



Knowsley Council

Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy

Accounting for Assessments

November 2012

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document sets out the main recommendations arising from each of the interim technical assessments undertaken on the Knowsley Core Strategy Preferred Options Report, which was published by the Council for consultation in June 2011. The interim assessment reports assessed the policy content of the Preferred Options Report, and published as part of the range of consultation materials which accompanied the Report. These assessments include:
 - Interim Sustainability Appraisal
 - Interim Habitats Regulations Assessment
 - Interim Health Impact Assessment
- 1.2 A further interim assessment was undertaken, referred to as the Interim Equality and Diversity Impact Assessment. However the format of this assessment was as a scoping report, and hence there were no clear recommendations to take forward as part of this.
- 1.3 The recommendations arising from each assessment have been set out under which Preferred Options policy area they apply to (i.e. CS1, CS2, CS3). This document includes a table for each of these policy areas, with sections for each assessment. Where no recommendations have been made for the particular policy area (i.e. if the policy area has been scoped out of the assessment process, or does not contain content relevant to the scope of the assessment), it is stated “no recommendations made”.
- 1.4 Each recommendation is referenced by the paragraph / table number from the assessment documents. For each recommendation, the Council has given a response as to whether any changes have been made to the Core Strategy (between Preferred Options and Proposed Submission version) as a result of the recommendation (i.e. “yes” or “no”). This is supplemented by some explanatory text, which sets out why the Council has considered it necessary to make a change, or alternatively why the Council does not consider a change is necessary. Where the Council has considered that a change is not necessary, this position has been justified with reference to matters such as competing objectives, or that a relevant change has been made elsewhere in the Core Strategy.
- 1.5 The Council has utilised the findings of this exercise to amend and refine the Core Strategy policies, as the Proposed Submission Version is drafted. It is therefore possible to use this document to identify how the Council has accounted for the findings of the technical assessments undertaken at the Preferred Options stage. This exercise will be followed by final versions of the range of technical assessments, which will come to a position about the overall compliance of the plan with sustainability, habitats and health objectives.

Contents

Policy CS1: Spatial Strategy for Knowsley.....	1
Policy CS2: Development Principles.....	5
Policy CS3: Housing Supply, Delivery and Distribution.....	9
Policy CS4: Economy and Employment.....	12
Policy CS5: Green Belts	17
Policy CS6: Town Centre and Retail Strategy	21
Policy CS7: Transport Networks	26
Policy CS8: Green Infrastructure	31
Policy CS9: Principal Regeneration Area – North Huyton and Stockbridge Village	38
Policy CS10: Principal Regeneration Area – Kirkby Town Centre	40
Policy CS11: Principal Regeneration Area – Knowsley Industrial and Business Parks.....	43
Policy CS12: Principal Regeneration Area – Tower Hill.....	46
Policy CS13: Principal Regeneration Area – South Prescott	49
Policy CS14: Principal Regeneration Area – Prescott Town Centre	52
Policy CS15: Delivery Affordable Housing	54
Policy CS16: Specialist and Supported Accommodation	57
Policy CS17: Housing Sizes and Design Standards	60
Policy CS18: Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	62
Policy CS19: Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development.....	64
Policy CS20: Managing the Borough’s Heritage	70
Policy CS21: Urban Greenspaces	72
Policy CS22: Sustainable and Low Carbon Development	75
Policy CS23: Renewable and Low Carbon Infrastructure	78
Policy CS24: Managing Flood Risk.....	80
Policy CS25: Management of Minerals and Resources	82
Policy CS26: Waste Management	85
Policy CS27: Planning for and Paying for New Infrastructure in Knowsley	87

Policy CS1: Spatial Strategy for Knowsley

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see text of report / summary tables in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.1 CS1 a)	The Spatial Strategy for Knowsley would have a largely positive impact on the sustainability objectives. There is however some scope for further improvement to the performance of the Spatial Strategy against the sustainability objectives.	No	Noted and welcomed. Responses to suggestions for changes are listed below.
4.1 CS1 b)	By seeking to regenerate existing residential neighbourhoods and through appropriate investment in services and facilities it is considered that the Spatial Strategy has the potential to have a positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and social deprivation; improving access to goods, services and amenities; improving health and reducing health inequalities; and improving educational attainment. The emphasis placed upon re-balancing the housing stock by providing a wide choice of new market sector and affordable housing should ensure that the Spatial Strategy has a positive impact on the objective relating to the provision of good quality housing.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.1 CS1 c)	By seeking to enhance existing employment areas, provide a range of sites and premises for new employment development and maintaining and enhancing the Borough's town and district centres. It is considered that the Spatial Strategy would have a positive impact on the economic objectives. It is however considered that there would be greater certainty that the Spatial Strategy would have a positive impact on the objective relating to the vitality and viability of the Borough's town and local centres if a reference to maintaining and enhancing the Borough's local	No	Noted. The need to maintain and enhance the Borough's local centres is considered under Policy CS6, which is part of the spatial strategy. Regarding the development of Green Belt land, through policy CS5 the Council has selected locations which are, or can be made, available by a wide choice of transportation modes. In addition, policies CS3 and CS17 give additional

	centres was included. The Spatial Strategy would also have a positive impact on the objectives relating to landscape; biodiversity and geodiversity; adapting to climate change; mitigating climate change; green infrastructure; land and soil; air quality; and reducing the need to travel. Nevertheless, the level of certainty that the Spatial Strategy would have a positive impact on some of these objectives is only low and a number of mitigation measures are suggested to ensure the Spatial Strategy would have a positive impact on these objectives, including ensuring that any new development built within the Green Belt is accessible by a choice of means of transport and ensuring new development is built to an appropriate density to minimise loss of countryside.		guidance about the density, size and type of housing development which would be suitable in the Green Belt locations as well as across the wider Borough.
4.1 CS1 d)	There are no anticipated negative impacts on the sustainability objectives. The impact of the Spatial Strategy on the objective of preserving, enhancing and managing Knowsley’s rich diversity of cultural, historic and archaeological buildings, areas, sites and features is however considered to be uncertain due to the increased development pressure being placed on the urban area. In order to mitigate this uncertainty it is considered that ‘managing and enhancing Knowsley’s heritage assets’ could be included as a Spatial Development Priority.	Yes	Noted and welcomed. Managing and enhancing Knowsley’s heritage assets has been included as a spatial development priority within Policy CS1.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App A CS1 a)	Any new development of land within the Green Belt for housing should ensure that public services are accessible	No	The selection of locations within Policy CS5 for development in the Green Belt

	within reasonable distance by a range of transport modes, giving priority to walking and cycling.		has been undertaken accounting for the ability to access the site by a range of transport modes, and that in being in close proximity to the urban area, are also near to existing services. Alongside Policy CS27, which seeks to provide and maintain supporting infrastructure, the Council considers that this issue has been addressed in the Core Strategy.
App A Social cohesion and social capital a)	That increased community engagement is undertaken within all aspects of regeneration, investment and development. Opportunities for this include through the design of new buildings and service provision and through investment and long-term maintenance of parks and open spaces ('Friends of' groups, allotment groups etc). This should be encouraged throughout the Core Strategy as a whole.	Yes	The preparation of the Core Strategy has been undertaken in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, which sets the standards for community engagement associated with plan preparation. Additional changes have been made to Policy CS19 to reflect that community engagement is a key consideration within design of new buildings and developments.
App A Resource minimisation a)	That reference within the Core Strategy is made to prioritising the redevelopment of brown field land, not just land within existing urban areas. This may be most appropriate within CS1 or CS2 and could be reinforced within policy CS22 or CS26.	No	The Council established the approach through Policy CS1 and CS2 to prioritise urban regeneration over development within the Green Belt. This is also reflected in the designation of Principal Regeneration Areas which cover areas of brownfield or previously developed land, including at Knowsley Industrial Park, South Prescot and

			Kirkby Town Centre. Therefore no additional changes are required.
--	--	--	---

Policy CS2: Development Principles

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.1 CS2 a)	The preferred option would have a positive impact on a wide range of social, environmental and economic objectives. The preferred option would have a particularly significant impact on the objectives relating to health; reducing climate change; and reducing the need to travel. It is anticipated that the positive impact on each of these objectives will become increasingly significant as the Plan’s proposals take effect.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.1 CS2 b)	The emphasis placed upon encouraging development that promotes sustainable economic development, tackles deprivation and helps reduce economic inequality should ensure that the preferred option has some positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and deprivation; improving the competitiveness and productivity of business; and maintaining high and stable levels of employment. The development principles also seek to ensure the provision of a range of services and facilities which should have some positive impact on the objectives relating to the accessibility of goods, services and amenities; and improving educational attainment. In addition, the inclusion of development principles relating to the protection of environmental assets and the quality of places ensures that the preferred option should have some positive impact on the objectives relating to Knowsley’s built heritage; landscape character and accessibility; biodiversity and geodiversity; land and soil; and water quality.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.1 CS2 c)	There are no negative or uncertain impacts on the	No	Noted and welcomed.

Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
15.12 and 15.13	<p>sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Policy CS2 states that the most efficient use will be made of <i>“available resources and infrastructure by prioritising locations consistent with the spatial strategy, which do not require major investment in new infrastructure including... water supply and sewerage or where this is unavoidable, incorporate appropriate development phasing and delivery assistance; and to support prudent and efficient management of natural and man-made resources”</i>. Avoiding an adverse effect is largely in the hands of the water companies (through their investment in future sewage treatment infrastructure) and Environment Agency (through their role in consenting effluent discharges). However, local authorities can also contribute through ensuring that sufficient wastewater treatment infrastructure is in place prior to development being delivered through the Core Strategy. In the case of Knowsley, this is alluded to in the supporting text for Policy CS27 (Planning for and Paying for New Infrastructure).</p> <p>However, it is considered that this allusion needs to be slightly expanded upon in order to provide a firm commitment with regard to the linking of housing delivery to delivery of necessary infrastructure that will ensure that an adverse effect on European sites is avoided. A policy in the Core Strategy will need to make specific reference to the fact that the delivery of development will be phased in order to ensure that it only takes place once any new water treatment infrastructure or appropriate retro-fitted technology (e.g. nitrate stripping) necessary to service the development while</p>	Yes	<p>Policy CS2 has been amended to account for the changes required. These include that the policy specifically states that the phasing of new development will be linked to the delivery of the necessary infrastructure to serve the development. The role of working with neighbouring authorities and key partner agencies as part of this has also been emphasised.</p> <p>Policy CS27 has also been amended to emphasise the need to plan holistically for the delivery of supporting infrastructure as part of the phased delivery of new development within Knowsley. Again, links with partner authorities and agencies have been emphasised. In particular, CS27 emphasises the need to ensure that environmental protection is paramount in delivery of new development, particularly where infrastructure improvements can help to avoid environmental risks. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan, as referenced in Policy CS27, also strongly reflects these agendas.</p>

	avoiding an adverse effect on European sites is in place. The Core Strategy should also make it clear that this need will be determined and delivered through interaction with other authorities including United Utilities and the Environment Agency.		
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App A CS2 a)	That Preferred Option CS2 is strengthened to ensure accessibility to public services for vulnerable groups is given appropriate consideration.	No	Noted. The Council considers it appropriate to promote access to public services for all; by definition this includes vulnerable groups. Therefore no additions have been made.
App A CS2 b)	It should be recognised that walking and cycling, although beneficial to human health, is not an appropriate means of transport for everyone and this could be emphasised within the supporting text of Preferred Option CS2.	No	Noted. It is felt that the wording of the third section of Policy CS2 already accounts for this. The use of the word “particularly” emphasises that these options may not be suitable for everyone.
App A CS2 c)	Whilst the principle that new development will have ‘no negative impact upon flood risk, air quality, etc’ is commendable, and a positive in terms of human health, it is questionable how realistic this is and how it would be measured and implemented. It is therefore recommended that this be reworded to take account of these issues.	Yes	Policy CS2 has been amended to reflect this, as follows: “Minimising negative impact upon flood risk, air quality, water quality, land quality, soil quality, and noise or vibration levels and ensuring any negative impacts are appropriately mitigated”.
App A CS2 d)	More specific guidance on noise levels should be included where appropriate (i.e. within the Core Strategy or Supplementary Planning Documents). Work to be undertaken with the Scientific Officer to make links to the Merseyside Noise Policy.	No	Noted. It is considered that specific references to noise policy are generally outside of the scope of the Local Plan and in particular the Core Strategy, although could be suitable for incorporation in a future Local Plan

			document or other Council strategy.
App A CS2 e)	That reference to the North West Sustainability Checklist for Developments is changed to something more current (the North West Regional Assembly has now been disbanded), for example, a reference to the Sustainability in Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Guidance or national recognised standard such as the Code for Sustainable Homes or BREEAM.	Yes	Policy CS2 has been amended to future-proof the approach in relation to meeting minimum sustainability standards. This includes removing reference to specific guidance documents, and instead referring in general to minimum existing standards. Policy CS22 and CS23 expand on this, as indicated in the “policy links” section under Policy CS2.
App A CS2 f)	That reference to the use of ‘new technology’ in order to reduce emissions is considered.	Yes	Noted. The role of new technology in minimising carbon emissions and helping to manage the impacts of climate change has been recognised in the wording of Policy CS2.

