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Chapter 1: Introduction

Background

1.1 Cheshire East Council ("CEC") is undertaking a Sustainability Appraisal ("SA") in support of the emerging Crewe Hub Area Action Plan ("CHAAP"), which will form part of the Development Plan for Cheshire East. SA of Local Plans is a legal requirement; Section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires a local planning authority to carry out SA for a Local Plan during its preparation.

1.2 SA is a systematic process that must be carried out during the preparation of a Local Plan. Its role is to promote sustainable development by assessing the extent to which the emerging plan, when judged against reasonable alternatives, will help to achieve relevant environmental, economic and social objectives. The National Planning Policy Framework (2019) identifies the SA process as an integral part of plan-making and should consider all likely significant effects on the environment, economic and social factors.

SA explained

1.3 It is a requirement that SA is undertaken in line with the procedures set out by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (‘SEA Regulations’), which transposes the EU Directive 2001/42/EC on Strategic Environmental Assessment (‘SEA Directive’) into national law. The SA process incorporates the SEA process. Indeed, SA and SEA are one and the same process, differing only in terms of substantive focus. SA has an equal focus on all three ‘pillars’ of sustainable development (environment, social and economic).

1.4 In line with the Regulations, a report (known as the SA Report) must be published for consultation alongside the draft plan that ‘identifies, describes and evaluates’ the likely significant effects of implementing ‘the plan, and reasonable alternatives’. The Report must then be taken into account, alongside consultation responses, when finalising the plan.

1.5 The SA Report must address the following:

1. Explain what plan-making/SA has involved up to this point, including in relation to ‘reasonable alternatives’.
2. Set out the appraisal findings at this stage of the process for the draft plan.
3. Set out the next steps to finalise the Plan.

Crewe Hub Area Action Plan

Overview

1.6 The Council is committed to putting in place a comprehensive set of up-to-date planning policies to support our ambition of making the Borough an even greater place to live, work and visit. The first part of the Council's Local Plan, the Local Plan Strategy ("LPS"), was adopted at Council on 27 July 2017. The Site Allocations and Development Policies Document

---

1 National Planning Practice Guidance ("NPPG"): Strategic environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal.
2 Regulation 12(2) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004
("SADPD") will form the second part of the Council's Local Plan, providing detailed development management policies and allocate additional sites to meet the overall development requirements set out in the LPS.

1.7 The significant change instigated by the arrival of HS2 is anticipated by the LPS. However, the LPS is a 'pre-HS2' plan and could not address the implications of HS2 in any detail because of the time when it was prepared. To manage change anticipated by HS2, the CHAAP is being prepared for a focused area around Crewe Railway Station and its vicinity. The CHAAP will be a bespoke planning document that will set out a planning framework for the development of the Hub Station and its environs. The CHAAP has an anticipated Plan period up to 1 April 2040 (subject to statutory review processes), once adopted.

1.8 Work on the CHAAP started in 2018 and included the publication of an Issues Paper for consultation between 6 November and 5 December 2018. This provided an opportunity for consultees to tell the Council what they thought it should contain and the direction its policies should take. The CHAAP Development Strategy was published for consultation between 12 February and 26 March 2019, and was accompanied by an interim SA, also for consultation.

1.9 The Crewe Hub Area Action Plan: Development Strategy and Further Options, referred to as the "Draft CHAAP" in this Report, has been prepared to further develop the Council's thinking on delivering HS2, and forms part of the Council's Regulation 18 consultation on the development of the CHAAP.

1.10 Once adopted the CHAAP will provide a framework to facilitate and manage development around Crewe HS2 Hub Station and set detailed policies to guide planning application decisions in the CHAAP area.

Objectives

1.11 The Draft CHAAP identifies a Vision and eight aims, with four Objectives to deliver them, which were drawn up based on current planning guidance, the existing policy framework, consideration of the relevant evidence base and the outcomes of consultations:

**Objective 1: Maximising economic opportunities**

Provide a new commercial district; the Crewe Commercial Hub, and mixed use commercial and residential development in other locations to support and enable the delivery of a HS2 Hub Station.

**Objective 2: Improving connectivity**

Development across the Crewe Hub will embed advanced digital infrastructure and vastly improve physical connectivity and accessibility to, from and around the Crewe Hub Station, and across the wider sub-region.

**Objective 3: Delivering sustainable development**

Development across the Crewe Hub will be underpinned by appropriate environmental and social infrastructure, that also contributes to sustainable place making.
Objective 4: Improving environmental quality

A new and innovative design dynamic will be promoted across the Crewe Hub with an emphasis on enhancing environmental quality through development that is coherent, connected and makes best use of local character and heritage to establish a sense of place.

1.12 Further information and appraisal of the Objectives can be found in Chapter 3 and Appendix C of this Report.

What is the CHAAP not trying to achieve?

1.13 The CHAAP will not include minerals and waste policies or make site allocations for these uses. These will be addressed through a separate Minerals and Waste Development Plan Document. It is also worth mentioning that the SADPD (the second part of the Local Plan) is being prepared separately to the CHAAP. The SADPD is a ‘daughter’ document to the LPS and seeks to provide detailed planning policies and additional sites to supplement the planning strategy set out in the LPS. The LPS and SADPD do not address the implications of HS2.

