

October 2007

Sustainability Appraisal of Hambleton LDF

SA of Allocations DPD Preferred Options

SA Report

Non-Technical Summary

A Submission to
Hambleton District Council
by
Land Use Consultants



NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Hambleton District Council is reviewing the Hambleton Local Plan. The Hambleton Local Plan will be replaced by a Local Development Framework, incorporating Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), in line with the Government's new format for development plans. The DPDs and SPDs included in the Local Development Framework need to be subject to sustainability appraisal (SA), under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The SAs conducted must also meet the requirements for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in accordance with European Directive 2001/42/EC (also known as the SEA Directive).

Land Use Consultants (LUC) was appointed by Hambleton District Council (HDC) in January 2004 to undertake the SA of Hambleton's Core Strategy DPD, Development Policies DPD and Allocations DPD. The SA of the Allocations DPD has been carried out jointly between HDC and LUC.

- LUC developed the methodology for appraising sites against SA objectives, overall assumptions to be applied and factors to be considered in determining the significance of effects.
- HDC planning officers have used this methodology to undertake an appraisal of sites, including alternatives.

The results of the appraisals have been summarised by LUC in Chapter 5 of the **SA Report** and reflect HDC's own appraisal of sites. Conclusions and recommendations in Chapter 5 of the Report are based on LUC's review of the SA.

The report constitutes the SA Report for the Hambleton District Council Allocations DPD. It takes account of the aims and requirements of SA and the SEA Directive and sets out the findings to date of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Allocations DPD. The report is supplemented by a number of appendices forming an accompanying report. **Appendices 1 and 2** set out the review of plans and programmes and **Appendix 3** shows the baseline information collected. **Appendices 4 and 5** provide summary and detailed appraisal matrices of sites appraised by HDC (Preferred Options and alternatives).

The production of the Allocations DPD was preceded by the production of the Core Strategy DPD. This was adopted on 3rd April 2007 and was accompanied by an SA Report¹ showing how policies were developed and tested through the SA process. The Allocations DPD will need to be in conformity with policies of the Core Strategy.

¹ Hambleton Local Development Framework Sustainability Appraisal. Sustainability Appraisal of Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Land Use Consultants, December 2005)

OVERVIEW OF SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL AND SEA

The purpose of SA is to **promote sustainable development** through the better **integration of sustainability considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans**. It should be viewed as an integral part of good plan making involving ongoing iterations to identify and report on significant effects of the plan and the extent to which sustainable development is likely to be achieved.

Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, SA is mandatory for Regional Spatial Strategies, DPDs and SPDs. When preparing DPDs and SPDs, planning authorities must also conduct an environmental assessment in accordance with the SEA Directive. The objective of the Directive is *'to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans....with a view to promoting sustainable development'*.

ODPM guidance on SA² explains the difference between environmental assessments required under the SEA Directive and SA of development plans as required by the UK Government³. There are many parallels but also some differences, and the guidance clearly shows how assessment to comply with the SEA Directive can be integrated with current practice on SA. Simply put, **SA includes a wider range of considerations, extending to social and economic impacts of plans, whereas SEA is more focussed on environmental impacts**. The SA guidance describes how it is possible to satisfy both requirements through a single appraisal process undertaking a joint SEA/SA. **Throughout this report the term 'SA' refers to Sustainability Appraisal incorporating the requirements of Strategic Environmental Assessment**.

METHODOLOGY

The SA guidance introduces the SA process and explains how to carry out SA as an integral part of the plan-making process. The table on the following page sets out the main stages of the plan making process and shows how these link to the SA process.