Policy CS3: Housing Supply, Delivery and Distribution

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.1 CS3 a)	The preferred option would have a largely positive impact on the sustainability objectives. The preferred option seeks to deliver a sufficient number of houses to meet Knowsley’s needs and ensure that the tenure, type and size of housing delivered supports the re-balancing of the housing market to better meet the needs and demands of Knowsley’s communities. As a result, it is considered that the preferred option has the potential to have a major positive impact on the objective of providing good quality, affordable and resource efficient housing, and some positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and social deprivations; and health.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.1 CS3 b)	The preferred option is likely to generate some employment and training opportunities in the construction sector. In addition, the provision of high quality residential developments can ensure that the Borough attracts a suitable workforce and thereby have a positive impact on the ongoing competitiveness of businesses and support the Borough’s town and local centres. As a result, it is envisaged that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the economic objectives and the objective of improving educational attainment, training and employability.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.1 CS3 c)	There are no anticipated negative impacts on the sustainability objectives. It is however considered that the preferred option would have an uncertain impact on the objectives relating to mitigating climate change and the use of water and minerals due to the environmental impacts	No.	Noted and welcomed. The Core Strategy’s approach to sustainability and design seek to minimise the negative impacts arising from new development.

	associated with the construction and operation of new dwellings. It is however recognised that there is an identified need to provide housing in the Borough and that the new dwellings would be built to higher environmental standards.		
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App A CS3 a)	That a separate Health Impact Assessment be undertaken on all applications which fall outside the stated housing density parameters, where a residential scheme is for 15 units or more.	No	Policy CS2 sets the principle of the use of Health Impact Assessments in the planning application process. The Council will consider its detailed preferred approach to the use of Health Impact Assessments in planning applications in a subsequent Local Plan document.
App A CS3 b)	That planning and health colleagues work together to better understand the changing health and housing needs of the borough, to allow planning for the future.	No	Noted. The preparation of the Core Strategy has involved extensive consultation with health colleagues from across the Council and the Primary Care Trust, and this should be continued with other Local Plan documents and similar projects.
App A Housing a)	Where appropriate the Core Strategy should make mention of the importance of post-construction management of all types of housing, not just for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation. This will help to manage accidents within the home.	Yes	Post-construction management has been mentioned as a requirement within Policy CS19. However, this is only where appropriate, as post-construction management will not be relevant to all types of new

			development.
App A Housing b)	That the Core Strategy also makes greater links to the Knowsley Housing Strategy currently under development.	Yes	The revised Housing Strategy has been mentioned in the supporting text for Policy CS3.
App A Housing c)	That strong links between new residential development and greenspaces/communal areas should be made.	No	The Council considers that this is already achieved through Policy CS21.

Policy CS4: Economy and Employment

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.1 CS4 a)	The preferred option would have a largely positive impact on the sustainability objectives. The preferred option seeks to support sustainable economic growth; provide sufficient land to meet employment development needs; improve accessibility to an appropriate range of jobs; and address skills and educational barriers to employment. It is therefore envisaged that the preferred option would have a major positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and deprivation; improving the competitiveness of business and increasing the number of new businesses; and maintaining high and stable levels of employment; and some positive impact on the objective relating to improving opportunities for lifelong learning and employability. It is anticipated that the positive impact on each of these objectives will become increasingly significant as the Plan's proposals take effect.	No	Noted.
4.1 CS4 b)	The preferred option seeks to direct retail and town centre leisure uses to existing town centres. It is therefore anticipated that the preferred option would also have a major positive impact on the objective of enhancing the vitality and viability of town and local centres. It is however considered that there would be a greater level of certainty that the preferred option would have a positive impact on this objective if the wording was strengthened to require proposals for town centre uses in out of centre locations to demonstrate that there are no sites in a town centre or edge of centre location that are suitable, available and viable. The directing of retail and town centre leisure uses to existing	No	Policy CS4 (iv) requires that a sequential approach to site selection be applied. Policy CS6 also supports this approach.

	town centres, which are all considered to be accessible by public transport, should also have some positive impact on the objectives relating to air quality and improving the use of more sustainable modes of travel. It is however considered that the certainty of this impact is also low.		
4.1 CS4 c)	It is not anticipated that the preferred option would have a negative impact on any of the sustainability objectives. It is however considered that the preferred option would have an uncertain impact on the objectives relating to mitigating climate change and the use of water and minerals due to the environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of new dwellings. Nevertheless, it is recognised that there is an identified need to for new employment premises in the Borough and that the new development would be built to higher environmental standards.	No	Noted.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App A CS4 a)	Any significant development being classified as edge or out of centre is subject to a separate Health Impact Assessment process. It is recognised that a process will have to be undertaken to define 'significant development', to ensure that the required HIAs are not too onerous for the development and case officers involved.	No	Policy CS2 sets the principle of the use of Health Impact Assessments in the planning application process. The Council will consider its detailed preferred approach to the use of Health Impact Assessments in planning applications in a subsequent Local Plan document.
App A CS4 b)	That CS4 be strengthened to recognise that the quality and connectivity of the retail environment is important to ensure	No	Policy CS6 deals with the retail environment and town centres in

	that town centres are considered as a whole.		Knowsley.
App A CS4 c)	That further Health Impact Assessment work is carried out on major developments on sites proposed for review and potential release from the Green Belt for employment or other uses.	No	Policy CS2 sets the principle of the use of Health Impact Assessments in the planning application process. The Council will consider its detailed preferred approach to the use of Health Impact Assessments in planning applications in a subsequent Local Plan document.
App A CS4 d)	That a reference be made to ‘an appropriate range of high quality jobs’ within CS4 (i) Point 3 to emphasise the need for high quality employment within the borough	No	Policy CS4 seeks to deliver a range of jobs in Knowsley, which includes high quality jobs. The Council recognises the need to deliver a range of employment opportunities for local people, which meet existing skill sets, as well as more highly skilled and technical jobs.
App A CS4 e)	That within CS4 (iii), accessibility by sustainable modes of transport is made a factor within the proposed phasing of release of land for employment uses. In addition, that this section is expanded to include ensuring a supply of business start-up premises around the borough.	Yes	The Council has commissioned new evidence regarding accessibility and transport provision to locations promoted through the Core Strategy. This is reflected in the Council’s approach to employment land provision, and to Green Belt review, as set out in Policy CS5. A new bullet point “Support new start up businesses including social enterprise” has been added to Policy CS4(i) “Overall Employment Development Strategy”.
App A	That opportunities to provide additional services which	No	Uses complementary to existing

CS4 f)	employees may require such as childcare and health care are encouraged within employment areas such as industrial and businesses parks which are away from traditional town centres.		employment uses are considered within Policy CS4, in particular with regard to the potential for them to bring wider regeneration, environmental or amenity benefits. The Council considers that it has developed a policy which strikes the right balance between safeguarding existing employment land, and recognizing that additional services may be required in some circumstances.
App A CS4 g)	That the need to promote new and emerging types of businesses e.g. the Knowledge Economy is encouraged, in order to diversify the range of jobs available within the area.	Yes	Policy CS4 supports emerging employment sectors. The supporting text for the policy has been expanded to include greater reference to the aims and objectives of the Knowsley Economic Regeneration Strategy as well as sub-regional work being led by the Local Enterprise Partnership.
App A CS4 h)	That opportunities to encourage working from home and improvements within digital communications and telecommunication should be explored (although possibly within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Design Quality in New Development or other Supplementary Planning Document, as appropriate).	Yes	A new bullet point “Encourage homeworking through improvements to digital communications and telecommunications infrastructure;” has been added to Policy CS4 “Overall Employment Development Strategy”
App A CS4 i)	That reference to the Council’s emerging Economic Regeneration Strategy is mentioned where and if appropriate.	Yes	Economic Regeneration Strategy is mentioned as a delivery mechanism for Policy CS4 and in the supporting text for the policy.
App A Social cohesion	That further encouragement is given to new start up businesses and social enterprise, for example, within CS4; and also, voluntary and community groups such as ‘Friends	Yes	A new bullet point “Support new start up businesses including social enterprise” has been added to Policy

Policy CS4: Economy and Employment

Accounting for Assessment Recommendations

and social capital c)	of' groups within CS8 and CS21.		CS4 "Overall Employment Development Strategy".
-----------------------	---------------------------------	--	--

Policy CS5: Green Belts

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.1 CS a)	The preferred option would have a positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives, particularly in the short and medium term. However, the number of mitigation recommendations is indicative of the fact that there are a number of opportunities to improve the sustainability performance of this policy.	No	Noted.
4.1 CS5 b)	Through the provision of a number of reserve and safeguarded locations for housing and employment development the preferred option would provide an additional mechanism to ensure that there is sufficient housing and employment land to meet the needs of the Borough in the latter stages of the plan period. It is therefore envisaged that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and deprivation; housing; the growth potential of business sectors; and maintaining high and stable levels of employment.	No.	Noted and welcomed.
4.1 CS5 c)	By ensuring housing and employment development are directed to the urban area in the short and medium term, the preferred option is likely to result in the protection of greenfield sites outside the urban area and thereby have a positive impact in the short and medium term on the objectives relating to health; landscape character and accessibility; mitigating climate change; green infrastructure; and land and soil. However, the preferred option would result in some housing and employment development in the Green Belt in the longer term. Consequently, in the longer term it	No.	Noted.

	<p>is envisaged that the preferred option would have a negative impact on the objective relating to land and soil and an uncertain impact on the objectives relating to health; landscape character and accessibility; mitigating climate change; and green infrastructure. This uncertainty will however be addressed through the publication of the Green Belt study. This will provide information on, amongst other things, the recreational value of the sites and their role in the green infrastructure network.</p>		
<p>4.1 CS5 d)</p>	<p>The preferred option would result in a more dispersed pattern of development. Limited information is currently provided on the accessibility of the reserve and safeguarded locations that may be released from the Green Belt later in the plan period. As a result, in the longer term, the preferred option would have an uncertain impact on the objectives relating to access to goods, services and amenities; air quality; sustainable transport use; and the vitality and viability of town and local centres. Similarly, the limited information provided on the biodiversity and geodiversity value of these sites and their proximity to the Borough's historic assets means that the impact of the preferred option on the objectives relating to built heritage and biodiversity are uncertain in the long term.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Further evidence, specifically a Sustainability Appraisal of the Green Belt locations, has been undertaken to ascertain what the likely consequences of a more dispersed pattern of development will be. Additional evidence has also been undertaken in relation to transport feasibility which have informed the Council's approach in Policy CS5.</p> <p>Access and transport considerations have been a central component of selecting and justifying locations for Green Belt release. This is demonstrated in the Council's evidence base. Policy CS27 outlines the Council's approach to developer contributions, including that developers should contribute towards necessary transportation and other infrastructure improvements to support their development.</p>

Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App A CS5 a)	That the Preferred Option be amended to highlight that a separate Health Impact Assessment could be undertaken on schemes which involve major development proposals on any 'Reserved' or 'Safeguarded' Location within the Green Belt, and that the recommendations of the HIA are incorporated within any development.	No	Policy CS2 sets the principle of the use of Health Impact Assessments in the planning application process. The Council will consider its detailed preferred approach to the use of Health Impact Assessments in planning applications in a subsequent Local Plan document. CS5 is not considered the appropriate place to introduce a requirement for HIAs which may also apply to larger sites within the urban area.
App A CS5 b)	That new development within any 'Reserved' or 'Safeguarded' Locations should retain or encourage access to adjacent open/rural areas (e.g. footpaths) and preserve as many natural features of the original character of the landscape as possible (e.g. tree-lines and hedgerows).	No	Noted. Detailed policies within the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies will identify the issues developers should consider when making a planning application. Detailed guidance is also provided in the Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD which will ensure adequate provision is made for working and cycling.
App A CS5 c)	To recognise that the Green Belt land is sometimes not perceived as an area which can be used for physical activity/recreation and therefore there are opportunities for colleagues within planning/regeneration and public health to	No	Noted.

	work together to encourage more use of these areas and open space in general within Knowsley, also accounting for environmental considerations.		
--	---	--	--

Policy CS6: Town Centre and Retail Strategy

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.1 CS6 a)	The preferred option would have a positive impact on a wide range of social, environmental and economic objectives. By directing investment to Knowsley’s town, district and local centres it is envisaged that the preferred option would have a major positive impact on the objectives relating to enhancing the vitality and viability of town and local centres and exploiting the growth potential of business sectors and increase the number of new businesses. Given that each of the Borough’s town centres is accessible by public transport and that the preferred option would also lead to appropriate shopping and service provision in Knowsley’s district and local centres, it is considered that the preferred option would also have some positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and deprivation; access to goods, services and amenities; health; education; mitigating climate change; air quality; and reducing the need to travel and improving the use of more sustainable transport modes.	No	Noted.
4.1 CS6 b)	By enhancing the vitality and viability of Knowsley’s centres, the preferred option is likely to increase the amount of activity in these centres and thereby have a positive impact on the objective of reducing crime and fear of crime. The investment in Knowsley’s centres, particularly Prescott town centre, could also result in some positive impact on the objective to preserve, enhance and manage Knowsley’s rich diversity of cultural, historic and archaeological buildings, areas, sites and features. The preferred option would also have some	No	Noted.