The purpose and structure of this Interim SA Report

1.14 This Interim SA Report has been produced and is published alongside the Draft CHAAP, under Regulation 18 of the Local Planning Regulations, to demonstrate that the SA process has formed an integral part of plan-making. It sets out the method and findings of the SA at this stage, including the consideration of any reasonable alternatives.

1.15 The legally required SA Report will be published alongside the final draft (‘Proposed Submission’) version of the CHAAP, under Regulation 19 of the Local Planning Regulations.

1.16 Following this introductory Chapter the Report is structured as follows:

- Chapter 2 sets out the scope of the SA, including key issues and SA objectives
- Chapter 3 sets out how reasonable alternatives have been identified, the findings of the alternatives appraisal and the reasons for selecting the preferred approach
- Chapter 4 sets out the findings of the appraisal of the Draft CHAAP at this stage
- Chapter 5 sets out the cumulative effects of the Draft CHAAP
- Chapter 6 sets out the next steps and initial thoughts on monitoring
Chapter 2: Scope of the SA

Introduction

2.1 The aim of this Chapter is to introduce the scope of the SA; that is the sustainability issues/objectives that should be a focus of (and provide a broad methodological framework for) SA.

2.2 The scoping stage identifies the scope and level of detail of the information to be included in the SA report. It sets out the context, objectives and approach of the assessment; and identifies relevant environmental, economic and social issues and objectives. National Planning Practice Guidance states that, “a key aim of the scoping procedure is to help ensure the sustainability appraisal process is proportionate and relevant to the Local Plan being assessed”.

Consultation on the scope

2.3 A Scoping Report was produced to set out the scope for the SA and published for consultation with statutory consultees (Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England) and wider stakeholders in February 2017. It set out the detailed policy context and baseline information that informed the identification of key sustainability issues and development of SA objectives.

2.4 Comments received were taken into account and are reflected in an updated version of the Scoping Report, published in June 2017.  

Policy context and baseline information

2.5 The policy context and detailed baseline information were set out in the Scoping Report that was published for consultation in February 2017 and updated in June 2017. The scoping information contained in Appendix B of this Report has been revised, where possible, to take into account any new or updated information and align with the subject matter and boundary of the Area Action Plan. Comments received about the scope and SA objectives presented in this Report will be taken into account at the next stage of the SA process.

2.6 As there were three CHAAP boundary options under consideration, the Council collected baseline information, where available, using the boundary option that covered the largest area, which was Option 3 "Opportunity and market led" (herein referred to as the 'scoping boundary'). This is considered to be a proportional approach and seeks to make sure that:

- all relevant sustainability issues are considered
- the SA Framework and appraisal is tailored to the CHAAP

Key issues

2.7 The key sustainability issues and characteristics identified in the Scoping Report (2017) are set out in Table 2.1. The issues fall under nine SA topics determined through the baseline review and consultation, which are:

---

- Biodiversity, flora and fauna
- Population and human health
- Water and soil
- Air
- Climatic factors
- Transport
- Cultural heritage and landscape
- Social inclusiveness
- Economic development

2.8 Following a review of the detailed baseline information (Appendix B of this Report), the sustainability issues have been refined to better reflect the key issues for the CHAAP.

**Table 2.1 Sustainability issues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Sustainability issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</td>
<td>There are priority species and habitats in the Borough, most of which need conservation measures due to threats to their numbers nationally. There are European designated sites located in the Borough boundary. There are no European designated sites (SPA/SAC or Ramsar sites) in the scoping boundary. There is a LWS (Mere Gutter with Basford Brook) located outside of the scoping boundary, to the south, and Quakers Coppice Site of Biological Importance is located just outside of the scoping boundary to the south. The scoping boundary falls in the IRZ for SSSIs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and human health</td>
<td>The Borough has an ageing population. There is limited ethnic diversity in the Borough. Generally the health of the Borough's population is varied. The proportion of overweight/obese reception age and Year 6 children has increased. There is an association between deprivation and health inequality reflected in higher incidences and mortality rates for some cancers in more deprived areas. There has been an increase in crime rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and soil</td>
<td>There is an area of flood risk in the north east of the scoping boundary. Pollution is an issue for the Weaver/Gowy and Upper Mersey river catchment areas. Ecological river quality in the Borough has improved, however chemical river quality has slightly declined. Cheshire East has 15 permitted mineral extraction sites with resources such as silica (or industrial) sand, construction sand and gravel, sandstone (hard/crushed rock), salt (brine) and peat. The Borough has proportionately more Grade 1, 2 and 3 agricultural land than the North West and England. The scoping boundary area is located in the ‘urban’ classification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics</td>
<td>Sustainability issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been a decrease in the amount of waste collected from the Borough's households.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>There are areas in the Borough that suffer from poor air quality. The scoping boundary contains part of the Nantwich Road Air Quality Management Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road traffic is the main source of air quality issues in the Borough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climatic factors</td>
<td>CO₂ emissions from road transport in the Borough have increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build standards have improved in the Borough, with an increase in the average Standard Assessment Procedure rating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>The Borough has an extensive road network, including the M6 and M56 motorways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scoping boundary includes Crewe Railway Station, which is on the West Coast Main Line.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Government has proposed that HS2 will pass through Crewe, with the potential for the development of a Hub Station at Crewe Railway Station.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus routes that serve the scoping boundary connect this area with other parts of the Borough and beyond.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a high reliance on private transport in the Borough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an unattractive pedestrian route and poor cycle links between Crewe Railway Station and Crewe town centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural heritage and landscape</td>
<td>The Borough contains a number of cultural and environmental assets, including designated heritage assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Grade II Listed Buildings and five historic land classifications are located in the scoping boundary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scoping boundary includes a small part of LCT 7 Lower Wooded Farmland landscape character type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two areas in the scoping boundary are subject to Tree Preservation Orders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The character of the scoping boundary area is urban, with limited areas of greenspace.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusiveness</td>
<td>Lower Super Output Areas E01018445 and E1018400, which are included in part of the scoping boundary, are some of the most deprived in England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average house prices in the Borough are higher than the North West, but lower than the England average.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of dwellings in the Borough are private sector.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>The Borough has a high jobs density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proportion of 16 to 64 year olds in the Borough with a first degree or equivalent qualification exceeds the figures for the North West and UK.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost half of the people working in the Borough are employed in high-skill occupations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proportion working in skilled trades and low-skill or elementary occupations are slightly below the UK average. There is a relatively high proportion of residents in employment and a low proportion of economically active population aged 16 and above unemployed.

