Centre Boundary (to include Wycombe General Hospital and extending westwards to Desborough Avenue) and maintain existing Local Plan boundaries for Marlow and Princes Risborough. Within this boundary, main town centre uses acceptable in principle; outside it, main town centre uses only permitted if they satisfy national policy, including the sequential and impact tests. Retail schemes to be subject to this test if they fall outside the primary shopping area boundary.  
Alternative Option: Maintain existing Local Plan

boundaries for all three town centres in the District

**DM7  
The Primary Shopping Areas**

Preferred Option: Retail and all other main town centre uses acceptable in principle.  
Alternative Option 1: More flexible approach –larger-scale formats acceptable  
Alternative Option 2: More restrictive approach – only retail uses acceptable

**DM8  
District Centres**

Preferred Option – Percentage target of frontage lengths in non-A1/A3 use – to be specified for each District Centre but some scope for non-A1/A3 use in each District Centre. Except where site-specific policies state otherwise, residential development acceptable on upper floors and on ground floors where this would involve no loss of ground floor frontage.

Alternative Option 1: Percentage target of frontage lengths in non-A1/A3 use – to be specified for each District Centre but some scope for non-A1/A3 use in each District Centre

Alternative Option 2 – Percentage target of frontage lengths in non-A1 use – to be specified for each District Centre but some scope for non-A1 use in each District Centre

Alternative Option 3 – Greater flexibility for changes of use from A1

Alternative Option 4 – No loss of A1 permitted

**DM9  
Thresholds for the Assessment of Schemes for Town Centre Impact**

Preferred Option: Tiered thresholds for impact on different types of Centre in the District

Alternative Option 1 – Retain the national threshold in PPS4 of 2,500m<sup>2</sup>

Alternative Option 2 – Adopt a higher threshold – in the range of 3,000-5,000m<sup>2</sup>

Alternative Option 3 – Adopt a lower threshold across the District (of 200m<sup>2</sup>)

**DM10  
Green Networks and Infrastructure**

Preferred Option - Policy giving protection to Green Networks and requiring development to contribute towards improvement of networks, including on Reserve Locations for Future Development where relevant.

Alternative Option – No policy

**DM11  
Green Spaces**

Preferred Option – Policy identifying and giving protection to Green Spaces

Alternative Option – No protection for Green Spaces

<b>DM12 Conservation and Enhancement of Sites, Habitats and Species of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Importance</b>	Preferred Option as set out in policy (No alternative policy as policy is a requirement in national policy)
<b>DM13 Biodiversity in Development</b>	Preferred Option: Development required to maximise biodiversity; requirements for ecological surveys where biodiversity interest identified. Alternative Option 1 - Less onerous approach -
<b>DM14 Protection and Enhancement of River and Stream Corridors</b>	Preferred Option: protection for watercourses and associated corridors; opportunities for deculverting to be actively pursued; 10m buffer required with landscape and ecological management plan for this buffer. Alternative Option 1 - Less protection for corridor (Less onerous requirements from developers/more flexible protection for the river corridor in part 1 of policy).  Alternative Option 2 – Alternative policy excluding deculverting requirements of policy.
<b>DM15 Open Space in New Development</b>	Preferred Option: District-wide minimum standard Alternative Option: Local standards tailored to local requirements
<b>DM16 Planning for Flood Risk Management</b>	Preferred Option: Requirements as set out in document for developments proposed in Flood Risk Zones 2 and 3 policy Alternative Option: No policy
<b>DM17 Carbon Reduction</b>	Preferred Option: Requirements for carbon reductions as set out in policy, applying to developments of 1 home or 100sq m (or greater). Alternative Option 1: Approach based on former South East Plan Policy NRM11 – no carbon reduction target, 10%on site renewables applies to 10 dwelling/1000 sq.m. plus
<b>DM18 Infrastructure and Delivery</b>	Preferred Option: Infrastructure requirements in line with Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Approach to viability set out. Alternative Option 1: Infrastructure requirements to support individual developments only, and not the IDP.

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
High Wycombe Town Centre Policies			
<p><b>High Wycombe Masterplan Preferred Delivery Scenario</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as the preferred option as, taking into account the complexity and scale of the masterplan proposals, and viability and deliverability evidence, this option brings forward the implementation of physical works and improvements across the town centre by 2026, whilst protecting longer-term opportunities for further improvements.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) due to the above factors and there have been no further changes in approach since.</p>	<p>This scenario has a positive effect on social objectives as it brings improvements to the public realm and environment of the town centre, whilst protecting opportunities for further improvements in the future.</p>	<p>This scenario has potential to have some positive impact on achieving environmental objectives as the scenario proposes improvements to the natural and built environment within the town centre.</p>	<p>This scenario has potential to have a positive impact on achieving economic objectives as the scenario supports new development opportunities within the town centre which will bring increased employment opportunities.</p> <p>Improvements in the public realm will also contribute to the investment potential of the town.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC1 High Wycombe Town Centre Vision</b></p> <p>This option was chosen as the preferred option as it has a significant positive impact on achieving the SA objectives and ensures that all development within the town centre, and not just those sites with site specific policies, contribute to achieving the town centre vision.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) due to the above factors and there has been no change in circumstance to warrant further changes.</p>	<p>Policy will have a significant positive effect on social objectives, as development is required to contribute to the delivery of the town centre vision in a comprehensive way.</p>	<p>Policy has the potential to have a significant positive effect on environmental objectives, as development is required to facilitate and protect future opportunities for environmental enhancement within the town centre.</p>	<p>Policy has the potential to have a significant positive effect on economic objectives, as development is required to focus economic growth and development in the town centre, through a diverse range of uses.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC2 Town Centre Environment</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as the preferred option as it delivers additional new public spaces within the town centre, as well as improving existing public spaces, which is in line with the town centre vision and objectives. Opportunities to implement new public spaces were identified within the urban and highway design assessments undertaken.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) due to the above factors and there has been no change in circumstance to warrant further changes.</p>	<p>This policy will have a significant positive effect on social objectives as improvements to the environment of the town centre will help encourage a sense of identity and community within the town centre.</p>	<p>This policy has a significant positive effect on environmental objectives as the proposed public space network addresses issues of open space deficiency within the town and proposed significant improvements to the natural and built environment within the town centre.</p>	<p>This policy has the potential to have a positive effect on economic objectives, as it proposes improvements to the town centre environment which would be likely to increase the town's reputation and standing as a business location as well as its attractiveness to visitors.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC3 Connections, Movement and Access</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as the preferred option as it requires highway changes to be designed to Manual for Streets standards which is supported by the highway and urban design work undertaken and the results of the transport assessment work. The use of Manual for Streets supports the achievement of SA objectives by requiring improvements to the public realm.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) due to the above factors and there has been no change in circumstance to warrant further changes.</p>	<p>Policy has limited beneficial effect on social objectives as it brings improvements to the public realm and environment of the town centre, whilst protecting opportunities for further improvements in the future.</p>	<p>Policy has potential to have some positive impact on achieving environmental objectives as the scenario proposes improvements to the natural and built environment within the town centre.</p>	<p>Policy has the potential to have a positive effect on economic objectives as the proposed changes to the highway network allow for further development opportunities within the town centre.</p>