	positive impact on the objectives relating to housing; protecting land and soil; and maintaining high and stable levels of employment. It is however considered that the degree to which these employment opportunities will be attainable for the long-term unemployed is uncertain.		
4.1 CS6 c)	The preferred option would result in significant investment being directed to Knowsley's town centres. The SFRA noted that surface water flooding incidents in the Borough are predominantly associated with highway flooding and are prevalent in all major conurbations within the Council's boundaries, including Halewood, Huyton, Prescot, Knowsley Village and Kirkby. Nevertheless, other policies in the Core Strategy should ensure that development is directed to areas at the lowest risk of flooding and that appropriate measures are taken to ensure new development does not exacerbate flood risk. It is therefore considered that the preferred option is unlikely to have any significant impact on the objective relating to adapting to climate change.	No	Noted.
4.1 CS6 d)	There are no negative or uncertain impacts on the sustainability objectives.	No	Noted.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	Scoped out of study	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App A CS6 a)	Investigate the potential of the Core Strategy to strengthen the strategic approach to the retention and / or enhancement of local service provision, particularly small shops (i.e. convenience goods).	No	The Council considers that the level of detail required in this regard is not suitable to be provided in a document such as the Core Strategy, which has a strategic focus. It is therefore the

			Council's intention to save policy S7 of the UDP following the adoption of the Core Strategy (that provides this information, as existing). This will ensure an appropriate transition period for development management purposes in advance of a new policy relating to local service provision being provided via a subsequent Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies document.
App A CS6 b)	That where the Council owns vacant shops (largely within neighbourhood centres and not town centres), pro-active ways to encourage the development of new businesses and services are considered.	No	The Council considers that the level of detail required in this regard is not suitable to be provided in a document such as the Core Strategy, which has a strategic focus. It is therefore the Council's intention to provide a more bespoke approach with regard to vacancy in local centres via the subsequent Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies document.
App A CS6 c)	That opportunities to encourage the establishment of new local businesses and particularly social enterprise which encourage the provision of food within areas where access to fresh food and diet are particularly poor, are explored. However, it is recognised that this may only really be achievable where the Council owns the business premises and that this may be outside the remit of the planning process.	No	The Council considers that this issue falls outside of the scope of the Core Strategy as it is not a matter relating to strategic planning policy or that falls within the remit of existing planning controls.
App A CS6 d)	That the supporting text to CS6 references the need for provision of a suitable retail environment for affordable, fresh produce, particularly in some of the more deprived areas of	No	The Council considers that the level of detail required in this regard is not suitable to be provided in a document

	the borough.		such as the Core Strategy, which has a strategic focus. It is therefore the Council's intention to consider a more bespoke approach with regard to the suitability and function of different retail uses via the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies document.
App A Access to public services a)	Re-wording Preferred Option CS6 to promote suitable night-time uses within Knowsley's existing town centres, which will encourage social interaction and cultural activities.	Yes	The Council agrees that there is a need for consistency in identifying support for enhancements to the evening economy across multiple policies. Additional wording has been provided in Policy CS6.
App A Access to public services b)	That additional work is undertaken and local evidence gathered around the issues relating to hot food takeaways within the borough, and the opportunities to tackle this problem through the planning process are explored, dependent upon the outcome of the local evidence. It is recognised that this may be better addressed within a subsequent Local Plan document to the Core Strategy alongside other mechanisms, e.g. licensing restrictions.	No	The Council considers that the level of detail required in this regard is not suitable to be provided in a document such as the Core Strategy, which has a strategic focus. It is therefore the Council's intention to consider a more bespoke approach with regard to the suitability and function of different retail uses via the subsequent Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies document and / or an additional SPD (if required).
App A Access to healthy food a)	That investigation into limiting numbers of additional takeaway food outlets within certain areas of the borough is continued, and that appropriate measures are incorporated within the Core Strategy or Supplementary Planning Documents to deal with this in future, alongside investigation of other potential restrictions e.g. licensing of premises.	No	The Council considers that the level of detail required in this regard is not suitable to be provided in a document such as the Core Strategy, which has a strategic focus. It is therefore the Council's intention to consider a more

			bespoke approach with regard to the suitability and function of different retail uses via the subsequent Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies document and / or an additional SPD (if required).
--	--	--	---

Policy CS7: Transport Networks

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.1 CS7 a)	The preferred option relating to Transport Networks would have a largely positive impact on the sustainability objectives. The preferred option would improve the choice and use of more sustainable transport modes, require larger scale proposals to be located in the most accessible parts of the Borough and give priority to schemes that provide for improvements to the rail network, enhanced provision for buses, line 1 of the Mersey tram scheme, and the delivery of an enhanced provision of walking and cycling routes as part of the Green Infrastructure network. It is therefore envisaged that the preferred option would have a major positive impact on the objectives relating to mitigating climate change and improving the use of more sustainable modes of transport, and some positive impact on the objective of protecting air quality.	No	Noted.
4.1 CS7 b)	The preferred option seeks to ensure that the Borough has a sustainable transport system that enables people to get to where they need to go by walking, cycling and public transport. It is therefore anticipated that the preferred option would improve access to services and facilities and thereby have a positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and deprivation; community severance; health inequalities; and educational attainment. It is also considered that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the economic objectives relating to the competitiveness of businesses in Knowsley and maintaining high and stable	No	Noted.

	levels of employment.		
4.1 CS7 c)	There are no negative or uncertain impacts on the sustainability objectives and, as such, no mitigation measures are proposed.	No	Noted.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App A CS7 a)	That CS7 (i) is re-worded to state that the overall Transport Strategy will 'Improvement the health and wellbeing of local people, by encouraging physically active means of travel and providing access to adequate healthcare facilities'.	No	Policy CS7 states that the sustainable transport system in Knowsley will improve the health and well-being of local people. The supporting text for the policy also supports this. It should be noted that improving health and wellbeing of local people is not limited to encouraging physically active means of travel, as demonstrated in other parts of the Core Strategy.
App A CS7 b)	CS7 (ii) could possibly be re-worded to clarify that developments should incorporate accessibility by private vehicles (in addition to parking provision), but that this is not a sustainable mode of travel.	No	Policy CS7 states that new development will be required to be located and designed to prioritise accessibility and sustainable modes of travel through a choice of walking, cycling, and public transport. The Council cannot ignore that accessibility by private vehicles must remain a complementary priority for new development, and the provision of car parking and maintenance of the

			strategic road network also supports this.
App A CS7 c)	Although it is recognised that CS7 supports the implementation of the major projects within the Merseyside Local Transport Plan 3, reference to this document would strengthen these links and help to ensure that all elements of the LTP3 are implemented across Knowsley.	Yes	Supporting text for Policy CS7 has been amended to include support for Local Transport Plan priorities.
App A CS7 d)	Clarity could be provided in relation to the definition of 'smaller scale proposals' where Transport Assessments and/or Travel Plans will not be required.	Yes	The Council intends to expand on these issues in a revised Supplementary Planning Document. A paragraph stating: "Further guidance on these issues will be provided in a revised Ensuring a Choice of Travel Supplementary Planning Document" has been added to Policy CS7 to reflect this.
App A CS7 e)	<p>CS7 (ii) could be strengthened by;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-wording to emphasise that it should be the developer's responsibility to ensure that their site is accessible by public transport, walking and cycling and to make the necessary improvements to local infrastructure to support this. (Links with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to also be made here). • Re-wording to ensure clarity over priority for sustainable modes of travel over the need of private vehicles. • Adding a reference to the Ensuring Choice of Travel Supplementary Planning Document. • Making reference to air quality within (4). 	Yes	<p>Policy CS7 is in the Core Strategy, therefore it is clear that it is the developer's responsibility to comply with its policies when proposing new development. Links to Policy CS27, which deals with infrastructure provision, have been maintained.</p> <p>Policy CS7 recognises the need to prioritise a sustainable transport network in Knowsley. However the strategic highway network must also be maintained, for the use of private vehicles as well as buses, cyclists, etc.</p> <p>A paragraph stating: "Further guidance</p>

			<p>on these issues will be provided in a revised Ensuring a Choice of Travel Supplementary Planning Document” has been added to Policy CS7 to reflect this.</p> <p>The issue of improving air quality has been incorporated into Policy CS7.</p>
App A CS7 f)	That consideration is given to the use of/or explanation of the term ‘Active Travel’ within the policy or supporting text, to align with terminology within the LTP3. However, the difficulty of using language which is not an adopted planning terms is recognised.	No	The Council considers that for the purposes of the Core Strategy, the terms “cycling” and “walking” are better understood. However the benefits of such modes of “active travel” are widely recognized in Policy CS7.
App A CS7 g)	In order to mitigate against any negative impacts of the proposed schemes within CS7 (iii), it is proposed that Knowsley Council ensure (through requiring developers of schemes within Knowsley or lobbying those leading on the development of schemes outside the borough) that separate Health Impact Assessments are carried out on major proposals at an appropriate time.	No	Policy CS2 sets the principle of the use of Health Impact Assessments in the planning application process. The Council will consider its detailed preferred approach to the use of Health Impact Assessments in planning applications in a subsequent Local Plan document.
App A CS7 h)	CS7 (iii) could also be strengthened by the addition of an extra bullet point which encourages development of multi-modal transport sites.	No	Policy CS7 contains priority to maintain and improve transport hubs; deliver schemes which would provide for provision of Park and Ride facilities; and expand and/or improve the facilities at the Knowsley Rail Freight Terminal.
App A CS7 i)	Opportunities to promote community transport through CS7 should be explored, or at least, future expansion of community transport projects should not be inhibited by the	No	CS 7 contains support for a sustainable and integrated transport system that will ensure that people can get to

	proposed Preferred Option.		where they need to go by a choice of walking cycling, and public transport. The Council's desire to work with the community transport sector has been added to supporting text.
App A CS7 j)	CS7 could also include reference to the importance of maintenance of transport hubs in encouraging safety and use by all sectors of the community.	Yes	Policy CS7 has been amended to include reference to the priority to maintain transport hubs such as bus termini and train stations to give improved safety.

Policy CS8: Green Infrastructure

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.1 CS8 a)	The preferred option for Green Infrastructure would have a positive impact on a large number of objectives, particularly those relating to environmental issues. In particular, it is considered that the preferred option would have a major positive impact on the objectives relating to landscape character and accessibility; biodiversity; adapting to climate change; and green infrastructure. By providing opportunities for sport and recreation the preferred option may also have some positive impact on the objective relating to health and the creation of green paths and cycle ways could encourage walking and cycling as an alternative to travelling by car and thereby have a positive impact on the objectives relating to mitigating climate change; air quality; and the use of more sustainable transport modes.	No	Noted.
4.1 CS8 b)	The protection afforded to open spaces and watercourses ensures that the preferred option should have some positive impact on the objectives of protecting land and soil; and water quality. In addition, the provision of an enhanced green infrastructure network within the Borough may increase the desirability of Knowsley as a destination for investment which would have a positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and deprivation; business competitiveness; and high and stable levels of employment. It is however acknowledged that there is only a low level of certainty about the impact on these three objectives. It is also anticipated that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objective to	No	Noted.

	Knowsley's built heritage.		
4.1 CS8 c)	There are no negative or uncertain impacts on the sustainability objectives. It is however considered that the level of certainty that the preferred option would have a major positive impact on the objective relating to biodiversity could be improved by the incorporation of a direct reference to protected and endangered species.	Yes	The Council agrees that reference to 'protected and endangered species' will enhance the sustainability credentials of the policy; changes have been made to Policy CS8.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
5.30	Although the wording of Policy CS8 (Green Infrastructure) does refer to " <i>sustaining and promoting biodiversity as one of the beneficial functions of Green Infrastructure and minimising the impact of development upon Knowsley's existing biodiversity and geological assets</i> " It does not acknowledge that the provision of Green Infrastructure within the borough, if linking to internationally important sites outside the borough, has the potential to result in disturbance to designated features within Natura 2000 sites.	Yes	The Council agrees that there is a need to acknowledge and appropriately address the potential linkage of the policy approach relating to Green Infrastructure within Knowsley relative to the potential influence on the protection afforded to internationally important sites for biodiversity outside of the Borough. Additional wording has been provided accordingly in both the policy and the supporting text.
5.31 & 15.6	Where the policy states " <i>Working in partnership with other districts and relevant bodies, where appropriate, to minimise the impact of development upon Knowsley's existing biodiversity and geological assets</i> ", this wording should be amended to include reference to biodiversity in the surrounding area. Suggested wording is " <i>Working in partnership with other districts and relevant bodies, where appropriate, to minimise the impact of development upon Knowsley's existing biodiversity and geological assets, as well as sustaining the protection afforded to internationally important sites for biodiversity outside of the Borough.</i> " The	Yes	The Council agrees that there is a need to acknowledge and appropriately address the potential linkage of the policy approach relating to Green Infrastructure within Knowsley relative to the potential influence on the protection afforded to internationally important sites for biodiversity outside of the Borough. Additional wording has been provided accordingly in both the policy and the supporting text.

	supporting text could add the clarification that this should be <i>“by managing recreational impacts and encouraging the use of the wider green infrastructure network which is less sensitive to recreational pressure”</i> .		
5.32	Any strategy that follows on from such a policy commitment will clearly need to be led by those authorities that actually border the Mersey Estuary. The delivery of enhanced access management and Green Infrastructure will need to be phased alongside delivery of housing. The contribution of each authority should be based upon their contribution to recreational activity in each site or (where this information is not yet available) their relative populations and proximity to the site.	No	The Council agrees with the need to link housing delivery to appropriate priorities for Green Infrastructure; however it is considered that a direct phasing mechanism within the Core Strategy specific to this relationship would be excessively complicated and counter-productive to the delivery of other strategic objectives. As an alternative it is considered that the issue can be more appropriately addressed through action and investment plan priorities incorporated within the existing Green Space Strategy and its association to contributions received through a revised Greenspace Standards and New Development SPD and / or any Community Infrastructure Levy if subsequently adopted.
5.33, 8.26 & 15.7	A further amendment to Policy CS8 is required in relation to the approach to green infrastructure and new development. Although it states <i>“New development must be served by Green Infrastructure to meet the needs of residents in a manner which will:provide access to high quality open spaces for leisure and recreational purposes.”</i> , the supporting text could add the clarification that this should <i>“not have a detrimental impact on important sites/species of nature</i>	Yes	The Council agrees that there is a need to acknowledge and appropriately address the issue of increased disturbance resulting from improved access and recreation use of Green Infrastructure. Additional wording has been provided accordingly in the supporting text.