Table 2.2 shows the sustainability objectives established through SA scoping to provide a methodological framework for appraisal. The objectives fall under the nine SA topics.

Table 2.2 Sustainability Topics and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Sustainability Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</td>
<td>Protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity, habitats, soils, species, geodiversity and important geological features, particularly those that are designated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and human health</td>
<td>Create an environment that promotes healthy and active lifestyles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and soil</td>
<td>Meet the health and social care needs of an ageing population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Manage sustainable mineral extraction and encourage their recycling/re-use, to provide a sufficient supply to meet social and economic needs, whilst minimising impacts on the environment and safeguarding resources for future generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Borough</td>
<td>Achieve sustainable waste management through adhering to the principles of the Waste Hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and soil</td>
<td>Manage sustainable waste management through adhering to the principles of the Waste Hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Create a safe environment and reduce levels of and the fear of crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Borough</td>
<td>Positively address the issues of water quality and quantity, and manage flood risk in the Borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Meet the health and social care needs of an ageing population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Borough</td>
<td>Protect and enhance green infrastructure and high quality agricultural land, and optimise the re-use of previously developed land, buildings and infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>Manage the impacts of development and associated activities to positively address all forms of air pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Borough</td>
<td>Reduce the consumption of natural resources, protect and enhance green infrastructure, and manage the impacts of development and associated activities to positively address all forms of air pollution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scope of the SA

The proportion working in skilled trades and low-skill or elementary occupations are slightly below the UK average.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Sustainability Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climatic factors</td>
<td>To adapt to and mitigate the impacts of climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimise energy use, promote energy efficiency and high quality design, and increase the generation of energy from by decentralised and/or renewable resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage the use of sustainable transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Create sustainable communities that benefit from good access to jobs, services, facilities and sustainable forms of transport, including walking, cycling and public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce reliance on private transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve pedestrian and cycle links between Crewe Railway Station and Crewe town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve accessibility to Crewe Railway Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural heritage and landscape</td>
<td>Conserve and enhance the area’s heritage (including its setting), landscape character, and townscapes; particularly those that are designated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protect, enhance and provide green infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusiveness</td>
<td>Provide an appropriate quantity and quality of housing to meet the needs of the Borough. This, which should include a mix of housing types, tenures and affordability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consider the needs of all sections of the community in order to achieve high levels of equality, diversity and social inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain and/or create vibrant rural communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a safe environment to live in and reduce fear of crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain and enhance community services and amenities to sustain the existing and future community of the Borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address levels of deprivation by improving access to education and training, and the links between these resources and employment opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>To promote a sustainable, competitive and low-carbon economy that benefits from a range of innovative and diverse businesses in both urban and rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of town and village centres with a balanced provision of retail, leisure, visitor and cultural facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positively manage the Borough’s diverse rural economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the supply of labour through improving access to job opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3: SA of alternatives

Introduction

3.1 In line with regulatory requirements there is a need to explain how work was undertaken to develop and then appraise reasonable alternatives, and how the Council then took into account appraisal findings when finalising the Draft CHAAP for publication. This includes an outline of the reasons for selecting alternatives dealt with.

3.2 This Chapter explains the work undertaken to date to develop reasonable alternatives for the emerging CHAAP, focusing on the following elements:

- Objectives to deliver the CHAAP vision and aims
- Consideration of development options relating to the CHAAP boundary and the overall quantum of development
- Consideration of development areas for improvement and regeneration

Background

3.3 The purpose of the CHAAP is to set detailed planning policies to guide planning decisions and manage the development implications presented by the Crewe Hub HS2 Station and its vicinity. The CHAAP will also set out policies to address a range of specific issues. Alternatives to policies were considered at an early stage, however, in respect of policies in the CHAAP, it is important to recognise that the majority directly relate to policies in the LPS (which have already been subject to SA through the development of the LPS); there are no significant changes in evidence or circumstances that indicate a need to revisit the alternatives appraisal findings in the LPS SA at this time.