**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC4 Economy</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as the preferred option as it sets out the objectives for the town centre in relation to economic development. It also provided as site dimension to the policy and identifies how the principles of the policy will be delivered.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) due to the above factors and there has been no change in circumstance to warrant further changes.</p>	<p>Policy has the potential to have a positive effect on social objectives as it concentrates services and facilities within an accessible town centre location.</p>	<p>Policy has a positive effect on environmental objectives as it helps bring forward a transformation in the environment of the town centre and locates services and facilitates in an accessible location.</p>	<p>Policy has a significant positive benefit on economic objectives as it proposes high value employment uses within the town centre, including high quality office development, which would raise High Wycombe's economic profile and encourage business and investment within the town centre.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC5 Primary Shopping Frontages: High Wycombe</b></p> <p>Significant increase in shop vacancy rate in parts of the town centre at the onset of the economic downturn in 2008 led to the need for a more dynamic approach than traditional frontage policies. This option enabled more flexible approaches to frontages were applied to certain more vulnerable parts of the town centre, whilst others were subject to stricter rules to protect the percentage of A1 units.</p> <p>Selected as a preferred option in 2009 and the persistence of the uncertain economic outlook, particularly for the retail industry, meant that the factors influencing the choice of this option as the preferred alternative in 2009 were still present at the time of the Submission DSA Plan in 2012.</p>	<p>Policy would enable the development of appropriate town centre uses including an appropriate proportion of retail developments and supporting non-retail uses targeted at individual sectors of the primary frontage. This would assist in maintaining the vitality and viability of the primary shopping frontage as a whole. It would thereby have positive effects on social objectives.</p>	<p>No direct negative impacts and policy would encourage an appropriate mix of town centre uses in accessible locations.</p>	<p>Policy could have a significant positive impact by creating the framework to enable a wider range of developments to come forward which would assist the local economy.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC6: Secondary Shopping Frontages: High Wycombe</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was considered that it represented an appropriately balanced approach in allowing for a range of uses, and movements between use classes, whilst also protecting units for uses containing an active ground floor frontage, and preventing those which would create a 'dead' frontage. It was therefore considered that this option would maintain the vitality and viability of the frontage and the town centre as a whole.</p> <p>This option was established as the preferred approach at Preferred Options stage (2007) and there were no subsequent changes in circumstances to merit changing this.</p>	<p>Policy would enable the development of appropriate town centre uses including an appropriate proportion of retail developments and supporting non-retail uses. This would assist in maintaining the vitality and viability of the District's town centres including secondary frontage zones, and therefore have a positive effect on social objectives.</p>	<p>No direct negative impacts and policy would encourage an appropriate mix of town centre uses in accessible locations and keep the town centre as a whole vital and viable. Significant positive environmental effects therefore likely.</p>	<p>Policy could have a significant positive effect by creating the framework to enable a wider range of developments to come forward which would assist the local economy.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Objectives</b>		
	<b>Social</b>	<b>Environmental</b>	<b>Economic</b>
<p><b>HWTC7 Easton Street</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was supported by the outcome of the SA and the recommendations of the Economy Study. This option was selected as the preferred approach at Preferred Options stage (2007) – whilst details of the policy requirements have altered, there has been no change in circumstances to merit altering the overall approach to mix of uses since then.</p>	<p>Policy has positive effect due to site being well located in relation to services and facilities</p>	<p>Policy has positive effect on environmental objectives due to site being well located, previously developed, not subject to flood risk and offering potential to improve and enhance the conservation area</p>	<p>Policy has positive effects on economic objectives as a result of maintaining site in employment use and allowing other employment generating uses</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC8 Council Offices and Royal Mail Sorting Office</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was supported by the outcome of the SA and the evidence base, with the Economy Study having found that the site contained buildings in good condition and therefore that there should be no change to the current mix of uses. The location of the site within the Town Centre Boundary indicated that a policy allowing for main town centre uses on ground floors would be appropriate.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Consultation Draft stage (2011) to reflect the changed scope of the document following the dropping of the prime business area policy (which had previously been the proposed designation for the site) and no change of circumstances since then to merit changing this approach.</p>	<p>Policy likely to have a positive effect on social objectives due to being a town centre site with good access to facilities and open space.</p>	<p>Policy is likely to have a positive effect on environmental objectives due to having good public transport accessibility, being a brownfield site and being mainly an area of low flood risk</p>	<p>Policy is likely to have a positive effect on economic objectives</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC9 Land off Duke Street</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as the preferred approach as it was supported by the evidence base (the Economy Study), the SA conclusions and consultation responses. The requirement for no net loss of B use class floorspace was selected as it reflected the aspiration for the retention of town centre employment uses.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) due to the above factors and no change in circumstances since then to merit changing this approach.</p>	<p>By providing new development on what is a very accessible town centre site, policy is likely to deliver positive effects on social objectives</p>	<p>The mix of uses in an accessible site means that policy is likely to have positive effects on environmental objectives</p>	<p>The mix of uses envisaged under this policy, including the provision of business use (and the stipulation of no net loss of B uses), means that it is likely to have positive effects on economic objectives.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC10 Swan Frontage</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as the preferred option as it recognises the potential of this site as a key gateway site into the town centre, identified through the studies supporting the masterplan proposals, and the opportunity for a mixture of uses to achieve the objectives for the site. It recognises existing adjacent users, such as the BNU building and the Swan Theatre that complement the aspirations for a cultural quarter in this area and the option facilitates the expansion of BNU if appropriate. This option facilitates but does not require the relocation of the existing uses, which is in line with the financial and deliverability evidence.</p> <p><b>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) due to the above factors. Further changes to the detailed wording of the policy in relation to the operation of the fire station have been proposed (FC44) but this does not change the overall approach of the policy.</b></p>	<p>This policy has the potential to have a positive impact on achieving social objectives, as it improves the physical and natural environment in this location. The addition of a landmark development on a key site will establish a key node at one of the gateways into the town centre of High Wycombe. The development of this site can reinforce the identity for High Wycombe in addition to other key town centre redevelopments.</p>	<p>This policy has potential to have a positive impact on achieving environmental objectives as the policy proposes significant improvements to the natural and built environment on the site. In particular opportunities for the future deculverting of the River Wye are protected.</p>	<p>This policy has the potential to have a significant positive impact on achieving economic objectives as the policy proposes significant employment-generating uses on site. Improvements in the public realm at this gateway location will also increase the investment potential of the site and wider town centre.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC11 Wycombe General Hospital</b></p> <p>This was selected as the preferred option because it was considered to allow for an appropriate degree of flexibility to allow for supporting uses on parts of the site, which would in turn help ensure continuing operational hospital use on the bulk of the site.</p> <p>This was selected as the preferred option at Update Consultation stage (2009) and there were no further changes in circumstances to merit changing this approach.</p>	<p>Policy would have a positive effect by allowing a mix of uses in an accessible location and by supporting continuing operation of the hospital at this town centre site.</p>	<p>Policy could provide environmental enhancements for a key part of the town centre. No significant adverse effects likely under any of the sub-categories.</p>	<p>Policy would help maintain future use of site as both operational hospital use and with a supporting mixture of supporting uses, would have positive effects on economic objectives.</p>



