

CALDERDALE LOCAL PLAN

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF LOCAL PLAN MAIN MODIFICATIONS

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL APPENDIX 3 –

HOUSING NEED UPDATE – SUSTAINABILITY UPDATE

CONCLUSIONS OF SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL COMPARISONS

Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council

August 2022



Calderdale Local Plan Examination

STAGE 2 - HEARINGS

MATTER 7 – Housing Need Update – Sustainability Update

Conclusions of Sustainability Appraisal Comparisons

January 2020

1.1 In relation to housing requirement, four distinct options have been considered by the Council:

Option 1) Maintain the housing requirement at 840dpa and reduce expected economic growth to below the existing baseline figure (6,441 additional jobs);

Option 2) Increase the housing requirement to 910dpa and reduce expected economic growth to the baseline figure (7,791 additional jobs);

Option 3) Increase the housing requirement to 1,040dpa and maintain expected economic growth at the current policy-on plus transport level (10,318 additional jobs).

Option 4) Increase the housing requirement to (on average) 997dpa which supports the 'policy-on with transport' economic growth aspirations and also takes into account the uncertainty in assumptions built into the forecasting model.

1.2 It should be noted that all site allocations have previously been subject to individual SAs, as has the original 840 dwellings per annum requirement. The four options have been subjected to SA and a summary of the outcomes is presented, based on the three distinct elements of the SA assessment, which are social, environmental and economic impacts.

Social

1.3 In terms of the four options, all were considered to have a positive impact; however, options 1 and 2 would result in a far greater shortfall of affordable housing delivery than options 3 and 4. Option 4 would deliver the housing requirement and would leave only a very minimal affordable housing shortfall (on allocations alone). It is therefore considered that

options 3 and 4 would help to ensure that a higher proportion of the borough's population would be in the right type and tenure of housing, increase housing choice, and help reduce social exclusion.

1.4 In addition, the employment growth figures proposed by options 3 and 4 would result in a greater reduction in economic inequality and poverty. Options 3 and 4 would also improve accessibility through a greater investment in transport infrastructure. Overall, options 3 and 4 are considered to have the strongest positive effect on the social element of the SA.

Environmental

1.5 In relation to the environmental objectives of the SA, option 1 would be likely to have the least uncertain impact as this would result in the same level of housing growth as proposed in the publication version of the Local Plan. Options 2, 3 and 4 would have a greater impact on the Green Belt, however the additional sites required to achieve the greater levels of growth proposed by these options have been subject to SA and will have identified necessary mitigation measures should they be required, and therefore there would be no greater impact on flood risk or nationally and locally designated habitats.

1.6 Options 3 and 4 would result in a greater level of investment in transport and would help to reduce congestion levels, thus having a positive impact on air quality. Whilst option 1 would have the least impact on the landscape, it is considered that of the 3 options requiring a greater level of growth, option 3 would secure greater levels of mitigation in relation to this growth.

Economic

1.7 The SA indicates that options 3 and 4 would have the strongest positive impacts on the economic objectives of the SA. In tandem, the higher level of housing and economic growth proposed by the options would result in the strongest positive impact in relation to supporting economic growth and therefore the creation of new jobs, and as a result reduce economic inequality and poverty. Increased local populations will help ensure there is a larger local labour supply for local firms, and also result in additional spending in local shops and town centres.

1.9 Options 1 and 2 would not deliver the levels of growth that options 3 and 4 would achieve and would undermine both economic growth aspirations and result in additional in-commuting.

Conclusion

1.10 Overall, it is considered that options 3 and 4 would result in the stronger positive effects against the SA objectives compared to the other options. In relation to social and economic objectives, option 3 and 4 promote increased housing choice, social inclusion, economic growth, investment in transport and although the options would have a greater impact in terms of Green Belt, the additional sites required compared to the other options have been subject to SA and this will have identified any necessary mitigation measures.