3.4 The development of reasonable alternatives for policy themes is discussed further in Appendix E. Following this analysis, it has been determined that there were no reasonable alternatives for the majority of Draft CHAAP policy themes, and that it was a reasonable and proportionate approach to not carry out a formal alternatives appraisal at this time.\(^4\)

3.5 The exception to the above approach is with regards to the “General development policies” theme, where it was considered appropriate to carry out a formal appraisal of the options for the CHAAP boundary, as well as the amount of housing and employment proposed for the CHAAP area as the basis for proposed CHAAP Policies GD 1 “Crewe Hub Area Action Plan boundary” and GD 2 “Development strategy”.

Objectives

Developing the reasonable alternatives

3.6 The Draft CHAAP identifies a Vision and eight aims, with four Objectives to deliver them, which were drawn up based on current planning guidance, the existing policy framework, consideration of the relevant evidence base and the outcomes of consultations. There is no

---

\(^4\) Case-law (most notably Friends of the Earth Vs. Welsh Ministers, 2015) has established that planning authorities may apply discretion and planning judgement when determining what should reasonably be the focus of alternatives appraisal, recognising the need to apply a proportionate approach and ensure a SA process/report that is focused and accessible.
regulatory requirement to develop reasonable alternatives for Development Plan Document Objectives, only that they be tested against the SA Framework. Therefore the four Objectives subject to testing are:

**Objective 1: Maximising economic opportunities**

**Provide a new commercial district; the Crewe Commercial Hub, and mixed use commercial and residential development in other locations to support and enable the delivery of a HS2 Hub Station.**

This will be delivered by:

a. Supporting the delivery of new employment floorspace
b. Enabling the delivery of new homes, leisure and cultural facilities, enhanced public realm and a limited amount of ancillary retail
c. Capitalising on accessibility by supporting improved transport infrastructure
d. Supporting the on-going regeneration of Crewe town centre through:
   i. New and improved pedestrian links between the town centre and the HS2 Hub Station
   ii. A retail offer that serves the needs of travellers, visitors and new residents, but which does not compete with the existing town centre
   iii. The extensive regeneration of the Mill Street area, creating vibrant new neighbourhoods connected to both the town centre and the HS2 Hub Station

**Objective 2: Improving connectivity**

**Development across the Crewe Hub will embed advanced digital infrastructure and vastly improve physical connectivity and accessibility to, from and around the Crewe Hub Station, and across the wider sub-region.**

This will be achieved through:

a. Integrating digital and smart technology in the fabric of new development
b. The delivery of a HS2 Hub Station with:
   i. Rail infrastructure to accommodate 5/7 HS2 trains per hour and that enables enhanced operational capacity to improve local and regional rail connectivity
   ii. A primary entrance on Weston Road providing main vehicular access and a local transport hub
   iii. A reconfigured entrance on Nantwich Road focussed on pedestrian and cyclist access
   iv. A new pedestrian access at Gresty Road creating a transfer deck and pedestrian link through the railway station to Weston Road
   v. An improved public realm adjoining the railway station
c. Successfully managing increased vehicular demand through:
   i. Minimising conflicts with local trips by ensuring that vehicles are directed to both the Strategic Road Network and major road network
ii. Increasing highway capacity to unlock development land and allow efficient operation of the highway network, particularly in relation to vehicle movements crossing the West Coast Mainline within the Crewe Hub

iii. Future proofing the transport network to ensure that it can fully adapt and capitalise on emerging opportunities (such as electric, self driving and on-demand vehicles) that improve journey time reliability and reduce vehicle emissions

iv. Consolidation of local parking provision and increased parking capacity close to the railway station

v. Creating a safe, high quality journey experience and maximising the use of sustainable transport modes by walking, cycling, bus and rail through new and improved links

vi. Establishing a local transport interchange adjoining the HS2 Hub Station on Weston Road, connecting the town centre

Objective 3: Delivering sustainable development

Development across the Crewe Hub will be underpinned by appropriate environmental and social infrastructure that also contributes to sustainable place making.

This will be delivered by:

a. Ensuring new development delivers zero net greenhouse gas emissions through a range of measures both on and off site

b. The provision of social, health, education and green infrastructure across the Crewe Hub

c. Creating new and unique homes through a variety and mix of modern, excellently designed apartments and town houses as part of a mixed use development in walking distance of the HS2 Hub Station; reducing the need to travel

d. Supporting skills and jobs by levying contributions to local education and skills-based training associated with the delivery needs of HS2 and other development across the Crewe Hub

e. Ensuring development supports and enables healthier and positive lifestyles through an improved leisure, recreation, sport and cultural offer

f. A net gain in biodiversity through a network of green infrastructure that retains, improves and provides new valuable habitats

g. Creating a sustainable solution to the water environment and improving overall water quality in the area

Objective 4: Improving environmental quality

A new innovative design dynamic will be promoted across the Crewe Hub with an emphasis on enhancing environmental quality through development that is coherent, connected and makes best use of local character and heritage to establish a sense of place.

This will be achieved through:

a. Outstanding station design including exceptionally high quality frontages that create a positive transition between the HS2 Hub Station and the local area
b. Creating a new townscape with active ground floor use and skyline of increased height and quality

c. An improved urban landscape, more recognisably connected to Cheshire’s countryside through integrated green infrastructure

d. The delivery of a high quality public realm

e. Retaining and integrating valuable heritage in new development

f. Delivering landmark buildings of exceptional design quality in key locations

g. Building design that fully integrates environmentally sustainable measures and that improves the image and function of the Crewe Hub

Appraising the Objectives

3.7 The following section sets out the method and summary appraisal findings for the Objectives.

3.8 A detailed method for the appraisal of the Objectives is presented in Appendix C, however, in summary the appraisal seeks to categorise the performance of each Objective against the sustainability topics in terms of ‘significant effects’ (using red or green shading).