**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC12 Chilterns Shopping Centre and Frogmoor East</b></p> <p>It was considered that this option would maximise the potential of the site in delivering an improved range of facilities for the town as well as regenerating a site where the proportion of empty shop units has increased substantially since the onset of the economic downturn. The provision for residential development on upper floors would enable greater flexibility for development options here and encourage sustainable town centre living, whilst retaining active ground floor frontages.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Update Consultation stage (2009) due to the onset of the economic downturn and the effect of the opening of the Eden Centre in 2008. There have been no changes to circumstances since then to merit changing this approach.</p>	<p>Policy would be a catalyst to regenerating a key town centre site including the provision of new shopping and other facilities which would be used by the wider community; therefore likely to have significant positive effects on social objectives.</p>	<p>Policy would provide environmental enhancements for a key part of the town centre. No adverse effects likely.</p>	<p>Policy would help regenerate site and assist economy of the district by providing facilities for a mix of uses.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC13 Lily’s Walk (Former Gas Works site)</b>                      This option was accepted as the preferred option as a mixed use development makes the most of the site’s edge-of-centre location including the proximity of the site to residential areas of the town centre. The requirement for the provision of land for the link road protects the opportunity for implementing the town centre masterplan proposals and was agreed with the site owner through engagement in advance of publishing the proposed submission version of the DSA. Following engagement with the site owner, it was felt not to be appropriate or in line with Regulation 122 of the CIL 2010 Regulations to <b>require the provision of the link road within the policy when the quantum of development on the site was at this stage unknown.</b></p> <p><b>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) due to the above factors. A further change has been proposed to the policy (FC17) regarding the provision of highway works in line with the wider town centre proposals but this does not change the overall approach of the policy.</b></p>	<p>This policy has the potential to have a significant positive impact on social objectives as it proposes the development of a currently redundant site bringing forward housing and other services within an accessible town centre location.</p>	<p>This policy has the potential to have significant positive benefits on environmental objectives as it develops a currently redundant site within the town centre.</p>	<p>This policy has the potential to have a significant positive benefit on economic objectives as it proposes the re-use of a currently vacant town centre site for employment-generating uses (subject to any retail proposals being in accordance with the town centre sequential and impact tests as set out in national planning policy), in conjunction with residential development. In addition the provision of land for the link road will help deliver the vision and masterplan for the town centre.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC14 Buckingham House and Castle House</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it makes the most of this edge-of-centre site and recognises that retail uses could be an acceptable use subject to the necessary sequential and impact assessments. The requirement for the provision of land for the link road protects the opportunity for implementing the town centre masterplan proposals.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) due to the above factors and there has been no change in circumstances since.</p>	<p>This policy has the potential to have a positive impact on social objectives as it proposes the redevelopment of a site for housing and other services within an accessible town centre location.</p>	<p>This policy has the potential to have significant limited positive benefit on environmental objectives as it proposes the redevelopment of a prominent site within the town centre.</p>	<p>This policy has the potential to have a positive benefit on economic objectives as it proposes the redevelopment of a town centre site for employment generating uses, in conjunction with residential development. In addition, contribution towards the provision of the link road will help deliver the vision and masterplan for the town centre.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC15 Collins House/Corner of Bridge Street/Desborough Road</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was supported by the evidence base (in the form of the 2004 Retail and Town Centre Uses Study, which outlined the site as a mixed-use opportunity. Also supported by the outcome of the SA.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Preferred Options stage (2007) and no change to circumstances since then to merit changing this approach.</p>	<p>This policy has the potential to have a significant positive impact on social objectives as it proposes the redevelopment of a site for housing and other services, including community facilities within an accessible town centre location.</p>	<p>This policy has the potential to have significant positive benefit on environmental objectives as it proposes the redevelopment of a prominent site within the town centre.</p>	<p>This policy has the potential to have a positive benefit on economic objectives as it proposes the re-development of a town centre site for employment-generating uses, in conjunction with residential development. In addition the provision of the junction improvements and treatment of street network will help deliver the vision and masterplan for the town centre.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC16 Oxford Road Roundabout</b></p> <p>This option was chosen as the preferred option as the land use allocation reflects the site's town centre location and facilitates the delivery of new public space and highway changes in line with the town centre vision and masterplan proposals. Significant engagement was undertaken with the site owners who supported this option.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) due to the above factors and there has been no significant changes since this time to warrant any change.</p>	<p>Policy has the potential to have a significant positive impact on achieving social objectives, as it improves the physical and natural environment in this location. The addition of a landmark development on a key site will establish a key node at one of the gateways into the town centre of High Wycombe. The development of this site can reinforce the identity for High Wycombe in addition to other key town centre redevelopments.</p>	<p>Policy has potential to have a significant positive impact on achieving environmental objectives as the policy proposes improvements to the natural and built environment on the site.</p>	<p>Policy has the potential to have a significant positive impact on achieving economic objectives as the policy proposes significant employment-generating uses on site. Improvements in the public realm at this gateway location will also increase the investment potential of the site and wider town centre.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC17 Bridge Street</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was supported by the evidence base (the Economy Study identified potential for the site to be redeveloped for residential/retail/mixed use), supported by the SA outcome and wider linkages to Desborough supported in consultation responses.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) following consultation responses advocating wider area to enable improved linkages and maximise redevelopment opportunities. No changes in circumstances since then to merit changing this approach.</p>	<p>This policy has the potential to have a positive impact on social objectives as it proposes the redevelopment of a site for housing and other services within an accessible town centre location.</p>	<p>This policy has the potential to have significant positive benefit on environmental objectives as it proposes the redevelopment of a prominent site within the town centre.</p>	<p>This policy has the potential to have a positive benefit on economic objectives as it proposes the re-development of a town centre site for employment generating uses, in conjunction with residential development. In addition the treatment of street network and public realm on Bridge Street and Oxford Road will help deliver the longer-term vision and masterplan for the town centre.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC18 Baker Street</b></p> <p>This option was chosen as the requirement for the provision of land for the link road protects the opportunity for implementing the town centre masterplan and therefore has a positive impact on achieving economic SA objectives. Following engagement from stakeholders, it was felt that it was not in line with Regulation 122 to require the provision of link road itself within the policy when the quantum of development on the site was at this stage unknown. This also reflects the policy approach to the provision of land taken under Policy HWTC13.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) due to the above factors. A further change has been proposed to the policy (FC18) regarding the provision of highway works in line with the wider town centre proposals but this does not change the overall approach of the policy.</p>	<p>Policy has the potential to have a significant positive impact on social objectives as it proposes the development of a currently under-utilised site bringing forward housing and other services within an accessible town centre location.</p>	<p>Policy has potential to have a significant positive impact on achieving environmental objectives as the policy proposes improvements to the River Wye corridor and the provision of additional public open space.</p>	<p>Policy has the potential to have a significant positive benefit on economic objectives as it proposes the redevelopment of a site for employment generating uses, in conjunction with residential development. In addition the provision of the link road will help deliver the longer-term vision and masterplan for the town centre.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HWTC19 Rapid House</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was considered to provide the best overall benefits for the site, encompassing residential and business needs as well as protecting a community facility, and supported the future potential of the site in terms of redevelopment and reconfiguration.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) following dialogue with owners of the site and consideration of potential for comprehensive development at the site. There have been no changes in circumstances since then to merit changing this approach.</p>	<p>Overall positive effect due to site being well located in relation to services and facilities and provision of residential uses.</p>	<p>Overall positive effect on environmental objectives due to more efficient use of previously developed land within an accessible location.</p>	<p>Overall positive effect on economic objectives as a result of retaining existing employment floorspace on site, whilst allowing other town centre and residential uses.</p>