² *Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents*. ODPM, November 2005

³ As set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

**Corresponding stages in plan-making and SA
(from SA Guidance, ODPM 2005)**

Figure 5 – Incorporating SA within the DPD process
DPD Stage 1: Pre-production – Evidence Gathering
SA stages and tasks
<p>Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A1: Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and sustainability objectives. • A2: Collecting baseline information. • A3: Identifying sustainability issues and problems. • A4: Developing the SA framework. • A5: Consulting on the scope of the SA.
DPD Stage 2: Production
SA stages and tasks
<p>Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B1: Testing the DPD objectives against the SA framework. • B2: Developing the DPD options. • B3: Predicting the effects the DPD. • B4: Evaluating the effects of the DPD. • B5: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects. • B6: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the DPDs.
<p>Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C1: Preparing the SA Report.
<p>Stage D: Consulting on the preferred options of the DPD and SA Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D1: Public participation on the preferred options of the DPD and the SA Report. • D2(i): Appraising significant changes.
DPD Stage 3: Examination
SA stages and tasks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D2(ii): Appraising significant changes resulting from representations.
DPD Stage 4: Adoption and monitoring
SA stages and tasks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D3: Making decisions and providing information.
<p>Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the DPD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E1: Finalising aims and methods for monitoring. • E2: Responding to adverse effects.

Stage A: Setting the Context and Scope

This stage was completed by LUC in two parts. The Stage I Report was conducted in February 2004⁴ and involved the following main stages:

1. Inception meeting
2. Review of plans, strategies and studies
3. Characterisation
4. Development of SA objectives and appraisal framework
5. Consultation workshop
6. Assessment of Vision and Spatial Strategy and alternatives considered

In February 2004 LUC facilitated on behalf of Hambleton District Council a **stakeholder workshop** to discuss sustainability issues in the District to help develop the characterisation and develop the sustainability objectives, which will be used for the SA of the Local Development Framework.

Following completion of this work, the new Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, which came into effect in September 2004, introduced a statutory requirement for undertaking SA. At the same time the ODPM produced draft guidance on SA. The SEA Directive also came into force in July 2004, introducing new requirements for environmental assessment of spatial plans. **The Stage I Report was therefore reviewed with these changes in mind and a SA Scoping Report was prepared.**

The **additional work**, completed in March 2005, involved updating the list of relevant plans, programmes and sources of baseline information and undertaking further reviews of new and updated plans where necessary. This information was used to update and further develop the characterisation/key sustainability issues and framework of sustainability objectives.

During March and April 2005 the Scoping Report was sent to the four SEA '**Consultation Bodies**' (i.e. the Countryside Agency, English Heritage, English Nature, Environment Agency), those involved in the stakeholder consultation group in Stage I, plus the Government Office, Regional Assembly and neighbouring authorities for a five week consultation. Responses to this consultation were received from:

- The Countryside Agency
- English Nature
- English Heritage
- Environment Agency

⁴ Integrated Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment of Hambleton Local Development Framework. Stage I Report: Vision and Spatial Strategy (Land Use Consultants, February 2004)

- Yorkshire Forward
- Government Office Yorkshire and Humber
- Darlington Borough Council

Stage B: Developing and Refining Options

The purpose of the Allocations DPD is to provide the site details that will help to deliver the Core Strategy of Hambleton District's LDF. The Core Strategy sets out an overall vision and 12 overarching strategic objectives that apply to the whole of the LDF, including the Allocations DPD. These were tested and refined against the SA framework as part of the SA of the Core Strategy.

The Council's approach to site selection set out in Annex I of each of the five Sub-Area Plans demonstrates how the step-by-step process considered all alternative sites to those selected as Preferred Options. A number of sites were discarded as they are contrary to the spatial strategy set out in the adopted Core Strategy DPD. All other alternative sites above a minimum size threshold of 0.3ha were considered alongside the Preferred Options and were subject to SA. As part of the appraisal, consideration was also given to whether alternative land uses on each site would be likely to result in more sustainable outcomes.

The framework of SA objectives used to appraise policies of the Core Strategy and Development Policies DPDs was used to appraise site allocations. A number of SA objectives and/or criteria within the SA framework are dependent upon successful implementation of development policies and cannot be used for appraising the sustainability effects of different locations. These were removed from the framework and an explanation provided, as set out in **Table 3.4** of Chapter 3 of the SA Report.

Table 3.4 also sets out factors likely to contribute to significant effects in order to clearly demonstrate how judgements were made when predicting and assessing effects and to encourage consistency within the appraisal. The table also includes key sources of data and information to be drawn upon as evidence to justify significant effects recorded. This draws on information compiled for the Scoping Report, was updated through a review of plans, programmes and baseline information was updated. Table 3.4 was used by planning officers at Hambleton District Council when appraising sites against the framework of SA objectives.