	<i>conservation interest within the borough or the surrounding area, through increased disturbance.”</i>		
5.34	For the Mersey Estuary an appropriate detailed framework that encompasses the management of recreation may exist, or come to exist in the near future, through a European Marine Site Management Scheme, which, if it follows the pattern of other EMS Management Schemes would include recreation/access management within its remit. If this does prove to be the case then the commitment given in the Green Infrastructure policy cited above could be explicitly linked to a commitment to support and participate (financially as required) to this Management Scheme, in conjunction with the other Merseyside authorities and stakeholders.	Yes	The Council agrees that there is a need to acknowledge and appropriately address the potential linkage of the policy approach relating to Green Infrastructure within Knowsley relative to the potential influence on the protection afforded to internationally important sites for biodiversity outside of the Borough. Additional wording has been provided accordingly in both the policy and the supporting text.
5.35, 7.15, 8.28 & 15.9	It is also recommended that the Core Strategy should include a clear statement that it will <i>‘not support schemes that will lead to adverse effects on internationally important wildlife sites, either alone or in combination with other projects and plans. Any scheme that would be likely to have a significant effect on a European site, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, will be subject to an assessment under Part 6 of the Habitat Regulations at project application stage. If it cannot be ascertained that there would be no adverse effects on site integrity the project will have to be refused or pass the tests of Regulation 61 and 62, in which case any necessary compensatory measures will need to be secured in accordance with Regulation 66’</i> . This would be in line with the example provided in Natural England internal guidance on HRA.	Yes	The Council agrees that the suggested wording would enhance the Core Strategy. Additional wording has been provided accordingly in the supporting text.
5.40, 8.31, 14.17 & 15.11	In order to inform the development of the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD and subsequent Green Belt review it will be necessary to undertake an exercise to identify areas outside of the SPA/Ramsar designation that serve as	No	The Council notes this requirement which will be addressed through the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies document and

	important supporting habitat for qualifying bird species, particularly pink-footed geese. The Site Allocations DPD should include appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure the loss of such sites is adequately assessed and mitigated as part of planning applications. If supporting habitat were to be lost to any development, then the applicant would need to determine (a) how significant it was i.e. whether it was used by more than 1% of the population of qualifying bird species and (b) to provide alternative habitat to replace it in a location that was approximately a similar distance from the Estuary.		the Green Belt Study.
7.13	A further amendment to Policy CS8 is required in relation to the approach to green infrastructure and new development. Although it states “ <i>New development must be served by Green Infrastructure to meet the needs of residents in a manner which will:provide access to high quality open spaces for leisure and recreational purposes.</i> ”, the supporting text could add the clarification that this should “ <i>not have a detrimental impact on important sites/species of nature conservation interest within the borough or the surrounding area, through increased disturbance.</i> ”	Yes	The Council agrees that there is a need to acknowledge and appropriately address the potential linkage of the policy approach relating to Green Infrastructure within Knowsley to potential implications relating to disturbance through increased recreational use. Additional wording has been provided accordingly in the supporting text.
7.14, 8.26 & 15.8	For the Sefton Coast SAC and the Sefton portion of the Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA/Ramsar site the most logical response Knowsley could make would be a Core Strategy commitment to assist in the future delivery of the requirements of the Beach Management Plan and Sefton Management Plan (specifically as they relate to recreation management) commensurate with the contribution of visitors to the site that arise from Knowsley. If this recommendation is implemented, it is concluded that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of the Sefton Coast SAC through direct disturbance as a result of any of the policies proposed within the Core Strategy.	Yes	The Council agrees that there is a need to acknowledge and appropriately address the potential linkage of the policy approach relating to Green Infrastructure within Knowsley relative to the potential influence on the protection afforded to internationally important sites for biodiversity outside of the Borough. Additional wording has been provided accordingly in both the policy and the supporting text.

8.25	In referring to the requirement of Green Infrastructure in new development, it makes no reference to biodiversity at all, focusing on leisure and recreation.	Yes	The Council agrees that there is a need to acknowledge and appropriately address the sensitive balance between leisure and recreation use, and biodiversity. Additional wording has been provided accordingly in both the policy and the supporting text.
15.3	<p>The Appropriate Assessment identified the following impact pathways from the Knowsley Core Strategy to these European Sites, particularly when considered ‘in combination’ with other projects and plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mersey Estuary SPA/Ramsar Site, Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA/Ramsar - Disturbance to qualifying bird species (from recreational pressure and other sources), deterioration in water quality and loss of supporting habitat. • Liverpool Bay SPA, Mersey Narrows & North Wirral Foreshore pSPA/pRamsar – Disturbance to qualifying bird species (from recreational pressure and other sources), water quality effects ‘in combination’. • Sefton Coast SAC and Ribble & Alt Estuaries SPA/Ramsar – recreational impacts and ‘incombination’ air quality impacts from Liverpool John Lennon Airport. • Dee Estuary - in-combination’ air quality impacts from Liverpool John Lennon Airport • Martin Mere SPA – potential loss of supporting habitat. 	No	Noted – the previous changes address these issues specifically.
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App A CS8 a)	That re-wording of Preferred Option CS8 is undertaken to ensure that the full range of opportunities for physical activity within the borough’s Green Infrastructure is recognised, for example, through play and as a means of accessing	Yes	The Council agrees that reference to ‘access to employment and services’ will enhance the policy; changes have been made accordingly to Policy CS8.

	employment and services.		However it is considered that ‘play’ would fall within the wider definition of ‘recreation’ meaning a specific reference in this regard is unnecessary.
App A CS8 b)	That other important factors and functions of the Green Infrastructure are recognised within the supporting text of CS8 including allowing people to interact with the natural environment to promote mental wellbeing.	Yes	The Council agrees that additional clarification in this regard will enhance the policy; changes have been made to Policy CS8.
App A CS8 c)	That other important factors and functions of Green Infrastructure are recognised within Preferred Option CS8 including its function as a buffer zone to reduce the impact of air and/or noise pollution.	Yes	The Council agrees that additional clarification in this regard will enhance the policy; changes have been made to Policy CS8.
App A CS8 d)	That opportunities for increased community involvement are explored, although this could be considered as part of the overarching Preferred Options of CS1 or CS2.	No	The Council agrees that additional clarification in this regard, however the inclusion of such a requirement is better located within an overarching policy or the design Policy CS19.
App A CS8 e)	That reference to areas for local food production is made either within the policy itself or within the supporting text.	Yes	The Council agrees that additional clarification in this regard will enhance the policy; changes have therefore been made to Policy CS8 to better align the policy with CS21.
App A CS8 f)	That reference to local food production (e.g. farms, small holdings and allotments) is added within CS8 (i) as appropriate. This will increase recognition of these issues and will also provide increased protection for allotment sites within CS21 (which refers to the protection of Green Infrastructure functions listed in CS8).	Yes	The Council agrees that some additional clarification in this regard will enhance the policy; changes have been made to Policy CS8 to refer to allotments and better align the policy CS21.

Policy CS9: Principal Regeneration Area – North Huyton and Stockbridge Village

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.2 CS9 a)	The preferred option for North Huyton and Stockbridge Village would have a positive impact on a wide range of objectives. In particular, by providing new housing development of a range of types suitable for local needs and also leading to the enhanced provision of retail, leisure and community facilities, the preferred option would have a major positive impact on the objectives relating to deprivation and social exclusion; access to goods, services and amenities; and housing, and some positive impact on the objectives relating to health and educational attainment.	No	Noted.
4.2 CS9 b)	The preferred option would result in the provision of public open spaces within a wider green infrastructure network. It is therefore envisaged that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objectives relating to landscape and green infrastructure. The proposed transport provision, including public transport, walking and cycling, should also ensure that the preferred option has some positive impact on the objectives relating to air quality and the use of more sustainable transport mode. The investment that would be directed to Stockbridge Village centre together with the specification that the retail provision in this centre must be of a scale and function which meets the needs of the area should ensure that the preferred option has a positive impact on the objective relating to the vitality and viability of town and local centres. It is also envisaged that the preferred option would have some positive impact on the objectives relating to	No	Noted.

**Policy CS9: Principal Regeneration Area –
North Huyton and Stockbridge Village**

Accounting for Assessment Recommendations

	crime and fear of crime; protecting land and soil; and reducing long-term unemployment.		
4.2 CS9 c)	There are no anticipated negative impacts on the sustainability objectives. Nevertheless, it is considered that the preferred option would have an uncertain impact on the objectives relating to mitigating climate change and the use of water and minerals due to the environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the built development proposed by the preferred option. It is however recognised that there is an identified need to re-balance the housing market to meet local needs. In addition, the new development would be built to higher environmental standards.	No	Noted.
4.2 CS9 d)	The SFRA has demonstrated that parts of the Principal Regeneration Area are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. It is likely that climate change will exacerbate this flood risk. Nevertheless, as other policies in the Core Strategy will ensure that appropriate measures are taken to ensure flood risk is managed, it is considered that the preferred option would have no significant impact on the objective.	No	Noted.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
N/A	Policy omitted at scoping stage of study	n/a	n/a

Policy CS10: Principal Regeneration Area – Kirkby Town Centre

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.2 CS10 a)	The preferred option would have a positive impact on a wide range of sustainability objectives. In particular, the preferred option would lead to the retail-led regeneration of Kirkby town centre and would lead to the provision of space for employment uses in the centre. It is therefore envisaged that the preferred option would have a major positive impact on the objectives relating to the enhancing the vitality and viability of town centres and increasing the number of new businesses.	No	Noted.
4.2 CS10 b)	The preferred option would result in the provision of facilities and employment opportunities in a location that is accessible from areas of deprivation. It is therefore considered that the preferred option has the potential to have a positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and social exclusion; and reducing long-term unemployment. Nevertheless, there is only a low level of certainty that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objective as it does not seek to address low skills/training and, as a result, it is not clear whether these employment opportunities would be accessible to the long-term unemployed. By not seeking to directly address low skills/training it is also considered that the preferred option would have no significant impact on the objective relating to educational attainment and employability.	Yes	Additional wording added to Policy CS4 to provide an overarching strategy in this context.
4.2 CS10 c)	The preferred option would deliver improved facilities for sustainable transport, including improvements to Kirkby bus station, safeguarding the potential delivery of the Merseytram	No	Noted.

	<p>Line 1 and the creation of new footpaths and cycleways. Whilst it is noted that the funding for delivering the Merseytram is unsecured, it is considered that the other aspects of the preferred option should ensure some modal shift to more sustainable modes of transport and, as a result, has some positive impact on the objectives relating to air quality and the use of more sustainable transport modes. It is also anticipated that the preferred option would have some positive impact on the objectives relating to access to goods, services and amenities; crime and fear of crime; health; and protecting land and soil.</p>		
4.2 CS10 d)	<p>The preferred option would result in significant investment being directed to Kirkby town centre. The SFRA noted that surface water flooding incidents in the Borough are predominantly associated with highway flooding and are prevalent in all major conurbations within the Council’s boundaries, including Kirkby. Nevertheless, other policies in the Core Strategy should ensure that development is directed to areas at the lowest risk of flooding within the centre and that appropriate measures are taken to ensure new development does not exacerbate flood risk. It is therefore considered that the preferred option is unlikely to have any significant impact on the objective relating to adapting to climate change.</p>	No	Noted.
4.2 CS10 e)	<p>There are no anticipated negative impacts on the sustainability objectives. Nevertheless, it is considered that the preferred option would have an uncertain impact on the objectives relating to mitigating climate change and the use of water and minerals due to the environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the built development proposed by the preferred option. It is however recognised that the development proposed is necessary to</p>	No	Noted.

	support the retail-led regeneration of Kirkby town centre. In addition, the new development would be built to higher environmental standards. The preferred option would also have an uncertain impact on the objective relating to protecting the Borough’s heritage as the impact of the additional footfall on Old Hall Lane Conservation Area is unclear.		
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
N/A	Policy omitted at scoping stage of study	n/a	n/a

Policy CS11: Principal Regeneration Area – Knowsley Industrial and Business Parks

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.2 CS11 a)	The preferred option would have a positive impact on several objectives. By resulting in the provision of a mix of new employment development in a location that is accessible from areas of deprivation and introducing measures to improve the accessibility of the parks from Kirkby, the preferred option would have a major positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and deprivation; the growth potential of businesses; and levels of employment and long term unemployment. It is anticipated that the significance of the positive impact on each of these objectives will increase as the Plan’s proposals take effect. Nevertheless, due to the preferred option not seeking to address low skills/training, it is considered that there is only a limited level of certainty about its impact on long-term unemployment.	Yes	Additional wording added to Policy CS4 to provide an overarching strategy in this context.
4.2 CS11 b)	The preferred option would have some positive impact on the objectives relating to community severance; health; and green infrastructure. By protecting the countryside and landscape from inappropriate development in the short and medium term, it is envisaged that the preferred option would initially have a positive impact on the objectives relating to landscape character and accessibility; and protecting land and soil. Nevertheless, the preferred option has the potential to result in the loss of Green Belt sites later in the plan period and it is therefore considered that in the longer term the preferred option would have an uncertain impact on the objective relating to landscape character and accessibility and	No	Noted.