**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Objectives</b>		
	<b>Social</b>	<b>Environmental</b>	<b>Economic</b>
<p><b>HWTC20 Oxford Road (West)</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was supported by the evidence base (the Economy Study found that there should be no change on the site in terms of uses) and the SA in terms of allowing small-scale supporting uses.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Consultation Draft stage (2011) – previously it had no site policy but fell under the General Business Area policy – site policy was drafted to reflect altered scope of the document meaning that the site was not covered by an overall designation. No further change in circumstances to merit altering this approach. Policy reflected previous approach enshrined in General Business Areas policy.</p>	<p>Overall positive effect due to site being well located in relation to services and facilities.</p>	<p>Overall positive effect on environmental objectives due to site being well located, previously developed land, and not subject to flood risk.</p>	<p>Overall positive effect on economic objectives as a result maintaining site in employment use and allowing other employment-generating uses.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Objectives</b>		
	<b>Social</b>	<b>Environmental</b>	<b>Economic</b>
<p><b>HWTC21 Central Business Centre</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was supported by the evidence base (the Economy Study found that there should be no change on the site in terms of uses) and the SA in terms of allowing small-scale supporting uses.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Consultation Draft stage (2011) – previously it had no site policy but fell under the General Business Area policy – site policy was drafted to reflect altered scope of the document meaning that the site was not covered by an overall designation. No further change in circumstances to merit altering this approach. Policy reflected previous approach enshrined in General Business Areas policy.</p>	<p>Overall positive effect due to site being well located in relation to services and facilities.</p>	<p>Overall positive effect on environmental objectives due to site being well located, previously developed, and not subject to flood risk.</p>	<p>Overall positive effect on economic objectives as a result maintaining site in employment use and allowing other employment-generating uses.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
Desborough policies			
<p><b>HW1 Desborough Delivery and Design Framework</b></p> <p>This option accepted as it was considered to be in accordance with Core Strategy 4.1 in terms of providing an overall vision and framework for Desborough.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Update Consultation stage (2009) following adoption of Core Strategy Policy CS4.1 in 2008. No further change in circumstances to justify altering this approach.</p>	<p>This policy has a positive impact over a range of areas, including open space, housing and economic regeneration.</p>	<p>This policy addresses the legibility of Desborough and as a consequence increases opportunities for cycling, walking and biodiversity enhancement and movement, particularly around the River Wye.</p>	<p>This policy has a positive impact on economic objectives as it seeks to secure regeneration and ensure low-cost start-up units and opportunities for emerging businesses are not lost to housing, whilst also enhancing the wider environment.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HW2 Delivering New Open Space and River Corridor Improvements</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was considered to be in line with the approach to the Desborough area in the Core Strategy (in Policy CS4.1, regarding the need for regeneration, open space improvements and enhancements to public access to the river), and supported by the evidence base (with the Economy Study advocating regeneration in the area and the Open Spaces Background Paper highlighting an open space deficiency in the area).</p> <p>Whilst this option has become a criteria-based approach from initially being conceived as a site-specific option, the overall aim of achieving regeneration and open space improvements, and enhanced access to the river, was established as the overall aim of the policy at Preferred Options stage (2007). There have been no subsequent changes in circumstances to justify altering this fundamental approach.</p>	<p>Policy would have a positive impact upon the community in terms of access to open space and the resulting health and integration benefits.</p>	<p>Policy would have a significant positive effect on environmental objectives in Desborough. Opening up the Wye and increased green space will enhance biodiversity whilst also providing routes for cycling and walking.</p>	<p>Positive effect as a result of encouraging regeneration, provision of modern business space and potentially creating jobs in area.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>HW3 Green Street School</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was considered to be in line with the approach in the Core Strategy (regarding open space and protection of community facilities) and the evidence base (regarding open space and urban capacity).</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Preferred Options stage (2007) and, whilst the detailed wording of the policy has evolved (regarding location of the open space provision within the site and linking residential element with the provision of open space) there has been no subsequent change in circumstances to justify altering this overall approach.</p>	<p>Site has good access to town centre and policy offers scope for significant improvements to community identity and well being. Significant deprivation in a range of areas, which have potential for improvement.</p>	<p>Significant potential to improve townscape and locality through redevelopment of the site. Pedestrian linkages between surrounding sites can also be enhanced through redevelopment.</p>	<p>No opportunities will be created in association with the development of this site.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
Marlow policies			
<p><b>MR1 Primary Shopping Frontages: Marlow</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as the preferred approach as it was considered that the wider role for town centres in the current economic context meant that a more flexible approach than the traditional primary frontage model was required. It was considered that this would enable a good mix of A uses in the primary frontage, whilst protecting a core proportion of A1 shop uses, to support town centre vitality and viability. This approach received support from local stakeholders.</p> <p>This was option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) following consultation with local stakeholders and ongoing challenges for the retail industry, and the factors for this choice remain extant.</p>	<p>Policy continues to focus retail and other town centre development in specific areas to maintain vitality and accessibility.</p>	<p>Policy will consolidate retail and some A3 uses in existing developed areas where they are most accessible by sustainable modes of transport so no negative effects likely.</p>	<p>Policy promotes retail uses and supporting A3 uses, which can have a positive impact on the economy within the town centre, with the latter being particularly important for the tourism industry.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>MR2 Secondary Shopping Frontages: Marlow</b></p> <p>This option was selected as it was considered to represent an appropriately balanced approach in allowing for a range of uses appropriate to a secondary frontage, whilst also protecting units for uses containing an active ground floor frontage, and so preventing those which would create a 'dead' frontage. It was therefore considered that this option would maintain the vitality and viability of the town centre as a whole.</p> <p>This alternative was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission Document stage (2012) following consultation with local stakeholders and reflecting the wider role for town centres. There have been no subsequent changes in circumstances to merit changing this approach.</p>	<p>Policy would enable the development of appropriate town centre uses including an appropriate proportion of retail developments and supporting non-retail uses. This would assist in maintaining the vitality and viability of the secondary frontage, and therefore have a positive effect on social objectives.</p>	<p>No direct negative impacts and policy would encourage an appropriate mix of town centre uses in accessible locations and keep the town centre as a whole vital and viable. Significant positive environmental effects therefore likely.</p>	<p>Policy could have a significant positive effect by creating the framework to enable an appropriately wide range of developments to come forward which would assist the local economy.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>MR3 Riley Road</b></p> <p>This option was selected as it was in line with existing Local Plan policy and adopted development brief, and was considered to be an appropriate approach in this town centre location, on a site which had been recommended for this approach in the Council's Retail and Town Centre Use Study and by the previous Local Plan Inspector's Report.</p>	<p>By providing new development on what is a very accessible town centre site, policy is likely to deliver significant positive effects on social objectives.</p>	<p>By leading to mixed-use development in an accessible town centre location, policy is likely to lead to significant positive environmental effects.</p>	<p>By providing for a range of new shopping facilities and new employment opportunities, policy is likely to lead to positive effects on economic objectives.</p>