3.9 A summary of the appraisal findings for the Objectives identified in ¶3.6 of this Report is provided below. Detailed appraisal findings are presented in Appendix C.

3.10 Objective 1 focuses on the development of a new commercial district (the Crewe Commercial Hub), which could have a negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna, and water and soil through the instigation of development; however mitigation is available through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. Objective 1 was found to have a potential positive effect against topics relating population and human health, air quality, transport, cultural heritage and landscape, social inclusiveness and economic development as there may be potential for a critical mass to be reached in terms of infrastructure provision, opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle and the visual improvement of the existing area.

3.11 Objective 2 focuses on connectivity and accessibility, including the delivery of the HS2 Hub Station. This could provide the circumstances to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle and take part in active travel, with the potential to improve air quality, reduce inequality and improve human health for example, with positive effects against topics relating to population and human health, air quality, transport, social inclusiveness and economic development. However, it does result in negative effects on biodiversity, flora and fauna, water and soil, and cultural heritage and landscape through the instigation of development and potential impact on Listed Buildings; but mitigation is available though LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies.

3.12 Objective 3 focuses on sustainable development. This could provide a range of infrastructure (including green infrastructure) to meet the needs of existing and new residents with the potential to reduce inequality, improve human health, improve air quality, with positive effects against topics relating to population and human health, water and soil, air quality, climatic factors, transport, cultural heritage and landscape, social inclusiveness, and economic development. However, it does result in potential negative effects on biodiversity, flora and fauna; but mitigation is available through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies.
3.13 Objective 4 focuses on environmental quality. This could provide the circumstances to create pleasing environments for business growth and efficiently use land through an increase in building heights, with a positive effect against topics relating to water and soil, cultural heritage and landscape, and economic development. However, it does result in potential negative effects on biodiversity, flora and fauna, and air quality through intensification of development; but mitigation is available through LPS, proposed CHAAP Policies, and CNLPP Policies.

3.14 In conclusion, the appraisal has found that, read as a whole, the objectives of the CHAAP are unlikely to have any significant negative effects. Ultimately, the nature and significance of effects against the majority of topics will be dependent on how they are taken forward, both through final policy proposals and subsequent implementation. It is considered that mitigation provided through Local Plan Policies and available at the project level should make sure that there are no significant negative effects.

Development Options

Developing the reasonable alternatives

3.15 The LPS sets out the policy context in which the CHAAP is being prepared and in particular, Strategic Location LPS 1 "Central Crewe" establishes a series of detailed principles that should underpin development in a broad area of Crewe including the existing Railway Station and the town centre.

3.16 The Crewe Masterplan 2017 further investigated many of these issues in seeking to understand a high level approach to enabling HS2 growth for Crewe. In particular, this work helped refine the issues of connectivity between Crewe’s key centres and set out a series of ‘key moves’ that could improve the urban structure of the town and unlock growth potential.

3.17 In October 2018 the Constellation Partnership published its HS2 Growth Strategy identifying the potential to deliver some 3,700 homes and 20,000 jobs close to the future HS2 Hub Station.

3.18 In November 2018 the Council embarked on its first consultation toward the development of a Crewe Station Hub Area Action Plan by publishing an Issues Paper. This identified a series of key issues the CHAAP could consider and sought input on the approach that could be taken in developing a planning framework to manage growth around the Railway Station.

3.19 The issues explored through the LPS, Crewe Masterplan and CHAAP Issues Paper were refined to put forward a vision for the area, a set of aims, a series of objectives, emerging policies and land use ideas based on delivering the aspirational growth opportunities identified in the Constellation Partnerships HS2 Strategy.

3.20 Based on the Constellation Partnership’s growth aspirations to deliver 3,700 homes and 20,000 jobs in the area around a HS2 Hub Station, a series of residential and employment quantum options were developed. This was done through the establishment of a potential level of residential and office-use floorspace, by considering development opportunities in the land blocks around the Railway Station. The overall gross external area of each land use was calculated and then, using established approaches to calculating job densities and
the Nationally Described Space Standards, converted into residential units or potential number of jobs. Further information on how the number of units were calculated is set out in the 'Developing the Crewe Hub Area Action Plan Boundary and Development Options' paper.

3.21 The quantum options have been developed at a high level by using standard recognised assumptions but do not represent a finalised position on growth capacity either from a position of supporting what is desirable or what is deliverable in land use terms. Further work is required to understand the detailed level of development that could be accommodated, and the figures presented represent a meaningful, rather than precise, approach to understanding the difference between what each option is capable of delivering. In terms of retail floorspace, this was calculated at 0.5% of the total site area for each boundary option.

3.22 The boundary options have been established through investigating the wider urban context of Crewe and its functionality, in particular developing an understanding of how its key centres relate to one another. This was investigated in detail through the Crewe Masterplan 2017, which further highlighted the current disconnection and severance between key centres that, if addressed, could help to unlock Crewe’s potential.

3.23 Focusing on the relationship of the HS2 Hub Station to the town centre and Grand Junction Retail Park then led to an investigation of the development opportunities around the Railway Station itself.