Where significant effects were recorded an explanation was included and consideration was given to whether opportunities are likely to exist to maximise beneficial effects or mitigate adverse effects. The need for monitoring of significant effects is discussed in Chapter 6 of the report.

Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report

The SA Report provides the results of the appraisal of the Allocations Preferred Options and the process undertaken.

Stage D: Consultation on Preferred Options and SA

The Preferred Options Allocations DPD along with this SA report will be placed on consultation for a statutory six-week period in October-November 2007. This consultation is designed to comply with the Statement of Community Involvement and requirements of the SEA Directive.

Stage E: Updating the Sustainability Appraisal Report to incorporate changes to the Plan

Following the consultation period, Hambleton District Council will prepare the Submission Draft of the Allocations DPD. Any significant changes to the DPD as a result of public consultation will be appraised and comments on the SA taken into account in an updated SA report. The Allocations DPD and revised SA Report will be submitted to the Secretary of State in mid-2008 for Examination.

Stage F: Monitoring Implementation of the DPD

This SA Report sets out recommendations for monitoring significant adverse sustainability effects of the Allocations DPD.

CHARACTERISATION OF HAMBLETON AND KEY SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

Hambleton is one of the **largest Districts in England**. It is essentially **rural** in character and includes part of the North York Moors National Park. Northallerton and Thirsk are the main towns in the District, and are supported by three other market towns of Bedale, Easingwold and Stokesley. **51% of the 86,500 population live in these five, historic, market towns dispersed across the District**. The remaining population is scattered throughout the District in villages and agricultural settlements.

There are over 130 villages in the District, with nearly a third (30%) containing less than 100 people. Outside the settlements land use is almost wholly agricultural, and this is a dominating influence on the landscape. The Vales of Mowbray and York form the lowland landscape which dominates the District, with their fertile and intensively farmed arable land. To the east a steep escarpment gives way to the upland landscape of the North York Moors National Park. To the south east the more gentle landscape of the Howardian Hills is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

The District is **relatively prosperous**, with unemployment levels roughly half the national average. There are **low levels of deprivation**, with the District ranked in the bottom quartile of districts in terms of indices of deprivation in the UK. To the north are the urban areas of Teesside and Darlington, and to the south are Harrogate and the City of York. **These large urban centres have a significant socio-economic influence on the District**. The most southern point of the District encompasses a section of the York Green Belt, which surrounds the settlement of Shipton.

Key environmental, economic, social, transport and access issues are summarised in the table on the following page.

Key environmental issues for Hambleton include:

- Need to protect existing **high quality landscape** and enhance lower quality landscape
- Relatively **low nature conservation value** due to deteriorating effect of agricultural activities
- Need to improve the number and diversity of **biodiversity sites**
- Need to conserve the **historic environment** for future generations
- High quality built environment under **pressure from development**
- **Re-use of land** within settlements to avoid sprawl
- **Noise pollution** and its potential to increase with **airfield expansions**
- Impacts of **climate change**
- Potential risk of **flooding**
- Potential to develop appropriate forms of **renewable energy** in the right locations to offset greenhouse gas emissions

Key economic issues in Hambleton include:

- Provision of a suitable range of **employment land and premises**
- Provision of training to **improve skills**
- Renaissance of **market towns**
- Diversification of the **rural economy**
- Reducing **out-commuting**
- **Diversity of employment** including more manufacturing and knowledge based employment and higher quality jobs
- Need to **address the digital divide** (those with/without broadband access)

Key social issues in Hambleton include:

- Fear of **crime**
- Needs of **young people** e.g. affordable housing, local jobs
- Need for **affordable housing** for local residents
- **Ageing** population
- **Education and skills/training** to support local employment
- **Rural service** provision
- Need to speed up the roll-out of **broadband**
- Need for **community-led social enterprises**

Key transport and access issues for Hambleton

- Need to address **transport and access** barriers faced by elderly and young people, people with disabilities and the socially/economically disadvantaged.
- Heavy **dependency on the private car**
- Poor provision of **public transport** particularly in rural areas
- Reverse **commuting** between Hambleton and surrounding urban areas

LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS OF THE PREFERRED OPTIONS ALLOCATIONS DPD

Below is a summary of the key likely significant positive and negative effects of the Hambleton Allocations DPD identified in the SA and recommendations for strengthening the DPD and its policies. These are summarised in **Table 5.1** in **Chapter 5** of the SA Report.