**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>MR4 Portlands</b></p> <p>Option would provide for the delivery of key housing site for Marlow, in a very constrained area with few development opportunities. Whilst it would not provide for the Portlands Link Road, this is a requirement which should be led by the highways authority, and to specify it as a stand-alone development requirement in the absence of the necessary supporting evidence, could be considered to be unreasonable. In the absence of the Portlands Link Road, West Street Car Park is not required for the development and can therefore be excluded from the site area, although any future developer will have to satisfy the highway authority's requirements in relation to satisfactory access to the site.</p> <p>This was selected as the preferred option during the examination process when it became apparent that the highway authority no longer saw a strategic reason to keep the road improvement line for the Portlands Link Road.</p>	<p>By providing new development on what is a very accessible town centre site, policy is likely to deliver significant positive effects on social objectives.</p>	<p>By delivering housing development in an accessible town centre location, policy is likely to lead to significant positive environmental effects.</p>	<p>By adding to the labour force, policy is likely to lead to positive effects on economic objectives</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>MR5 Liston Road Car Park</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was considered to offer the potential for additional housing in a very constrained area with few development opportunities, whilst protecting the existing quantum of car parking.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Update Report stage (2010) and no change in circumstances since then to merit changing this approach.</p>	<p>This development would be a more intensive use of an existing car park site. It is near to facilities and services. The policy would therefore have positive effects on social objectives.</p>	<p>The site is previously developed land and policy is therefore likely to have positive effects on environmental objectives.</p>	<p>There will be no new or retained employment. The car parking itself is important in terms of local economy. Overall effects on economic objectives likely to be neutral.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
Princes Risborough policies			
<p><b>PR1 Primary Shopping Frontages: Princes Risborough</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as the preferred approach as it was considered that the wider role for town centres in the current economic context meant that a more flexible approach than the traditional primary frontage model was required. It was considered that this would enable a good mix of A uses in the primary frontage, whilst protecting a core proportion of A1 shop uses, to support town centre vitality and viability. This approach received support from local stakeholders.</p> <p>This was option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) following consultation with local stakeholders and ongoing challenges for the retail industry, and the factors for this choice remain extant.</p>	<p>Policy continues to focus retail and other town centre development in specific areas to maintain vitality and accessibility.</p>	<p>Policy will consolidate retail and some A3 uses in existing developed areas where they are most accessible by sustainable modes of transport so no negative effects likely.</p>	<p>Policy promotes retail uses and supporting A3 uses, which can have a positive impact on the economy within the town centre, with the latter being particularly important for the tourism/leisure industry.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>PR2 Secondary Shopping Frontages: Princes Risborough</b></p> <p>This option was selected as it was considered to represent an appropriately balanced approach in allowing for a range of uses appropriate to a secondary frontage, whilst also protecting units for uses containing an active ground floor frontage, and so protecting against those which would create a 'dead' frontage. It was therefore considered that this option would maintain vitality and viability of the town centre as a whole.</p> <p>This alternative was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) following consultation with local stakeholders and reflecting the wider role for town centres generally in the current economic context. There have been no subsequent changes in circumstances to merit changing this approach.</p>	<p>Policy would enable the development of appropriate town centre uses including an appropriate proportion of retail developments and supporting non-retail uses. This would assist in maintaining the vitality and viability of the secondary frontage, and therefore have a positive effect on social objectives.</p>	<p>No direct negative impacts and policy would encourage an appropriate mix of town centre uses in accessible locations and keep the town centre as a whole vital and viable. Significant positive environmental effects therefore likely.</p>	<p>Policy could have a significant positive effect by creating the framework to enable an appropriately wide range of developments to come forward which would assist the local economy.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>PR3 Land Fronting New Road</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as the preferred approach as it was considered that it would provide a catalyst to regenerating this site and also provide environmental enhancements at the site. It was also supported by local stakeholders.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Update Report stage (2010) and no change in circumstances since then to merit changing this approach.</p>	<p>Positive effect on Social Objectives – policy would be a catalyst to regenerating a town centre site with benefits for the wider town.</p>	<p>Policy would provide environmental enhancements for a key site in the town centre. Adverse effects unlikely.</p>	<p>Positive effect. Policy would help regenerate a town centre site with a mix of uses including those which would support employment and tourism.</p>
<p><b>PR4 Land South of Horns Lane</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was considered that it would represent an appropriate mix of uses in sustainable town centre site, subject to requirements on relocating existing uses.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Preferred Options stage (2007) and no change in circumstances since then to merit changing this approach.</p>	<p>By providing new development on a town centre site, policy is likely to deliver positive effects on social objectives, particularly if scheme contains an element of residential.</p>	<p>Given the location of the site within a town centre, the re-use of the site is likely to have positive effects on environmental objectives.</p>	<p>Overall, the policy is likely to have a neutral to positive impact on the economic objectives given the retention of the retail element on site and potential to encourage tourism.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
District-Wide Development Management Policies			
<p><b>DM1a Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development</b></p> <p>This option was the only one appraised, since inclusion of this policy is a requirement of the government. Hence, not considered to be any reasonable alternatives.</p>	<p>Option could potentially quicken the delivery of housing (and, by corollary, affordable housing), therefore having positive effect on social objectives. However, the precise nature of the effect is uncertain.</p>	<p>Option could potentially have negative effects on some environmental objectives if developments are approved more quickly without full consideration of specific objectives. However, precise nature of effects are uncertain.</p>	<p>Option could potentially quicken the approval of development schemes, therefore having positive effect on economic objectives. However, the precise nature of the effect is uncertain.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>DM1 Transport Requirements of Development Sites</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was supported by highway authority and other consultation responses, and also was considered to augment and supplement Core Strategy Policy 20 (as well as Core Strategy Policies 16 and 21). It was considered that the approach would enable appropriate transport requirements to be secured without specifying the detail of these in each individual policy.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Update Report stage (2010) when it was co-written with the highway authority, and no subsequent change in circumstances to justify changing this approach, other than modifications to the detailed wording of the policy.</p>	<p>Positive impact on social objectives relating to provision of safe cycle and pedestrian routes in new developments and the potential these offer to encourage people to improve health through exercise.</p>	<p>Positive impact on environmental objectives due to focus of policy on achieving sustainable transport</p>	<p>Positive impact on economic objectives</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>DM2 Transport Improvement Lines</b></p> <p>This option accepted as it was in compliance with the approach of the highway authority in designating and protecting transport improvement lines. Approach is in compliance with the national policy (NPPF para 41, which states that local planning authorities should identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which would be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice).</p> <p>This option selected as the preferred approach at Preferred Options stage (2007) and, with the exception of minor wording changes, no new circumstances since then to warrant changing this approach.</p>	<p>Overall positive effect due to implementation of road improvements which would contribute towards improving accessibility to essential services and facilities across the District.</p>	<p>The environmental impacts of the policy would be dependent on the outcomes of studies, more detailed assessment and the resulting nature of development.</p>	<p>Improved accessibility and transport policies are likely to improve the District's status as a desirable business location, while improving opportunities for residents to access employment opportunities.</p>