**Policy CS11: Principal Regeneration Area–
– Knowsley Industrial and Business Parks**

Accounting for Assessment Recommendations

	a negative impact on the objective relating to protecting land and soil. Ensuring development is built to an appropriate density to minimise the need to release further greenfield sites is likely to be a key mitigation measure.		
4.2 CS11 c)	The preferred option would have an uncertain impact on several other objectives. It is considered that the impact of the preferred option on the objectives relating to mitigating climate change and the use of water and minerals would be uncertain due to the environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the built development proposed by the preferred option. It is however recognised that the development proposed is necessary to support the Borough's economy and the regeneration of Knowsley Industrial and Business Parks. In addition, the new development would be built to higher environmental standards and the preferred option includes a proposal to identify the parks as a 'Priority Zone' for the production of renewable, low carbon and decentralised energy.	No	Noted.
4.2 CS11 d)	The preferred option would result in the parks being identified as a 'Priority Zone' for the production of renewable, low carbon and decentralised energy. The supporting text to the policy notes that this does not imply that the parks are suitable locations for Energy from Waste schemes. It is also noted that the Merseyside Joint Waste DPD identifies no need for site allocations for new Energy from Waste uses. It is therefore considered that the preferred option is unlikely to have any significant effects on the objective relating to waste.	No	Noted.
4.2 CS11 e)	The impact of the preferred option on the objective relating to air quality and sustainable transport is uncertain.	Yes	The Council agrees that the policy benefits from specific reference to sustainable transport improvements and additional wording has been provided accordingly.

Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
8.35	<p>The wastewater treatment works at Fazakerley, which takes wastewater from Knowsley Business Park, discharges into Fazakerley Brook and ultimately into the River Alt and the Alt Estuary. Development in this area could therefore result in a deterioration of water quality in the Ribble and Alt Estuary SPA/Ramsar. Similarly, hydraulic connections were identified between the Ribble and Alt Estuary SPA/Ramsar and the Mersey Estuary. These potentially significant effects could be relevant on the Ribble and Alt SPA/Ramsar due to the hydraulic connections. These changes could arise from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • waste water discharge (domestic and industrial) and surface water runoff. 	No	The Council accepts that the development of Knowsley Industrial and Business Park has potential influence in this regard; however the issue is more appropriately dealt with through policy as part of strategic infrastructure provision and water cycle management rather than site specific intervention.
8.36	<p>It is worth considering at this point that the majority of water quality pressures being experienced by the SPA/Ramsar are likely to arise from the River Ribble and the River Alt as well as the River Mersey. However, as wastewater treatment works discharge into both rivers, in-combination contributions to the water quality of the Mersey should be considered and mitigated appropriately.</p>	No	The Council accepts that the development of Knowsley Industrial and Business Park has potential influence in this regard; however the issue is more appropriately dealt with through policy as part of strategic infrastructure provision.
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
N/A	Policy omitted at scoping stage of study	n/a	n/a

Policy CS12: Principal Regeneration Area – Tower Hill

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.2 CS12 a)	The preferred option for Tower Hill would largely have a positive impact on the SA objectives. The preferred option would deliver a range of dwellings to provide a wider choice of housing in Tower Hill and would also result in small scale enhancements to health and leisure facilities and improvements to the quality and accessibility of open space. It is therefore considered that the preferred option would have a major positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and social exclusion; health; and the provision of good quality, affordable and resource efficient housing. The provision of this housing, facilities and accessible open space should also ensure that the preferred option has some positive impact on the objectives relating to community severance; the accessibility of the landscape; and green infrastructure.	No	Noted.
4.2 CS12 b)	It is envisaged that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objectives relating to green infrastructure and the vitality and viability of Knowsley’s town centres. Due to the range of public transport enhancements proposed, it is considered that the preferred option has the potential to support a modal shift to more sustainable modes of transport and thereby have a positive impact on the objectives relating to air quality and the use of sustainable modes of transport. There is however only a low level of certainty over the positive impact on these objectives due to the funding for several of the public transport enhancements being	No	Noted.

	unsecured.		
4.2 CS12 c)	Whilst parts of the Tower Hill regeneration area may be susceptible to surface water flooding, other policies in the Core Strategy should ensure that development is directed to areas at the lowest risk of flooding and that appropriate measures are taken to ensure new development does not exacerbate flood risk. It is therefore considered that the preferred option is unlikely to have any significant impact on the objective relating to adapting to climate change.	No	Noted.
4.2 CS12 d)	There are no anticipated negative impacts on the sustainability objectives. However, the preferred option would have an uncertain impact on a number of sustainability objectives. It is considered that the impact of the preferred option on the objectives relating to mitigating climate change and the use of water and minerals would be uncertain due to the environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the built development proposed by the preferred option. It is however recognised that the development proposed is necessary to support the regeneration of Tower Hill. In addition, the new development would be built to higher environmental standards.	No	Noted.
4.2 CS12 e)	The impact of the preferred option on the objective relating to educational attainment is also uncertain due to it being unclear whether small-scale enhancements would be delivered to educational facilities. Similarly, the impact of the preferred option on the objective relating to protecting land and soil is also uncertain due to it being unclear the extent to which the new housing proposed would be delivered on previously developed land.	Yes	<p>The Council agrees the policy benefits from clarification in terms of small scale enhancement of educational facilities and additional wording has been provided accordingly.</p> <p>The Council however supports the flexibility provided within the policy to allow issues such as land and soil protection to be addressed at a non-</p>

			strategic / site specific level through a subsequent Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies document and / or a revised Tower Hill SPD.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
N/A	Policy omitted at scoping stage of study.	n/a	n/a

Policy CS13: Principal Regeneration Area – South Prescott

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.2 CS13 a)	The preferred option for South Prescott would have a largely positive impact on the sustainability objectives. It would result in the redevelopment of former industrial land, much of which is now vacant, and could therefore have a major positive impact on the objective of protecting, managing and restoring land and soil quality. The preferred option would result in the provision of accessible employment opportunities and a range of dwellings to meet identified local need. It is therefore considered that the preferred option would also have a major positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and social exclusion; providing good quality housing; increasing the number of new businesses; and maintaining high and stable levels of employment. It is considered that this positive impact will increase in significance as the Plan’s proposals take effect. Nevertheless, there is only a low level of certainty that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objective relating to unemployment due to uncertainties over whether the employment opportunities would be accessible to the long-term unemployed.	Yes	Additional wording added to Policy CS4 to provide an overarching strategy in this context.
4.2 CS13 b)	Due to the proposed creation of new footpaths and cycle routes it is considered that the preferred option is also likely to have some positive impact on the objectives relating to community severances; health; green infrastructure; air quality; and the use of sustainable modes of transport.	No	Noted.
4.2 CS13 c)	There are no anticipated negative impacts on the sustainability objectives. It is however considered that the	No	Noted.

	<p>preferred option would have an uncertain impact on the objectives relating to mitigating climate change and the use of water and minerals due to the environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the built development proposed by the preferred option. It is however recognised that the development proposed is necessary to support the rebalancing of the Borough’s housing market and the provision of an adequate supply of employment land. In addition, the new development would be built to higher environmental standards.</p>		
<p>4.2 CS13 d)</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that there are existing heritage constraints in Prescott town centre which may mean that there are no suitable, available and viable locations in the town centre for B1 offices of the scale that can be accommodated in South Prescott. However, the impact of the preferred option on vitality and viability of town centres is also considered to be uncertain as no evidence is provided to demonstrate that office provision could not be accommodated in centre or that directing it to this out of centre location would not have a detrimental impact on Prescott town centre.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Council supports its strategic approach toward the location of office uses in Policy CS4 which allows offices uses in accessible locations in other employment areas (including South Prescott) provided that town centre and edge of centre sites have been considered first. Land availability for B1 uses has been assessed through the Joint Employment Land and Premises study, which included a call for sites consultation. In this regard, it is considered reasonable to identify South Prescott as an appropriate employment location, noting existing constraints to land availability in and around Prescott town centre which reduces its potential ability to provide for a range of employment opportunities, aside from smaller office units and windfall provision resulting from wider remodelling.</p>

Policy CS13: Principal Regeneration Area – South Prescott

Accounting for Assessment Recommendations

Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
N/A	Policy omitted at scoping stage of study.	n/a	n/a

Policy CS14: Principal Regeneration Area – Prescott Town Centre

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.2 CS14 a)	The preferred option for Prescott town centre has the potential to have a positive impact on a wide range of sustainability objectives. It is envisaged that the preferred option would have a particularly significant impact on the objective of enhancing the vitality and viability of town and local centres by directing investment to Prescott town centre and encouraging a wider mix of uses in the centre to create a distinctive identity and a complimentary evening economy. The provision of this mix of uses in Prescott town centre should also improve access to services and facilities and also create a number of employment opportunities. It is therefore envisaged that the preferred option would have some positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and social exclusion; community severance; health; educational attainment; and levels of employment. It is however recognised that there is only a low level of certainty that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objectives relating to health and educational attainment as it only indicates a willingness to accommodate these uses in the town centre rather than proposing to provide them.	No	Noted.
4.2 CS14 b)	The preferred option would direct investment in Prescott town centre, which is a designated conservation area that is considered to be at risk. This investment would present opportunities to enhance the setting and significance of this heritage asset and it is noted that other policies in the Plan will ensure that the Borough’s historic and architectural assets	No	Noted.

	are protected. It is therefore considered that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objective relating to Knowsley’s built heritage. The provision of a mix of uses in Prescott town centre should also help people to meet their needs locally and could thereby have a positive impact on the objectives relating to air quality and reducing the need to travel.		
4.2 CS14 c)	There are no anticipated negative impacts on the sustainability objectives. It is however considered that the preferred option would have an uncertain impact on the objectives relating to mitigating climate change and the use of water and minerals due to the built development proposed by the preferred option. It is however recognised that there is a need to regenerate Prescott town centre and that the new dwellings would be built to higher environmental standards.	No	Noted.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
N/A	Policy omitted at scoping stage of study	n/a	n/a

Policy CS15: Delivery Affordable Housing

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.3 CS15 a)	<p>The preferred option has the potential to have a positive impact on a number of social, environmental and economic objectives. It would support the delivery of well designed, affordable housing and would require new affordable housing to comply with the design standards set out in preferred option CS17, including Code for Sustainable Homes Standards. The preferred option is therefore likely to have a positive impact on the objectives of providing good quality, affordable and resource efficient housing; reducing poverty and social deprivation; and improving health and reducing health inequalities. Nevertheless, it is noted that the Council’s Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identified a need to provide over 5,000 affordable housing units over a ten-year period in order to meet the outstanding and arising need for affordable housing in Knowsley. The required percentage contribution to affordable housing set out in the preferred option (25%) will however only provide approximately 1,900 units during the entire plan period although registered providers may contribute additional units. Pursuing a higher percentage contribution to affordable housing may however impact on the viability of residential development. Nevertheless, no evidence is provided to demonstrate that requiring a higher percentage contribution would impact upon viability. It is considered that this reduces the level of certainty that the preferred option would have a positive impact on this objective.</p>	No.	<p>It is noted that at the Preferred Options stage, there was a lack of evidence to demonstrate that a higher percentage of affordable housing would impact on development viability. However, additional evidence has now been produced to support Policy CS15 in terms of the impact of its implementation on the viability of new development. The Council recognises the evidence within the SHMA of the scale of affordable housing required to meet identified needs; however, accounting for the above-mentioned viability evidence, market conditions and the need to rebalance the housing market overall, the Council considers that Policy CS15 represents the best policy solution to meeting these needs.</p>

4.3 CS15 b)	By requiring new affordable housing to comply with the design standards set out in preferred option CS17, including Code for Sustainable Homes Standards, the preferred option should have some positive impact on the objectives relating to mitigating climate change; using water and mineral resources prudently; and minimising the production of waste and increasing reuse, recycling and recovery rates.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.3 CS15 c)	By helping to ensure the Borough attracts an adequate workforce to support its economy, the preferred option also has the potential to have some positive impact on the objective of exploiting the growth potential of business sectors and increasing the number of new businesses. Nevertheless, there is only a limited level of certainty over this impact as the preferred option would not deliver the required levels of affordable housing identified by the SHMA.	No	Noted. The Council considers that its approach to delivery of affordable housing is the most appropriate given the available evidence and competing policy interests. The Council does not consider that raising the proportion of affordable housing requirements, for example to meet the gross requirements identified in the SHLAA would have an overall benefit for the sustainability of the plan. This is set out in the Council's evidence base.
4.3 CS15 d)	There are no negative or uncertain impacts on the sustainability objectives.	No	Noted and welcomed.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App A CS15 a)	That the supporting text for the Preferred Option be re-phrased to try to encourage over the minimum of 25% affordable housing for market schemes.	No	Policy CS15 already states that a minimum of 25% affordable housing will be sought. It is anticipated however that only Registered Provider-led

			developments (i.e. of up to 100% affordable housing) will voluntarily exceed this. The affordable housing requirement within Policy CS15 has to be set to account for variations based on economic viability. The Council's approach responds to evidence of housing need and demand and economic viability and is the most appropriate given this available evidence.
App A CS15 b)	That the Preferred Option be open to encouraging new types of affordable housing products which may develop over time.	Yes	The supporting text for Policy CS15 has been altered to reflect the need for this flexibility.
App A CS15 c)	That it be made clear that new housing sites, including those potentially made available as part of the Green Belt review and release, incorporate the same levels of affordable housing as other residential sites within the borough.	No	The Council considers that this policy approach is already sufficiently clear within the wording of Policy CS15.