3.24 To provide some context and structure in which to form ideas, a series of ‘broad opportunity areas’ were developed based on distance and time from the Railway Station and the potential to accommodate key land use issues associated with the Objectives.

3.25 Subsequently, four opportunity areas were identified, further information on which is set out in the 'Developing the Crewe Hub Area Action Plan Boundary and Development Options' paper:

1. Core Station Hub
2. Primary Opportunity Area
3. Secondary Opportunity Area
4. Peripheral Opportunity Area

3.26 Each opportunity area could perform a different function supporting delivery of specific land uses identified in the CHAAP Objectives. Accordingly, a high level development strategy was set out to describe the potential role and function of each area, and then used alongside the development quantum options to establish the potential development Options.

3.27 Therefore, taking into account the boundary Options and quantum Options, three development Options were identified, which were developed to take account of three factors:

1. Delivering the growth aspirations established through the Constellation Partnership's HS2 Growth Strategy
2. Understanding broad opportunity areas – the spatial geographies in which Objectives of the CHAAP could potentially be delivered

3. Developing a high level development strategy, which has been applied across the opportunity areas. The configuration of each Option captures different opportunities presented by this strategy

### 3.28 The Options are:

- **Option 1: Commercial and regeneration led** - investigates using a restrained boundary to deliver a lower quantum of development, but which satisfies growth aspirations and the emerging Vision, aims and Objectives
- **Option 2: Mixed use led** - uses an extended boundary to exceed growth aspirations, enables more flexibility of land supply and the ability to plan for wider opportunities
- **Option 3: Opportunity and market led** - hybrid of Options 1 and 2, which exceeds growth aspirations over a land area and offers a balance of key opportunities

### 3.29 The development Options needed to take into account the Vision, aims and Objectives of the CHAAP, and be achievable. They also should have addressed any issues identified. Table 3.1 explains in further detail the three Options that were subject to testing.

#### Table 3.1 Development Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use type</th>
<th>Option 1: Commercial and regeneration led</th>
<th>Option 2: Mixed use led</th>
<th>Option 3: Opportunity and market led</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area (excluding rail tracks)</td>
<td>31ha</td>
<td>128ha</td>
<td>149ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office use</td>
<td>25,300 jobs</td>
<td>26,150 jobs</td>
<td>35,300 jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1,500 homes</td>
<td>3,700 homes</td>
<td>6,550 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1,550sq.m</td>
<td>6,400sq.m</td>
<td>7,450sq.m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary description**

- **Option 1:**
  - a level of development that meets growth aspirations
  - focus on office led development and mixed use regeneration
  - restraint applied to residential development
  - office led development to be more intensely focused in the primary opportunity area, with mixed use regeneration in the secondary opportunity area to the north west

- **Option 2:**
  - a level of development that meets and exceeds growth aspirations
  - development dispersed across the primary and secondary opportunity areas
  - high levels of mixed use led schemes, including residential

- **Option 3:**
  - a level of development that significantly exceeds growth aspirations
  - development dispersed over primary, secondary and peripheral opportunity areas
  - peripheral opportunity areas included to enable a market led approach and establish a delivery framework for highways and other infrastructure

### Appraising the reasonable alternatives

3.30 The following section sets out the method and the summary appraisal findings for development Options.
3.31 A detailed method for the appraisal of the development Options is presented in Appendix D, however, in summary the appraisal seeks to categorise the performance of each option against the sustainability topics in terms of ‘significant effects’ (using red or green shading) and also rank the alternatives in relative order of performance. Where it is not possible to differentiate between all alternatives, ‘=’ is used.

3.32 A summary of the appraisal findings for the development Options identified in ¶3.27 of this Report is provided in Table 3.2. Detailed appraisal findings are presented in Appendix D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and human health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and soil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climatic factors</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural heritage and landscape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.33 The appraisal found no significant differences between the Options in relation to climatic factors.

3.34 Option 1 looks to focus development in the Primary opportunity area ("POA"), with additional development in part of the Secondary opportunity area ("SOA"), therefore any effects are limited to a relatively smaller area. This option could have a negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna, water and soil, and cultural heritage and landscape through the instigation of development, the potential for loss of amenity greenspace and the effect on the historic environment for example; however, mitigation is available though LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. Option 1 was found to have potential positive effects against sustainability topics relating to population and human health, air quality, transport, social inclusiveness and economic development as there may be potential for a critical mass to be reached in terms of infrastructure provision, opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle and the visual improvement of the existing area for example.

3.35 Option 2 looks to focus development in the POA and SOA, therefore any effects are spread over a slightly larger area than Option 1. This Option could have a negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna, water and soil, and cultural heritage and landscape through the instigation of development, the potential for loss of amenity greenspace and the effects on a watercourse and the historic environment for example; however, mitigation is available though LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. Option 2 was found to have potential positive effects against sustainability topics relating to population and human health, air quality,
transport, social inclusiveness and economic development as there may be potential for a critical mass to be reached in terms of infrastructure provision, opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle and the visual improvement of the existing area, for example.

3.36 Option 3 looks to distribute development across all three opportunity areas, therefore any effects are spread over a relatively larger area. This Option could have a negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna, water and soil, and cultural heritage and landscape through the instigation of development, the potential for loss of amenity greenspace, effects on a watercourse and the historic environment, and potential for effects on a LWS and SBI for example; however, mitigation is available through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. Option 3 was found to have potential positive effects against sustainability topics relating to population and human health, air quality, transport, social inclusiveness and economic development as there is a greater likelihood of a critical mass being reached in terms of infrastructure provision (compared to the other Options), opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle and the visual improvement of the existing area, for example.