**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>DM3 Former Bourne End to High Wycombe Railway Line</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was considered to be supported by the evidence base (the High Wycombe to Bourne End Railway Line Background Paper) in terms of being deliverable and support received from consultation responses.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Update Report stage (2010) following evidence base indicating that the route should be protected for this purpose. No subsequent changes of circumstances to justify altering this approach.</p>	<p>Policy would have a positive impact on achieving social objectives due to increasing potential access to facilities</p>	<p>Policy would have positive impact on achieving environmental objectives due to providing a sustainable transport link, being a part of the green infrastructure network and increasing access to the countryside</p>	<p>Policy would have no impact on economic objectives.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>DM4 Scattered Business Sites</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was considered to be supported by the evidence base (the Economy Study), which states whilst providing flexibility for changes where justified; and marketing requirements add clarity to the approach.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Update Consultation stage (2009) although the wider economic context has shaped further evolution to the wording of the policy.</p>	<p>Positive effect on social objectives due to the potential to deliver new homes and community facilities</p>	<p>Overall positive effect on environmental objectives due to redevelopment of previously developed land</p>	<p>Overall negative effect on objectives due to potential loss of employment land</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>DM5 Mixed-Use Development</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was considered that it was necessary to reflect the aspiration of Core Strategy Policy CS11 and to ensure the deliver of the wider objectives of mixed-use sites, in a piecemeal rather than fragmented fashion. Approach supports the economic elements of sustainability objectives.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Proposed Submission stage (2012) and no subsequent changes in circumstances to merit altering this approach.</p>	<p>General and non-locational nature of the policy makes it difficult to identify specific effects, and the precise effect of policy is likely to depend upon site-specific issues and requirements in individual site policies.</p>	<p>Policy itself has largely neutral or uncertain effects; precise nature of effects are likely to be dependent on site-specific issues. Small positive effect likely due to the requirement for comprehensive development having a positive effect on the potential for reducing the need to travel.</p>	<p>Policy approach likely to have a positive effect on economic objectives as it provides a framework for ensuring the delivery of the business component of mixed-use schemes where relevant.</p>
<p><b>DM6 Town Centre Boundaries</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was considered to represent an appropriate area of each town centre and set out a clear framework for uses proposed inside and out of these boundaries.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Update Consultation stage (2009) and no change in circumstances since then to merit changing the approach.</p>	<p>Policy would encourage the development of further appropriate town centre uses (as defined in national planning policy) in a wide range of locations in the town centre, assisting the regeneration of those – and adjacent – communities.</p>	<p>No direct negative impacts and policy would encourage the re-use of previously developed land.</p>	<p>Policy could have a positive impact by creating the framework to enable a wider range of developments to come forward which would assist the local economy.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>DM7 The Primary Shopping Areas</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as the preferred approach as it was considered to most appropriately reflect national policy in terms of the range of uses considered to be acceptable in principle in primary shopping areas. It was also considered that a caveat on developments being of an appropriate scale would protect against schemes which could have a significant adverse impact on the vitality and viability of these or other town centres.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Preferred Options stage (2007) and no change of circumstances since then to merit changing this approach.</p>	<p>Policy would continue to focus retail and other town centre uses in specific areas to maintain vitality, viability and accessibility.</p>	<p>Policy would consolidate retail and other town centre uses in the primary shopping areas where they are most accessible by sustainable modes of transport and be of a scale that complements the existing centre. It will therefore have significant positive effects on environmental objectives.</p>	<p>Policy promotes retail and other uses which can have a positive impact on the economy within the existing town centre shopping areas.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>DM8 District Centres</b></p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach as it was considered that it would enable an appropriate proportion of retail developments, A2 and other supporting non-retail uses, which would assist in maintaining the vitality and viability of District Centres. The addition of the acceptability of residential in certain circumstances was considered appropriate to reflect government and local policy supporting town centre living provided certain criteria are met.