Policy CS16: Specialist and Supported Accommodation

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.3 CS16 a)	It is considered that the preferred option for Specialist and Supported Accommodation has the potential to have a positive impact on a wide range of sustainability objectives. In particular, by resulting in the provision of housing to meet the needs of households requiring specialist housing or supported accommodation, the preferred option should have some positive impact on the objectives of providing good quality, affordable and resource efficient housing; reducing poverty and social deprivation; and improving health and reducing health inequalities.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.3 CS16 b)	The preferred option would require specialist housing and supported accommodation to comply with the design standards set out in preferred option CS19. These standards include Code for Sustainable Homes standards and it is therefore envisaged that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objectives relating to mitigating climate change; using water and mineral resources prudently; and minimising the production of waste and increasing reuse, recycling and recovery rates. The standards also include requiring new development to respond to the challenges posed by climate change and be designed to minimise crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour. As a result, the preferred option should also have some positive impact on the objectives relating to adapting to climate change and reducing crime, disorder and fear of crime.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.3 CS16	The preferred option requires specialist and supported	Yes	Policy CS16 has been amended to

c)	residential accommodation to be located in an appropriate environment, near to transport links and local amenities. It is therefore envisaged that the preferred option would have some positive impact on the objectives of improving local accessibility of goods, services and amenities and reduce community severance; protecting local air quality; and reducing the need to travel and improving the choice and use of more sustainable transport modes. Nevertheless, as the preferred option does not specify that the specialist and supported residential accommodation should be located near to be public transport links, it is considered that there is a lower level of certainty that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objectives relating to air quality and the use of sustainable transport.		ensure that proximity to public transport links for specialist and supported residential accommodation are specified.
4.3 CS16 d)	There are no negative or uncertain impacts on the sustainability objectives.	No	Noted and welcomed.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App A CS16 a)	That where possible, it is be specified that residents of specialist and supported living accommodation are included within the design of new buildings, therefore accounting for the needs and aspirations of older people, for example, scooter parking.	Yes	An extra criterion has been added to Policy CS16 to reflect that, where appropriate, developers should seek to consult older people’s groups and/or relevant design guides as part of the development process.
App A CS16 b)	That opportunities for re-modelling and re-fitting older people’s accommodation are maximised through wording of the Preferred Option.	No	Policy CS16 already reflects opportunities for improving quality and remodelling existing accommodation.

Policy CS16: Specialist and Supported Accommodation

Accounting for Assessment Recommendations

App A CS16 c)	That the Preferred Option is amended to capitalise on opportunities to align planning policies with health policies, e.g. care at home.	Yes	The supporting text for policy CS16 has been amended to reflect opportunities to align planning and health policies.
------------------	---	-----	--

Policy CS17: Housing Sizes and Design Standards

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.3 CS17 a)	The preferred option has the potential to have a positive impact on a range of social and environmental objectives. The preferred option would ensure that a mix of housing is provided to meet local needs. It also specifies that the new housing would need to comply with the Code for Sustainable Homes standards and, as such, the preferred option should ensure that the new homes are built to a high standard of energy efficiency. The preferred option should therefore have a major positive impact on the objective of providing good quality, affordable and resource efficient housing and its sub-objectives relating to providing a wider choice of accommodation and improving the energy efficiency of housing. Requiring new housing to be built to Building for Life and Lifetime Homes standards should also ensure that the preferred option has some positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and deprivation and health.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.3 CS17 b)	The preferred option would require dwellings to comply with the design standards set out in preferred option CS19. These standards include Code for Sustainable Homes standards and it is therefore envisaged that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objectives relating to mitigating climate change; using water and mineral resources prudently; and minimising the production of waste and increasing reuse, recycling and recovery rates. The standards also include requiring new development to respond to the challenges posed by climate change and be designed to minimise crime,	No	Noted and welcomed.

	fear of crime and anti-social behaviour. As a result, the preferred option should also have some positive impact on the objectives relating to adapting to climate change and reducing crime, disorder and fear of crime.		
4.3 CS17 c)	There are no negative or uncertain impacts on the sustainability objectives.	No	Noted and welcomed.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App CS17 a)	That the Preferred Option should emphasise that good quality design should be given a high priority, to mitigate against examples of poor design within the borough.	No	This is already reflected in numerous policies, including CS17 and CS19.
App A CS17 b)	That provision of new housing which includes bungalows should be supported where appropriate within the borough, including both affordable and market units.	Yes	The need for provision of bungalows is emphasised in the Council's evidence base. The supporting text for Policy CS17 has been changed to place emphasis on this.

Policy CS18: Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.3 CS18 a)	The preferred option would have a positive impact on a range of social, environmental and economic objectives. The preferred option would ensure that sites for accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople have ease of access to local centres, health facilities, education facilities and public transport nodes. The preferred option would also require sites to have a sufficient level of supporting physical infrastructure, including ensuring it can be served by adequate electricity, water, sewerage and other utilities connections. It is therefore envisaged that the preferred option has the potential to have a major positive impact on the objective relating to health and some positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and deprivation; accessibility of goods, services and amenities; education; air quality; reducing the need to travel; the vitality and viability of town and local centres and levels of employment.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.3 CS18 b)	The preferred option specifically states that flood risk will be taken into account when considering the suitability of sites for accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople. It is therefore considered that the preferred option should have some positive impact on the objective of adapting to climate change, including flood risk. The preferred option would also ensure that sites for accommodation for Gypsies, Travellers or Travelling Showpeople maintain local environmental quality and have suitable physical environmental conditions, including ground conditions. It	Yes	Noted. Policy CS18 has been amended to include reference to the need for proposals for the development of sites for the accommodation of travelling communities should account for the impact of development on landscape character and accessibility.

Policy CS18: Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Accounting for Assessment Recommendations

	should therefore have some positive impact on the objectives of protecting land and soil quality and protecting the local character and accessibility of the landscape. It is however noted that the preferred option does not state that the impact of the proposal on the accessibility of the landscape will be taken into account. This reduces the level of certainty that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objective of protecting the local character and accessibility of the landscape.		
4.3 CS18 c)	There are no negative or uncertain impacts on the sustainability objectives.	No	Noted and welcomed.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	
App CS18 a)	The Preferred Option could be amended to highlight the opportunity presented by planning and health colleagues working together to tackle issues of social exclusion, and providing outreach and other services to the Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople communities within the area.	Yes	The supporting text for Policy CS18 has been amended to better reflect the opportunities available for joint working.

Policy CS19: Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.3 CS19 a)	The preferred option has the potential to have a positive impact on a wide range of social, environmental and economic objectives. The preferred option includes a range of measures to improve the sustainability of new development. In particular, it requires new development to comply with Code for Sustainable Homes/BREEAM standards, which should ensure that the preferred option has some positive impact on the objectives relating to providing good quality, resource efficient housing; mitigating climate change; using water and mineral resources prudently; and minimising the production of waste and increasing reuse, recycling and recovery rates.	No	Noted.
4.3 CS19 b)	Requiring new development to be built to BREEAM standards should ensure that new premises provided for businesses are more energy efficient and thereby reduce their operating costs for businesses and improve their competitiveness. In addition, the higher standards of design in new development that are required by the preferred option could help stimulate investment and attract skilled workers to the Borough. It is therefore envisaged that the preferred option could also have some positive impact on the objective of improving the competitiveness and productivity of business, exploiting the growth potential of business sectors and increasing the number of new businesses.	No	Noted.
4.3 CS19 c)	The preferred option would include an expectation for new development to be well integrated with Knowsley’s town	Yes	The Council agrees that the reference to centres outside of Knowsley is

	centres and larger centres outside of the Borough and provide safe, secure and convenient routes for movement, with priority given to walking, cycling and public transport. It is therefore considered that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objectives relating to community severance; air quality; the use of more sustainable transport modes; and the vitality and viability of the Borough's town centres. It is, however, acknowledged that there is only a low level of certainty that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objective relating to the vitality and viability of the Borough's town centres due to the fact that the preferred option also seeks to ensure that new development has linkages to larger centres outside of the Borough which could potentially exacerbate existing levels of expenditure leakage.		unnecessary and likely to be unachievable at a site specific scale; therefore Policy CS19 has been reworded accordingly.
4.3 CS19 d)	The preferred option states that new development will be expected to respond to, compliment and integrate with green infrastructure. It also requires new development to respond to the challenges of climate change, incorporate landscaping which promotes biodiversity, ensure the integration of high quality open spaces, compliment the positive characteristics of features of historic interest, and be designed to minimise crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour. The preferred option should therefore have a positive impact on the objectives relating to green infrastructure, adapting to climate change, biodiversity, landscape character and accessibility, health, Knowsley's built heritage and crime.	No	Noted.
4.3 CS19 e)	There are no negative or uncertain impacts on the sustainability objectives.	No	Noted.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was</i>

		<i>(yes/no)</i>	<i>changed)</i>
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations <i>(see appendix A)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
App A CS19 a)	That reference is made within CS19 (1) to the importance of responding to, complementing and integrating views and scenery, particularly of natural landscapes, possibly within the supporting text.	Yes	The Council agrees that additional clarification in the supporting text in this regard with supplement specific references to related considerations in sub-point 1 of the policy. Additional wording has been provided accordingly.
App A CS19 b)	That reference to ‘unacceptable impacts’ as stated in CS19 (7) is further explained within the Preferred Option itself or the supporting text.	No	The Council considers that appropriate clarity has already been provided in this regard within the supporting text, that provides a strategic link to more specific detail within saved policies in the UDP: ENV1, ENV2 and ENV3 (until they are subsequently superseded by the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies document), and the existing Householder Development SPD.
App A CS19 c)	That potential conflicts between aesthetic design quality and environmentally friendly design are explored and tackled, potentially within the Design Quality in New Development Supplementary Planning Document.	No	The Council agrees that there is a need to find appropriate balance in design between aesthetic quality and environmental sustainability. However the level of specific detail required in this context is not of a strategic nature that can be included within a Core Strategy. It is therefore appropriate to provide additional and more detailed

			guidance with the emerging Design Quality in New Development SPD.
App A CS19 d)	The importance of creating legible environments where people can orientate themselves easily both within development sites and internally within buildings could be mentioned, either within CS19 or in the Design Quality in New Development Supplementary Planning Document.	No	The Council agrees that there is a need to provide detailed guidance on issues such as legibility as a component of design quality. However the level of specific detail required in this context is not of a strategic nature that can be included within a Core Strategy. It is therefore appropriate to provide additional and more detailed guidance with the emerging Design Quality in New Development SPD.
App A CS19 e)	In addition, internal building design should reflect health objectives, for example, by placing stairs in a more prominent position than the lifts, making optimum use of views and natural light.	No	The Council agrees that there is a need to provide detailed guidance on issues such as internal design as a component of design quality. However the level of specific detail required in this context is not of a strategic nature that can be included within a Core Strategy. It is therefore appropriate to provide additional and more detailed guidance with either the emerging Design Quality in New Development SPD or the Sustainability of New Development SPD.
App A CS19 f)	Appropriate signage could also be mentioned as a means of helping people orientate themselves more easily.	Yes	The Council agrees that the policy is enhanced through reference to 'appropriate signage' and additional wording in this regard has been provided accordingly in Policy CS19.
App A	That CS19 (8) is strengthened through reference to the	Yes	The Council agrees that the policy is

CS19 g)	principles of Secure By Design, the recognised standard for improving community safety through design. A reference to the need to create natural surveillance here or in (4) would also be welcomed.		enhanced through reference to ‘natural surveillance’ and additional wording in this regard has been provided accordingly. However it is considered that the approach of referencing the principles of Secured by Design within the supporting text rather than within the policy is appropriate given the need for flexibility to adapt to future initiatives that may emerge during the plan period.
App A CS19 h)	Reference to the need for landscaping which is appropriate for the area and given long term consideration would also reinforce the community safety priority.	Yes	The Council agrees that clarification of the expectation that associated landscaping is delivered will enhance the policy approach. Additional wording has been provided accordingly within Policy CS19.
App A CS19 i)	Specific reference could be made to the importance of highway design in creating streets which encourage social interaction and play e.g. Home zones and/or the Manual for Streets (or this may be more appropriate within CS19 or within a relevant Supplementary Planning Document).	No	The Council agrees that there is a need to provide detailed guidance on issues such as highway design and encouraging social interaction. However the level of specific detail required in this context is not of a strategic nature that can be included within a Core Strategy. It is therefore appropriate to provide additional and more detailed guidance with the emerging Design Quality in New Development SPD.
App A Crime reduction	That the Core Strategy or subsequent LDF document include measures to encourage the incorporation of sensitive lighting within the design of new development including housing,	No	The Council considers that appropriate clarity with regard to ‘unacceptable impacts’ has already been provided in

and community safety a)	business and transport hubs, to reduce opportunities for crime and fear of crime. It is recognised that this may be most appropriate within a relevant Supplementary Planning Document.		this regard within the supporting text, and provides a strategic link to more specific detail within a saved policy in the UDP: ENV3 (until subsequently superseded by the Local Plan: Site Allocations and Development Policies document).
App A Crime reduction and community safety b)	That community involvement in the design of new facilities and community ownership/maintenance of open spaces and other areas be encouraged to help increase community safety, for example, through 'Friends of' groups.	Yes	The Council agrees that clarification of the expectation of community engagement in the design process will enhance the policy approach. Additional wording has been provided accordingly.