The summary table shows that many more significant positive effects are predicted than significant negative effects. Significant positive effects are recorded for all SA objectives apart from Objective O: **To provide support to deprived groups and disadvantaged areas**. This is more likely to be a result of there being limited information on site proposals for employment and community uses rather than there being insufficient development of the right type in the right locations.

The SA identified several sites where development was predicted to have significant positive effects on maintaining and enhancing **landscape and townscape quality** (Objective A). Most of the predicted effects are a result of the redevelopment of brownfield sites and the opportunities this presents to improve the quality of development on the sites themselves, as well as the appearance of the sites from their surrounding locality.

The SA predicted that the majority of sites would have significant impacts on choice of **sustainable locations appropriate to settlement character** (Objective D). Most of these predicted significant effects are positive and relate to the criteria from the SA framework – the choice of brownfield sites which are in accessible locations, reducing the need to travel, and developing on sites that are not at risk of flooding. A small number of preferred sites (primarily those in Easingwold) were also predicted to have significant negative effects on this SA objective, as these sites have a high water table and land drainage issues, although some uncertainty remains in these assessments.

Areas at greatest risk of flooding are generally avoided in each sub-area which is to be commended given the degree of constraint flooding imposes throughout the District, particularly Thirsk and therefore is a positive effect. Question marks remain in relation to a small number of Preferred Option sites in Easingwold East, Northallerton and to the north east of Thirsk, resulting in significant negative effects on **minimising climate change and its effects on the population** (Objective F).

Site selection avoided the need to develop on greenfield land as far as possible (although the overall target for development on brownfield land will not be met) and should reduce the need to travel, thereby potentially reducing reliance on fossil fuels, which in turn will encourage the positive effects of **prudent use of natural resources** (Objective E).

A small number of significant positive effects have been recorded in relation to **improving the health of the population** (Objective P) as a result of development providing opportunities for walking and cycling to nearby services and facilities, proposals for pocket parks alongside development or the provision of open space.

The location of the majority of sites in close proximity (walking distance) to facilities means that several of the preferred sites are predicted to have significant positive effects on **improving access to a range of services and facilities** (Objective T). One of the preferred sites (152/05 in Thirsk) is predicted to have a significant positive effect on this SA objective as it would provide open space for recreation.

Several preferred sites (including all scattered sites in Thirsk) are predicted to have significant positive effects on providing **closer links between where people live and where they work** (Objective I). The priority given to brownfield land in the Allocations site selection process means that the majority of preferred sites are located within the existing development limits. This means they are more likely to be within walking distance of local facilities and employment.

The SA predicted that several of the preferred sites would have significant positive effects on **providing housing to meet local needs** (Objective R). These are mainly proposals for residential development on large sites presenting opportunities for the provision of high levels of affordable housing.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Table 5.1 provides a guide as to how the development of Preferred Options sites taken together may result in cumulative effects in relation to certain sustainability objectives. Positive cumulative effects may result in relation to:

- The maintenance and enhancement of landscape and townscape quality.
- The location of development in the most sustainable locations that are appropriate to settlement character.
- The encouragement of conditions which facilitate business success.
- Making the most of Hambleton's economic strengths.
- Providing closer links between where people live and where they work.
- Providing housing to meet local needs.

Whilst negative cumulative effects are not apparent from the summary of appraisals, it is likely that the level of development proposed in Hambleton will inevitably result in negative cumulative effects on:

- Encouraging the prudent use of natural resources.
- Minimising climate change and its effects on the population.