</p> <p>This was selected as the preferred approach via a Further Change following submission, following further consideration of the proposal to add this residential option into the approach.</p>	<p>Policy would enable the development of appropriate uses for the district centres including an appropriate proportion of retail developments, A3 and other supporting non-retail uses. This would assist in maintaining the vitality and viability of the district centres.</p>	<p>Policy would consolidate retail, A3 uses and other supporting main town centre uses in the District Centres where they are most accessible by sustainable modes of transport and be of a scale that is appropriate for their functions and position in the Town Centre Hierarchy. It would therefore have significant positive effects on environmental objectives.</p>	<p>Policy could have a positive impact by creating the framework to enable a wider range of developments to come forward which would assist the local economy.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>DM9 Thresholds for the Assessment of Schemes for Town Centre Impact</b></p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach as it was considered that it would be the most dynamic, responsive and robust way of ensuring that developments which could have the potential to have a significant adverse impact on centres would be subject to an assessment for this impact, whilst not representing an undue burden on developments which would be unlikely to have such a significant adverse impact. It was considered that the approach would have regard to (a) the future scope for retail floorspace in the District and (b) the varying roles of the different town centres in the Town Centre Hierarchy.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Consultation Draft stage (2011) following consultation responses, and no circumstances since then to merit changing this approach.</p>	<p>Policy would ensure that developments in out-of-centre locations which could have the potential to have a significant adverse impact on designated centres are subject to a robust test to assess their impacts on such centres. Under this policy, this policy approach would function over an appropriate balance of developments. The policy would therefore assist in maintaining the vitality and viability of these centres.</p>	<p>Policy likely to assist in ensuring that proposals for development in out-of-centre locations are thoroughly appraised for their impacts where appropriate.</p>	<p>Policy likely to create barriers for businesses who wish to locate in out-of-centre locations. However it is likely to help provide appropriate protection for designated centres, ensuring that they maintain vitality and viability.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>DM10 Green Networks and Infrastructure</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was considered to be supported by the evidence base (the County Council's Green Infrastructure Strategy and the District's Green Networks and Infrastructure Background Paper) and the outcome of the SA. Consultation responses also supported this approach, and it was considered that it would enable improvements to be made to the GI network.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Update Consultation stage (2009) when the policy was first drafted. The detailed wording of the mechanisms of the policy has been adjusted but the overall approach has remained the same since then.</p>	<p>Overall positive effect on social objectives due to promoting, enhancing and increasing green infrastructure network, and associated social benefits.</p>	<p>Overall policy has a positive impact upon environmental objectives through improving linkages and quality of the green infrastructure network.</p>	<p>The policy is unlikely to have a significant direct impact upon economic objectives.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Objectives</b>		
	<b>Social</b>	<b>Environmental</b>	<b>Economic</b>
<p><b>DM11 Green Spaces</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was considered to be supported by the evidence base (the Open Spaces Audit), the outcome of the SA and general responses to the consultation.</p> <p>The fundamental approach encompassed within this option was selected as the preferred approach at Preferred Options stage (2007). Since then there have been adjustments to the wording of the policy and some of the sites subject to the policy, but not to the fundamental approach.</p>	<p>Overall positive effect on social objectives due to protecting spaces that have potential to contribute towards achieving access, community welfare and health objectives</p>	<p>The policy has a positive impact upon environmental objectives by avoiding loss of natural settings/landscapes and retaining open space and green infrastructure.</p>	<p>The policy is unlikely to have a significant direct impact upon the objectives, although maintaining open spaces may have a positive effect on tourism.</p>
<p><b>DM12 Conservation and Enhancement of Sites, Habitats and Species of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Importance</b></p> <p>This option was selected as it was considered to be supported by the outcome of the SA and to be in compliance with Core Strategy Policy CS17 and NPPF para 113 on setting policies to conserve and enhance sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance.</p>	<p>The policy will be promoting the conservation and enhancement of sites and habitats many of which are used by the community. These areas bring benefits to health, well-being and community cohesion.</p>	<p>This policy has a positive impact on environmental objectives by conserving biodiversity resources, natural settings/landscapes and retaining open space and green infrastructure.</p>	<p>Protection and enhancement of nature conservation areas may have a positive effect on tourism, e.g. Chiltern beech woods and by helping attract businesses to the area.</p>