Policy CS20: Managing the Borough’s Heritage

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.3 CS20 a)	The preferred option would have a largely positive impact on the sustainability objectives. In particular, by supporting the preservation and enhancement of the Borough’s historic assets and encouraging the sympathetic reuse of vacant and underused historic assets, it is envisaged that the preferred option would have a major positive impact on the objective of preserving, enhancing and managing Knowsley’s rich diversity of cultural, historic and archaeological buildings, areas, sites and features. It is however noted that the preferred option does not contain any reference to protecting archaeological assets. It is considered that this reduces the level of certainty that the preferred option would have a major positive impact on this objective.	Yes	The Council agrees that the policy is enhanced through reference to ‘archaeological assets’ and additional wording in this regard has been provided accordingly within Policy CS20.
4.3 CS20 b)	The preferred option encourages the re-use of vacant and underused historic assets and states that favourable consideration will be given to schemes that enhance the importance of the asset for the economy. The preferred option could thereby result in the creation of premises for new businesses. In addition, protecting and enhancing buildings and features of historic interest should help create more attractive places to invest in and would lead to enhancements to Prescott town centre. Consequently, the preferred option also has the potential to have a positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and deprivation; increasing the number of new businesses; enhancing the vitality and viability of town and local centres; and maintaining high and stable	No	Noted.

	levels of employment and reducing long-term unemployment.		
4.3 CS20 c)	The preferred option would encourage the preservation and enhancement of the Borough's heritage assets, including sites included on the English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens. Accordingly, the protection afforded by the preferred option to parts of Knowsley Hall Park and Croxteth Park should ensure that the preferred option has a positive impact on the objectives of protecting the local character and accessibility of the landscape and conserving and maintaining green infrastructure.	No	Noted.
4.3 CS20 d)	There are no negative or uncertain impacts on the sustainability objectives.	No	Noted.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App A CS20 a)	There is potential conflict between improving the energy efficiency of a historic building, whilst also preserving its character. However, often older buildings can be colder with higher levels of damp and draughts than modern housing. This can be detrimental to human health, particularly, the elderly and vulnerable. It is felt that CS20 should state the need to improve the energy efficiency of historic buildings where this is appropriate, whilst accounting for conservation requirements. Further guidance about this could be given within the Design Quality in New Development Supplementary Planning Document.	Yes	The Council agrees that the policy is enhanced through reference to 'energy efficiency' and additional wording in this regard has been provided accordingly within CS20.

Policy CS21: Urban Greenspaces

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.3 CS21 a)	The preferred option for Urban Greenspaces would have a positive impact on a wide range of objectives. In seeking to resist the loss of greenspace in and supporting the provision of new areas of greenspace in order to maintain an appropriate range of sites the preferred option is likely to have a major positive impact on the objective of protecting, enhancing and managing the local character and accessibility of the landscape; and providing, conserving, maintaining and enhancing green infrastructure; and some positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and social deprivation; health; and protecting land and soil.	No	Noted.
4.3 CS21 b)	The preferred option encourages the provision of new areas of greenspace which conserve natural features, wildlife and fauna and encouraging the retention of trees, woodland and vegetation which offer a positive contribution to biodiversity/wildlife interest. It should therefore have a major positive impact on the objective relating to biodiversity. By seeking to retain existing woodland and secure the appropriate planting of trees and other soft landscaping in new development the preferred option should have some positive impact on the objectives relating to mitigating climate change and air quality. Furthermore, the retention of greenspaces and existing trees and woodlands has the potential to provide enhanced flood risk management through water storage or reduced rates of surface water run-off. It is therefore considered that the preferred option has the	No	Noted.

Policy CS21: Urban Greenspaces

Accounting for Assessment Recommendations

	potential to have a positive impact on the objectives relating to adapting to climate change and the protecting the quality of inland and estuarine waters.		
4.3 CS21 c)	The preferred option should help ensure that the borough has an adequate supply of accessible, high quality greenspaces. This should have a positive impact on the objective relating to community severance and, by increasing the attractiveness of the Borough as a place to live and invest, could also have a positive impact on the objective relating to improving competitiveness and increasing the number of new businesses.	No	Noted.
4.3 CS21 d)	There are no negative or uncertain impacts on the sustainability objectives.	No	Noted.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App A CS21 a)	That linkages between Preferred Option CS21 and the Knowsley Rights of Way programme are made, possibly within the supporting text of CS21.	Yes	The Council agrees that the supporting text would benefit from reference to 'rights of way'. Additional wording has therefore been provided accordingly.
App A CS21 b)	That CS21 be amended to note that developer contributions should be used in the most appropriate way i.e. provision of new open space or contribution to the maintenance or improvement of established green space within the area.	No	The Council supports its approach in view of the reference to the 'Greenspace Standards and New Development SPD' which provides detailed criteria in terms of developer contributions.
App A CS21 c)	That CS19 (8) is strengthened through reference to the principles of Secure By Design, the recognised standard for	No	The Council considers that the approach of referencing the principles

Policy CS21: Urban Greenspaces

Accounting for Assessment Recommendations

	improving community safety through design, or via reference within the supporting text to CS19.		of Secured by Design within the supporting text of Policy CS19 rather than within a policy is appropriate given the need for flexibility to adapt to future initiatives that may emerge during the plan period.
App A CS21 d)	Further links could be made with the Greenspace Strategy and the need to increase community safety within open spaces within the borough.	No	The Council supports its approach of making specific reference to Knowsley's Green Space Strategy within Policy CS8, with reference to the linkage within the supporting text of this policy. Furthermore the issue of community safety is already addressed within the policy as part of accessibility and also remains part of quality.
App Social cohesion and social capital b)	Leisure and cultural facilities can also provide a focus for social interaction, and increased reference to these facilities could be made through out the Core Strategy.	No	The Council supports its approach in referring to leisure and culture within the hierarchy of centres and retail strategy (Policy CS6) given both are classified as main town centre uses.

Policy CS22: Sustainable and Low Carbon Development

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.3 CS22 a)	It is envisaged that the preferred option for Sustainable and Low Carbon Development would have a positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives, particularly those that relate to environmental issues. The preferred option requires new development to manage flood risk, including through the use of sustainable drainage systems and flood resilience measures. It also requires new development to be built to Code for Sustainable Homes/BREEAM standard, requires new developments to limit energy use and encourages new development to incorporate low carbon and renewable energy technologies and use of locally sourced materials. It is therefore considered that the preferred option has the potential to have a major positive impact on the objectives of adapting to climate change and mitigating climate change. By requiring new development to comply with Code for Sustainable Homes/BREEAM standards the preferred option should also have some positive impact on the objectives relating to using water and mineral resources prudently; and minimising the production of waste and increasing reuse, recycling and recovery rates. In addition, the encouraging of Sustainable Drainage Systems, landscaping and green roofs/walls should ensure that the preferred option also has a positive impact on the objectives relating to biodiversity and water quality.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.3 CS22 b)	The preferred option would require new housing to incorporate high standards of insulation, heat retention,	No	Noted and welcomed.

	natural ventilation and passive solar techniques. The preferred option also requires compliance with Code for Sustainable Homes standards. It is therefore envisaged that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objective relating to the provision of good quality, resource efficient housing. Given that good quality housing is a significant contributor to health, it is envisaged that the preferred option would thereby also have a positive impact on the objectives relating to poverty and social deprivation and health.		
4.3 CS22 c)	There are no negative or uncertain impacts on the sustainability objectives.	No	Noted.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App A CS22 a)	That CS22 (i) make reference to the efficient re-use of materials and use of recycled materials within developments.	No	The efficient use of materials is already addressed by part 1 (d) of Policy CS22.
App A CS22 b)	That in addition to 'local suppliers', reference is also made to 'local materials' within (7). This will not only support local businesses but will also ensure that materials do not use large amount of carbon through the transportation process	No	It is the intension of part (d) of CS22 to ensure that resources are used in the most effective and sustainable way. To require developments to use "local materials" would be overly onerous and restrictive, and the Council has no evidence to support this position.
App A CS22 c)	That a reference to encouraging active travel (walking and cycling) through the design, layout and location of development by added to add strength to this issue.	No	Sustainable transport is addressed by CS19 Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development.
App A	Consideration should be given to encouraging buildings	No	There is currently no evidence base to

Policy CS22: Sustainable and Low Carbon Development

Accounting for Assessment Recommendations

CS22 d)	undergoing refurbishment, including historic buildings, to apply standards such as BREEAM and the Code for Sustainable Homes, where appropriate.		support this type of requirement. There may be opportunities to introduce localised and/or building specific targets for the refurbishment of buildings where the opportunity and need is apparent and can be evidenced.
App A CS22 e)	That opportunities to strengthen CS22 (iii) to encourage and facilitate more installation of decentralised energy networks is considered.	No	Noted and welcomed. This is the aim of part 7 – 9 of Policy CS22.
App A CS22 f)	Supporting text for CS22 could outline not only the environmental benefits of reduced energy consumption but also the social and health benefits in terms of reducing fuel poverty and financial exclusion (however, this may be more appropriate within the Design Quality in New Development or Sustainability in Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document).	No	Noted and welcomed. These matters have been explored and are documented in the Local Plan evidence base.

Policy CS23: Renewable and Low Carbon Infrastructure

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.3 CS23 a)	It is envisaged that the preferred option for Renewable and Low Carbon Development would have a positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives, especially those that relate to environmental issues. In particular, by incorporating a presumption in favour of proposals for decentralised, low carbon and renewable energy provided that the proposals would not have an unacceptable impact on communities or the natural and built environment that could not be mitigated, the preferred option could support the shift to more low carbon sources of energy generation and thereby have a major positive impact on the objective relating to mitigating climate change.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.3 CS23 b)	By recognising that there are a range of potential environmental and social considerations that should not be significantly harmed by proposals for decentralised, low carbon and renewable energy developments, it is considered that the preferred option should also have some positive impact on the objectives relating to health; Knowsley's built heritage; the character and accessibility of the landscape; biodiversity and geodiversity; water quality; and air quality.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.3 CS23 c)	There are no negative or uncertain impacts on the sustainability objectives.	No	Noted and welcomed.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a

Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations <i>(see appendix A)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	
App A CS23 a)	That work is undertaken with the Scientific Officer to agree an approach to the use of Biomass within new developments in the borough.	No	This will be addressed when more detailed guidance within the Sustainability in Design and Construction SPD is prepared.

Policy CS24: Managing Flood Risk

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.3 CS24 a)	The preferred option seeks to reduce the extent and impact of flooding by directing development away from areas of greatest risk of flooding, requiring development to incorporate mitigation measures to manage flood risk and the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems to significantly reduce surface water run-off. It is therefore envisaged that the preferred option would have a major positive impact on the objective of adapting to climate change, and some positive impact on the objectives relating to biodiversity; land and soil quality; and water quality.	No	Noted.
4.3 CS24 b)	The supporting text states that the majority of land at a greatest risk of flooding in Knowsley is located within the Green Belt and is therefore unlikely to be developed for employment unless it is identified as a 'reserve' or 'safeguarded' location in preferred option CS5. Whilst some of these locations for Green Belt release are within or adjacent to areas of flood risk, it is noted that the indicative development capacities for these locations assume no development takes places within Flood Zones 2 and 3. It is therefore considered that the preferred option is unlikely to restrict the provision of an adequate supply of housing and employment land in the Borough. As a result, it is concluded that the preferred option is unlikely to have any significant effects on the objectives relating to the provision of good quality housing and exploiting the growth potential of business sectors and increasing the number of new	No	Noted.

	businesses.		
4.3 CS24 c)	It is not envisaged that the preferred option would have a negative impact on any of the sustainability objectives. Nevertheless, the SFRA noted that surface water flooding incidents are prevalent in all major settlements within the Council's boundaries, including Halewood, Huyton, Prescot, Knowsley Village and Kirkby. The preferred option would result in development being directed away from areas that are at a higher risk of flooding and could thereby have some impact on levels of investment in the Borough's centres. As a consequence, the impact of the preferred option on the objective of enhancing the vitality and viability of town and local centres is considered to be uncertain.	No	Although there a flooding issues near to some town and local centres, the risk of flooding within the centres is considered to be low, in accordance with the Council's Local Plan evidence base.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App A CS24 a)	That the term 'SFRA' within Point 3 is explained.	Yes	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is written in full in the Core Strategy.
App A CS24 b)	In addition to mitigation measures to manage the risk of flooding, consideration should be given to the actual design of buildings on the site to reduce the impact of flooding on the buildings themselves and their inhabitants. However, it is recognised that this may be more appropriate within Preferred Option CS19, with additional guidance given with the Design Quality in New Development Supplementary Planning Document.	Yes	Design of buildings on the site to reduce the impact of flooding on the buildings will be introduced into Policy CS19.