ALTERNATIVE SITES REJECTED

Sites ruled out early on in the process

Nearly half of all sites considered were discarded during Step 2 of the Council's site selection methodology, as it was considered that they do not conform to the spatial strategy presented in the adopted Core Strategy DPD. A much smaller number of sites (58 in total) were ruled out as they are below the Council's minimum size

threshold of 0.3ha. The remaining sites (around 350 in total) were all subject to detailed appraisal against the framework of SA objectives. Just over 75% of these were rejected, leaving just over 90 Preferred Option sites.

Sites subject to SA but subsequently rejected

Many of the rejected alternative sites scored similarly to the Preferred Options and several of the discounted alternative sites were predicted to have significant positive effects in relation to certain SA objectives, particularly where development would be on brownfield land and in close to existing services and facilities. However, it is often the case that sites were rejected as they were predicted to have significant negative effects in relation to other SA objectives.

The highest number of significant negative effects predicted to result from the alternative sites appraised were in relation to SA objective A (landscape and townscape), D (location and character) and F (access to services). Negative effects were predicted against SA objective A for sites which were greenfield sites, in prominent positions or resulted in the loss of other assets such as Easingwold's Green Wedge, or views to/from Easingwold Conservation Area. Several of the rejected sites were predicted to have significant negative effects against SA objective D because they were greenfield sites, would increase travel distances for residents, would disrupt settlement form, or would increase the risk of flooding. A significant number of rejected alternative sites were also predicted to have significant negative effects on SA objective F as they were partially or entirely in areas identified in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as being at risk of flooding.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Table 5.1 in **Chapter 5** of the SA Report shows that the majority of predicted significant effects are positive. There are very few significant negative effects predicted to result from the development of the Preferred Option sites. To a certain extent, this results from the adoption of a Core Strategy DPD which has already been subject to SA, is based on sound spatial principles and sets the framework for the Allocations DPD. Development has therefore been steered towards settlements in the District that are most likely to present opportunities for sustainable development. In addition, the site selection methodology described in Annex I of each sub-area plan is successful to the extent that it concentrates development within urban areas in the first instance, helping to reduce the need to travel to reach services and facilities and reducing the need to develop on greenfield sites which may be to the detriment of local countryside character.

It should also be borne in mind that at this stage allocations are for proposed types of development only, and not for specific proposals. This means that the predicted effects of the development of the sites are likely to be similar and it is primarily the location of the site which makes the predicted impacts differ. The SA is looking at the impact of development in principle on a particular site, rather than the effects of a specific proposal. The impacts of development on the SA objectives will happen during the development of the site as well as when development is 'complete'.

An example is the lack of significant positive effects in relation to Objective O 'To provide support to deprived groups and disadvantaged areas'. This might suggest

that more could be done to develop and re-develop sites in areas in need of regeneration. However, each sub-area plan has allocated sufficient land for employment and residential uses to meet the scale and distribution prescribed by the adopted Core Strategy DPD. However, significant effects are more dependent on the allocation of land for specific uses to meet different needs of the community, of which there is limited detail in the Allocations DPD. Positive effects are also dependent on a wider range of measures to target support to particular sectors of the population, such as the young, elderly or economically deprived. It is therefore the implementation stage which will determine the extent of most of the effects on this SA objective.

Although the individual site appraisals are generally positive, taken together there are some outstanding issues that need to be considered:

- Meeting brownfield targets
- Avoiding an increase to the risk of flooding
- Minimising reliance on cars
- The provision of sufficient affordable housing
- Uncertainties of effects on biodiversity

The SA of the Development Policies DPD noted that the Site Allocations DPD will help to ensure that the policies in the Development Policies DPD and Core Strategy DPD will be implemented. In particular, the SA highlighted the need to address flood risk, reduce reliance on cars and provide affordable housing. This SA suggests that the Allocations DPD Preferred Options goes some way to addressing these issues, however, a number of concerns remain in relation to these factors.