3.37 In conclusion, the appraisal found that there is little difference between the Options; there is a variance as to the amount of growth each Option would accommodate and the area of land covered. However, none of the Options are likely to have a significant negative effect. Although Option 3 was the best performing under four of the sustainability topics, Option 2 performs well across all of the topics. Mitigation provided through Local Plan Policies and available at the project level should make sure that there are no major negative effects. Ultimately the nature and significance of effects against the majority of topics will be dependent on the precise location of development.

Reasons for selecting the preferred approach

3.38 Appendix D of this Report sets out a detailed appraisal of each Option by SA topic. Table 3.3 provides an outline of the reasons for the progression/non-progression of options for the development strategy where relevant. It should be noted that whilst the SA findings are considered by the Council in its selection of options and forms part of the evidence base for supporting the CHAAP, the SA findings are not the sole basis for a decision; other factors set out and considered in the 'Developing the Crewe Hub Area Action Plan Boundary and Development Options' paper such as distance from the HS2 Hub Station and design quality also play a key role in the decision process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Reasons for progression or non-progression of the Option in plan-making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: Commercial and regeneration led</td>
<td>The approach has not been progressed as it does not take full advantage of the opportunities presented by an enhanced HS2 service to Crewe and does not fully realise Crewe’s potential as a nationally important economic centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: Mixed use led</td>
<td>Option 2 (mixed use led) has been progressed as it enables Crewe to take full advantage of opportunities provided by HS2. It also allows Crewe to fully realise its potential as a nationally important economic centre. This Option includes a quantum of growth that can be successfully accommodated in design terms and managed in highways terms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Options | Reasons for progression or non-progression of the Option in plan-making
---|---
Option 3: Opportunity and market led | The approach has not been progressed as it includes peripheral areas of land at some distance from the HS2 Hub Station, the development of which is less certain and may not be realised until beyond the time frame of the CHAAP. The Option requires a density of development that may compromise design quality through a need for increased height of buildings, and could therefore compromise the creation of quality of place. The Option also requires a quantum of development that could have a significant impact on the efficient operation of the local highways network.

Development areas

Developing the development areas

3.39 The Draft CHAAP proposes six ‘Development Areas’ and a set of policy principles that will be developed within them. These areas were established to take account of the emerging land use requirements that may be necessary in order to deliver the vision, aims and objectives of the CHAAP.

3.40 Previously, ten potential opportunity areas were identified in the Crewe Station Hub Area Action Plan Development Strategy (“CSHAAP”) of January 2019. This document set out a broad set of development principles that could be progressed within each of the areas and identified each on a base map; no firm boundaries for any area were established and no policy intentions were attached to them.

3.41 The CSHAAP included three boundary options and Opportunity Areas were proposed across the widest area under consideration. Following consultation on this paper, and additional evidence, the opportunity areas were renamed ‘Development Areas’ and reconfigured with new defined boundaries and a set of policy principles that could underpin development in the future. It is these development area options that we consider to be reasonable alternatives and they have therefore been subject to SA.

3.42 The Draft CHAAP identifies a preferred overall boundary and quantum of growth to be taken forward in the submission version of the CHAAP, later in 2019. The preferred option carried forward was Option 2: Mixed Use Led. This boundary choice has determined the geography within which each Development Area could be established.

3.43 The six Development Areas identified within the preferred boundary are:

- DA 1 Mill Street
- DA 2 Gresty Road
- DA 3 Macon Way
- DA 4 Weston Road
- DA 5 Crewe Commercial Hub
- DA 6 Nantwich Road Corridor

3.44 The extent of the Development Areas was also informed by:
• physical boundaries created by the road and rail network
• existing land uses
• potential future land uses
• constraints

3.45 Clearly, each of the proposed Development Areas could be further subdivided, however, each is proposed due to their overall coherence in relation to their physical boundaries and operational character both now and in the future, even where such land uses may be varied from one to another within an area. Further information is set out in the 'Establishing the Development Areas' paper.

Appraising the development areas

3.46 The following section sets out the method for appraising the development areas.

Method

3.47 A detailed method for the appraisal of the development areas is presented in Appendix F of this Report, however, in summary the appraisal employs GIS datasets, site visits, measuring, qualitative analysis and planning judgement to see how each development area relates to various constraint and opportunity features.

3.48 Several evidence based documents and assessments have informed the Council's decision-making process to determine the preferred approach to establish and appraise the development area options including the ‘Establishing the Development Areas’ paper, SA findings and the HRA.

Reasons for selecting the development areas

3.49 Appendix F sets out the approach to the SA of development areas. It should be noted that whilst the SA findings are considered by the Council in its selection of development areas and forms part of the evidence base supporting the Local Plan, the SA findings are not the sole basis for decision making; other factors set out in detail in the 'Establishing the Development areas' paper, have informed the Council's approach to decision making. Reasons for progression of the development areas are included in Appendix F (Table F.3).
Chapter 4: SA of the Draft Plan

Introduction

4.1 The aim of this Chapter is to present an appraisal of the Draft CHAAP, as currently published under Regulation 18 of the Local Planning Regulations.