Policy CS25: Management of Minerals and Resources

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.3 CS25 a)	The preferred option for the Management of Mineral Resources would have a positive impact on a wide range of objectives. In particular, the preferred option should have a major positive impact on the objective of using minerals prudently by ensuring that mineral resources are not sterilised unnecessarily and encouraging the use of recycled or secondary construction aggregates as an alternative to primary extraction. The preferred option seeks to reduce the need for primary extraction by facilitating the greater use of recycled aggregates and secondary mineral products. In addition, it requires applications for mineral extraction to comply with a set of criteria which will ensure that the impacts of such developments are controlled and managed effectively. As a result, it is envisaged that the preferred option would have a positive impact on the objectives relating to health; Knowsley’s built heritage; landscape character and accessibility; biodiversity and sites of geological importance; flood risk; land and soil quality; water quality; and air quality.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.3 CS25 b)	The preferred option would help minimise the production of waste and increase reuse, recycling and recovery rates by seeking to ensure that construction and demolition wastes are managed sustainably in accordance with the waste hierarchy. It also seeks to ensure that operators transport minerals in a sustainable way. It is therefore envisaged that the preferred option would also have some positive impact on the objectives relating to waste and recycling and the use of	No	Noted and welcomed.

	sustainable modes of transport.		
4.3 CS25 c)	By identifying the importance of local sources of brick clay for the future viability of the brick making industry and ensuring that these resources are not needlessly sterilised, the preferred option should have a positive impact on the objectives relating to the provision of housing; exploit the growth potential of business sectors and increase the number of new businesses; maintaining high levels of unemployment. It is however acknowledged that the requirement to extract minerals prior to non-minerals development taking place in a Mineral Safeguarding Area could however result in some delays to the development process.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.3 CS25 d)	It is not envisaged that the preferred option would have a negative impact on any of the sustainability objectives. Nevertheless, although the preferred option seeks to ensure that operators transport minerals in a sustainable way, it would also potentially encourage the extraction of coal. Recovering this coal would increase the likelihood of the UK being 'locked into' dependence on fossil fuels, which would have an adverse impact on the objective relating to mitigating climate change. As a result, it is concluded that the impact on the objective relating to mitigating climate change is uncertain. It is however recognised that there is little information about the viability of future coal extraction in Knowsley and it is therefore highly uncertain whether coal will be extracted again from the Borough. In addition, it is acknowledged that coal will remain an important part of the UK's energy mix and that the only alternative to incremental coal output in the UK is likely to be the importation of coal over long distances which would have a more significant negative impact on greenhouse gas emissions.	No	Noted and welcomed.
Document	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes	Additional Council comments

Para Ref		made (yes/no)	<i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
App A CS25 a)	That CS25 (i) the requirement for ‘a proportion of construction aggregates...from recycled or secondary sources’ is strengthened to say ‘a <i>significant</i> proportion’ or something similar.	No	The current wording of the policy carries enough weight to ensure development uses appropriate amounts of recycled and secondary aggregated. The Council’s emerging Sustainability in Design and Construction SPD will add further detail and guidance on this issue.
App A CS25 b)	That major future mineral extraction work and/or major development within areas of existing or proposed mineral extraction (e.g. backfilling) be subject to separate Health Impact Assessments.		The existing policy wording provides a satisfactory level of higher level guidance to support the planning application process. Further detailed guidance and as a requirement for development specific HIAs, if deemed appropriate, will be delivered by subsequent Local Plan documents.

Policy CS26: Waste Management

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.3 CS26 a)	It is envisaged that the preferred option for Waste Management would have a positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives, particularly those that relate to environmental issues. The key purpose of the preferred option is to ensure that waste is managed sustainably in order to minimise waste and promote the use of recycled materials. The preferred option also specifies that new development should be designed so as to facilitate the collection and recycling of waste. It is therefore considered that the preferred option has the potential to have a major positive impact on the objectives relating to using mineral resources prudently and minimising the production of waste and increasing reuse, recycling and recovery rates.	No	Noted and welcomed.
4.3 CS26 b)	The preferred option would encourage the sustainable transport of waste and would promote the use of site waste management plans to minimise the volumes of waste that need to be transported. In addition, the requirement to comply with the waste hierarchy would reduce contributions to climate change by minimising the amount of biodegradable waste going to landfill. It is therefore considered that the preferred option would have a major positive impact on the objective of mitigating climate change, and some positive impact on the objectives relating to land and soil quality; water quality; air quality and the use of sustainable transport modes. The preferred option also seeks to minimise the impacts of waste development on communities and the	No	Noted and welcomed.

Policy CS26: Waste Management

Accounting for Assessment Recommendations

	environment. As such, the preferred option should have some positive impact on the objectives relating to health and landscape character.		
4.3 CS26 c)	There are no negative or uncertain impacts on the sustainability objectives	No	Noted and welcomed.
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
	No recommendations given.	n/a	n/a
Document Para Ref	Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)	Changes made (yes/no)	Additional Council comments (rationale behind why policy was changed)
App A CS26 a)	That within CS26 (3) 're-use' of materials is added to strengthen this point.	Yes	Policy CS26 has been amended to reflect this.
App A CS26 b)	That within CS26 (5), the term 'impacts' are further explained, for example, would it be clearer to state 'negative impacts' or maybe explain what these impacts may be.	Yes	Policy CS26 has been amended to state that negative impacts only should be minimised.

Policy CS27: Planning for and Paying for New Infrastructure in Knowsley

Document Para Ref	Sustainability Appraisal Recommendations <i>(see report text / summary table in Appendices)</i>	Changes made <i>(yes/no)</i>	Additional Council comments <i>(rationale behind why policy was changed)</i>
4.3 CS27 a)	The preferred option has the potential to have a positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives. The preferred option would secure contributions towards the provision of new, and improvement of existing, physical, social, green and digital infrastructure. As a result, it is envisaged that the preferred option has the potential to have a positive impact on a wide range of sustainability objectives, including those that relate to poverty and deprivation; community severance; health; educational attainment; built heritage; landscape character and accessibility; biodiversity and geodiversity; adapting to climate change; mitigating climate change; green infrastructure; waste; the vitality and viability of centres; and unemployment. Nevertheless, there is limited information available on the introduction CIL at the moment. In addition, whilst the preferred option would seek to ensure that the economic viability of new development is not undermined by the required infrastructure contributions, it provides no certainty as to the effect on contributions to infrastructure. It is therefore considered that there is only a low level of certainty about the impact of the preferred option on many of the sustainability objectives.	Yes	At the Preferred Options stage, the Council had limited evidence available to inform its position on CIL and consequently the mechanisms by which planning obligations and hence infrastructure funding could be secured. However, now that Economic Viability Assessment work has been undertaken, the Council has information to determine its position. Policy CS27 has been amended to reflect this.
4.3 CS27 b)	It is not envisaged that the preferred option would have a negative impact on any of the sustainability objectives. Nevertheless, it is considered that the impact of the preferred option on several objectives is uncertain. In	Yes	As noted above, additional clarity for Policy CS27 has now been added as a result of the availability of Economic Viability Assessment evidence.

	<p>particular, as it is unclear whether the required contributions to infrastructure may reduce the ability of developers to also contribute to the provision of affordable housing and, as a result, the impact of the preferred option on the objective of providing good quality, affordable housing is uncertain. Similarly, as it is unclear the extent to which the required infrastructure contributions may impact on investment levels, the impact of the preferred option on the objective of exploiting the growth potential of business sectors and increasing the number of new businesses is uncertain. It is also unclear whether the preferred option would prioritise contributions to public transport infrastructure in preference to infrastructure for less sustainable modes of transport. As a result, the impact of the preferred option on the objectives relating to air quality and the use of sustainable transport modes is uncertain.</p>		
Document Para Ref	Habitats Regulation Assessment Recommendations	Changes made (yes/no)	
15.12 and 15.13	<p>Policy CS2 (Development Principles) states that the most efficient use will be made of “<i>available resources and infrastructure</i>”. Avoiding an adverse effect is largely in the hands of the water companies (through their investment in future sewage treatment infrastructure) and Environment Agency (through their role in consenting effluent discharges). However, local authorities can also contribute through ensuring that sufficient wastewater treatment infrastructure is in place prior to development being delivered through the Core Strategy. In the case of Knowsley, this is alluded to in the supporting text for Policy CS27 “<i>Infrastructure planning should also include consideration of funding and phasing of infrastructure</i>”</p>	Yes	<p>Policy CS2 has been amended to account for the changes required. These include that the policy specifically states that the phasing of new development will be linked to the delivery of the necessary infrastructure to serve the development. The role of working with neighbouring authorities and key partner agencies as part of this has also been emphasised.</p> <p>Policy CS27 has also been amended</p>

	<p><i>delivery, together with contingency planning where appropriate.”</i></p> <p>However, it is considered that this allusion needs to be slightly expanded upon in order to provide a firm commitment with regard to the linking of housing delivery to delivery of necessary infrastructure that will ensure that an adverse effect on European sites is avoided. A policy in the Core Strategy will need to make specific reference to the fact that the delivery of development will be phased in order to ensure that it only takes place once any new water treatment infrastructure or appropriate retro-fitted technology (e.g. nitrate stripping) necessary to service the development while avoiding an adverse effect on European sites is in place. The Core Strategy should also make it clear that this need will be determined and delivered through interaction with other authorities including United Utilities and the Environment Agency.</p>		<p>to emphasise the need to plan holistically for the delivery of supporting infrastructure as part of the phased delivery of new development within Knowsley. Again, links with partner authorities and agencies have been emphasised. In particular, Policy CS27 emphasises the need to ensure that environmental protection is paramount in the delivery of new development, particularly where infrastructure improvements can help to avoid environmental risks.</p>
<p>Document Para Ref</p>	<p>Health Impact Assessment Recommendations (see appendix A)</p>	<p>Changes made (yes/no)</p>	
<p>App A CS27 a)</p>	<p>That the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), when developed in full, properly reflects the needs of local communities and ensures that developer contributions are allocated and spent in ways which will support improvements to social cohesion and capital. In addition, local communities should also be involved in the development of the IDP where appropriate, through public consultation and involvement in stakeholder groups.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>The Council’s approach to preparation of the IDP, and subsequent documents (e.g. CIL charging schedule) will reflect priorities in the Core Strategy, including meeting community needs and providing appropriate social, physical and environmental infrastructure. Local communities will continue to be involved in the IDP through its role as a supporting document for the Core</p>

			Strategy, and will also be involved in the development of the Council’s approach to future planning obligations.
App A Access to public services c)	Links to the borough wide Child Health Strategy could be made to highlight issues relating to access to public services for future generations.	Yes	Noted. This has been referenced in the development of the IDP.
App A Access to public services d)	Potential gaps in references to schooling and health centres within the wider document should be considered, including service provision and accessibility.	No	This is considered within the scope of Policy CS27 and the supporting IDP.
App A Access to public services e)	Greater flexibility about use of public buildings, for example schools, could be employed to ensure service delivery at a level accessible to communities. Opportunities should be taken to explore how to promote this through the Core Strategy, subsequent LDF documents and potentially other Council plans and strategies.	No	The detail of how public buildings are used is outside of the scope of the Core Strategy. However the Council already operates such strategies through the Future Schooling programme. This issue is mentioned in the IDP.
App A Opportunities for physical activity a)	That reference is made within the Core Strategy to the borough’s Leisure and Culture Strategy.	No	This is already mentioned within the IDP.
App A Social cohesion and social capital d)	That consideration is given to where there is a need for new community facilities and where consolidation and investment is required in other areas. It is recognised that this is an area which the Council may not have tackled on a borough wide basis yet and therefore would be difficult to convert into policy at this stage.	No	This is considered as part of the IDP and the assembly of evidence to support the implementation of future planning obligations within Knowsley.

For more information log on to
www.knowsley.gov.uk/LocalPlan

All mapping is reproduced from the Ordnance Survey material with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office Crown © Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Knowsley MBC 100017655, 2012

You can also get this information in other formats.
Please phone Customer Services on 0151 443 4031
or email customerservices@knowsley.gov.uk