Meeting brownfield targets

The distribution of sites identified for each sub-area meets the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CP6. In particular, at least 51% of the overall housing requirement is to be concentrated in Northallerton and Thirsk and two-thirds of housing is concentrated in the main Service Centres. However, the amount of housing to be provided on brownfield land averages 38%, which falls well short of the Development Policies DPD target of 55%. Areas outside of the Principal Service Centres of Northallerton and Thirsk are by their nature expected to have a more limited supply of brownfield land, but **shortfalls in each sub-area raises the questions of whether the site selection process goes far enough to examine all brownfield opportunities or whether the target in Policy DPI2 of the Development Policies DPD needs to be revised.**

Avoiding an increase to the risk of flooding

In relation to flood risk, some of the site proposals suggest that only those parts of the sites which are not at risk from flooding would be developed. However, it is questioned whether development of part of the site might increase the risk of flooding by reducing the amount of permeable ground and therefore increasing run-off. Such development would conflict with Policy DP43 of the Development Policies

DPD. In other cases it is suggested that mitigation will be sufficient to control flood risk. **Above all, it is essential that the Council is confident that all alternatives have been considered before sites at risk of flooding are proposed for development, given current risks of flooding in the District and the exacerbating effects of climate change over time. Where development is dependent on mitigation to control the risk of flooding, the Council should ensure this is enforced through the application of Policy DP43 including the use of developer contributions where necessary.**

Minimising reliance on cars

The outcome of the site selection process needs to be assessed in the context of overall development strategy for each sub-area and existing live-work patterns of the District's population. The proposals for the relief roads to the north of Northallerton and north of Bedale would seem to be contrary to Core Strategy Strategic Objective 2 and Policy CP2 which aim to reduce the need to travel, and may exacerbate current trends of high levels of car ownership and use and out-commuting to employment opportunities in Middlesbrough and Darlington to the north. This may undermine attempts to encourage higher-value local employment opportunities on land proposed for employment uses in the Allocations DPD. **Although the proposed relief roads to the north of Northallerton and north of Bedale may relieve congestion in the short term, it is questioned whether they represent the most sustainable long-term solution.**

The provision of sufficient affordable housing

There is significant uncertainty in relation to the delivery of affordable housing in Northallerton Sub-Area. The sub-area plan for Northallerton states that levels of affordable housing in Northallerton may not meet the 40% target of Core Strategy Policy CP9 due to the need to pay for the northern relief road and the conclusions and recommendations of the viability and financial appraisal report on the Northern Area Masterplan (presented in Annex 7) suggest that 20% affordable housing is the maximum that could be achieved. **The Council should consider in the first instance whether realistic alternatives to the northern relief road exist to relieve congestion problems in Northallerton. If it is established that no realistic alternatives exist, alternative means of funding the relief road should be sought, to avoid reducing the level of affordable housing provision in the sub-area.**

Uncertainties of effects on biodiversity

In addition to the points raised above, it should be noted that whilst unlikely to be significant, many of the effects on flora, fauna and geological features remain uncertain. This might be expected as detailed site assessment is reliant on further ecological survey which may be required as a result of Environmental Impact Assessment but the cumulative impacts of development will also need to be considered. Additionally, whilst there are no Natura 2000 or Ramsar sites within the District, the Allocations DPD will be subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment in order to establish whether indirect effects such as increased recreational pressure

or increased water abstraction have the potential to significantly affect Natura 2000 and Ramsar sites adjoining or in close proximity of the District boundary.

MONITORING

The final section of the SA Report sets out the framework for monitoring implementation of the Allocations DPD. The key effects to be monitored are the suitability of development locations (including flooding) and effects on settlement character and the effects of the plan on climate change and its effects on the population. As a result of the outstanding issues identified, it is also suggested that car travel and patterns of commuting and levels of affordable housing provision are closely monitored, along with biodiversity due to the uncertainty of likely effects. A range of indicators and sources of information are identified in **Table 6.1**. An on-going dialogue with the statutory environmental consultees and other stakeholders is also recommended to agree the significant effects to be monitored and the information to be collected, including who will collect the information and when.

Land Use Consultants

October 2007

S:\4100\4138 SA of Hambleton District Council Allocations DPD\Documents\SA Report\Final Draft\SA of Site Allocations DPD Draft 22.08.07_FINAL 03.10.07.doc