**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>DM13 Biodiversity in Development</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was supported by national planning policy, consultation responses and the outcome of the SA.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Update Consultation stage (2009) and, other than minor wording changes, no subsequent changes in circumstances to merit altering this overall approach.</p>	<p>The policy promotes the retention and creation of biodiversity rich open spaces and improvements to the management of those spaces, thus potentially improving health and providing a better quality of environment for local residents.</p>	<p>This policy has a positive impact on environmental objectives by avoiding loss of habitats and the creation of new ones. As a consequence there will be positive impacts on issues such as biodiversity, landscape, open spaces, flooding etc.</p>	<p>Conservation and enhancement of biodiversity in developments may have a positive effect on tourism and attractiveness of an area to business.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>DM14 Protection and Enhancement of River and Stream Corridors</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was supported by the Environment Agency, and was considered to be in compliance with Core Strategy Policy CS17 and supported by the outcome of the SA process in terms of providing protection for these vital elements of the green infrastructure in the District. Requirement for active pursuit of deculverting opportunities considered to be in compliance with the wider objectives of the town, especially in High Wycombe town centre.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Consultation Draft stage (2011), when the policy was first drafted. Apart from minor and detailed wording changes, no further changes in circumstances to merit altering this approach.</p>	<p>The policy promotes the retention, improvement and creation of river corridors which have the potential to deliver benefits to health and well-being, and provide a better quality of environment for local communities.</p>	<p>This policy has a positive impact on environmental objectives by providing benefits to the physical river environment, wildlife associated with watercourses and their corridors, landscape and townscape character, and water cycle processes.</p>	<p>Conservation and enhancement of river corridors may have a positive effect on the attractiveness of areas to businesses.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>DM15 Open Space in New Development</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was considered that approach was in line with the Core Strategy Policy CS19 (and Policy CS21), supported by the evidence base (The Open Space Framework) and was considered that these standards could be implemented without a burdensome requirement in terms of process or negotiation.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Update Report stage (2010) and, apart from modification of the detail of the standards, this has remained the preferred approach.</p>	<p>Policy is likely to have significant positive effects as it will be promoting an environment where great emphasis is placed upon the need for quality open spaces and landscapes that are conducive to improving health and providing a better quality of life for local residents.</p>	<p>By avoiding loss of natural settings/landscapes and retain open space and green infrastructure, policy is likely to have significant positive effects on environmental objectives.</p>	<p>The policy is unlikely to have a significant direct impact upon economic objectives.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>DM16 Planning for Flood Risk Management</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was considered to be in compliance with national policy (NPPF para 100, which sets out the overall approach and criteria to be used when considering development proposals in areas at risk of flooding), Core Strategy Policy CS18 and the responses of the Environment Agency.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Update Consultation stage (2009) when the single policy was drafted, although it was redrafted at Consultation Draft stage (2011).</p>	<p>Reducing flood risk is unlikely to have a direct effect on social objectives.</p>	<p>Policy would be likely to have significant positive effect on environmental objectives as measures to reduce flood risk will also provide opportunities to safeguard water quality.</p>	<p>Policy is unlikely to have a direct effect on economic objectives.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>DM17 Carbon Reduction</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it was supported by the evidence base on viability of such requirements (The Blewburton Partnership report), and considered to be in compliance with government policy. Approach is in compliance with national policy (NPPF para 96), which states that LPAs should expect new development to comply with adopted Local Plan policies on local requirements for decentralised energy supply unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant, having regard to the type of development involved and its design, that this is not feasible or viable.</p> <p>This option was selected as the preferred approach at Update Report stage (2010) and, other than detailed alterations, maintained as the preferred overall approach since.</p>	<p>Positive effect on environmental objectives due to requirement applying to nearly all new residential and commercial development. Sustainable construction to the required standards will improve the quality of housing and minimising carbon emissions and use of fossil fuels may have positive effects on health.</p>	<p>An important focus of the policy is the reduction of carbon emissions and use of on-site renewable technology to generate energy as part of delivering that reduction. Along with the efficient use of resources this will have a positive effect on meeting environmental objectives.</p>	<p>The policy is unlikely to have a significant impact upon the objectives.</p>

**Table 6 Summary of Sustainability Appraisal Conclusions and summary of reasons for selecting the preferred option for each policy**

Policy	Objectives		
	Social	Environmental	Economic
<p><b>DM18 Infrastructure and Delivery</b></p> <p>This option was accepted as it reflected the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy, and Infrastructure Delivery Plan, in the District. It was considered appropriate to incorporate an approach to viability to provide clarity on this issue in the current uncertain economic context.</p>	<p>Policy will have a positive effect on social objectives as it ensures the provision of infrastructure to support the needs of local communities.</p>	<p>Policy has a positive effect on environmental objectives, as it promotes the provision of green infrastructure and sustainable transport modes to support new development.</p>	<p>This policy has a limited positive impact in achieving economic objectives as the IDP identifies infrastructure that is required to support economic activity.</p>