Methodology

4.2 As explained in Chapter 2 (Scope of the SA), the SA objectives and topics identified at the scoping stage provide a methodological framework to undertake the SA. Nine SA topics were identified and these are:

- Biodiversity, flora and fauna
- Population and human health
- Water and soil
- Air
- Climatic factors
- Transport
- Cultural heritage and landscape
- Social inclusiveness
- Economic development

4.3 For each of the SA topics identified in ¶4.2 of this Report an appraisal narrative has been produced that evaluates the ‘likely significant effects’ of the plan on the baseline, with reference to sites and the policies that will provide mitigation. A final section at the end of each SA topic summarises the appraisal and provides a conclusion for the plan as a whole.

4.4 The appraisal narrative for each topic takes into account the effect characteristics and ‘significance criteria’ presented in Schedules 1 and 2 of the SEA Regulations. So, for example, where necessary, account is taken of the probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of effects as far as possible. Cumulative effects are considered, that is, the potential for the Draft CHAAP to impact an aspect of the baseline when implemented alongside other plans, programmes and projects in Chapter 5 of this Report.

4.5 It is important to note that the SEA Regulations require the evaluation of significant effects; therefore, there is no need or requirement to refer to every single policy in the appraisal narrative. Specific policies are referred to as necessary.

4.6 The process of Plan making can be considered high level in nature and proportionate to the matter identified, that is, a process that omits consideration of some detailed issues in the knowledge that these can be addressed further down the line (through the planning application process). Given this, there will be a number of uncertainties and assumptions made in the appraisal narrative, and where necessary, these have been explained.
4.7 Although, under each of the nine appraisal topics, there is a need to focus on the draft plan as a whole, it is helpful to break up the appraisal and give stand alone consideration to the various elements of the Draft CHAAP. Therefore each of the nine appraisal narratives have been broken down under the following headings, which contain reference to policies/proposals, where appropriate:

- General development policies
- General design and heritage policies
- General infrastructure policies
- General transport and highways policies
- Development areas

Appraisal of the Draft CHAAP

Biodiversity, flora and fauna

General development policies

4.8 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 “Development strategy” suggests an overall level of development for the Crewe Hub area. Due to the nature of the Crewe Hub area, development is highly likely to be directed to brownfield sites, which means that it is possible to minimise the loss of greenfield land. The increase in housing distributed to Crewe will result in an increased population, which in turn may increase pressure on biodiversity sites through increased demand for leisure and recreation. This means that there is potential for a long term negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna, the significance of which will be dependent on other CHAAP and LPS policies. Development can also lead to an increase in traffic, and therefore an increase in atmospheric pollution, which could have a long term minor negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna.

4.9 It is worth noting that proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 also requires the provision of green infrastructure, including high quality recreation and open space.

4.10 The HRA Screening Assessment for the Draft CHAAP determined that the Draft CHAAP could potentially have significant adverse effects due to the potential for increased air pollution and recreational impacts, both alone and in combination with other plans, on the following sites:

- Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 1 Ramsar
- Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 2 Ramsar
- West Midlands Mosses SAC

4.11 An Appropriate assessment as part of the HRA was then undertaken to consider the European Sites identified above and potential issues in more detail in order to determine whether the Draft CHAAP has the potential to result in significant adverse effects on the integrity of identified European Sites, either alone or in combination with a number of other plans.

4.12 The Assessment identified that the existing policies and provisions in the Cheshire East Council LPS and CHAAP in relation to the provision of green infrastructure and outdoor space, sport, leisure and recreation facilities, will make sure that the Local Plan will have no
adverse effects on these European sites in relation to recreational pressure. The arrival of HS2 and the plan’s improvements to public transport, pedestrian and cycling facilities across the Hub Area will lead to a trend in decreasing reliance on cars on the main road network around Crewe. The habitats sensitive to nitrogen deposition within the affected European Sites are also considered to be located sufficiently far from the road network as to not be adversely impacted by any CHAAP-related traffic increases.

4.13 The CHAAP will therefore not have any adverse impacts upon the integrity of any European sites.

4.14 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 4 “Improving connections between the town centre and railway station” seeks to provide high quality pedestrian and cycle networks. This could encourage walking and the use of cycles, which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna, with a potential improvement in air quality and noise levels.

4.15 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 5 “Enabling sustainable transport interchange” seeks to incorporate measures to facilitate the use of walking, cycling and public transport. This measure could improve air quality, which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna, with reduced travel movements likely to reduce noise levels that may disturb wildlife.

General design and heritage policies

4.16 Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 1 “Design and integration of development” requires the provision of green infrastructure, which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna.

General infrastructure policies

4.17 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 1 “New infrastructure” requires contributions to and/or the provision of green infrastructure, which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna.

4.18 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 4 “Green infrastructure” requires the provision of green infrastructure as well as the delivery of biodiversity net-gain, making sure that (where possible) new provision is linked to existing habitats. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna.

4.19 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 “Transport and highways infrastructure” looks to support improvements to air quality and the reduction of traffic emissions, which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna through a potential improvement in air quality. The proposed policy also promotes sustainable transport and requires the provision of a high quality public transport interchange that provides onward travel information to encourage integration with other transport modes including walking and cycling. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna, with a potential improvement in air quality and noise levels.
General transport and highways policies

4.20 Proposed CHAAP Policy **TH 1 “Accessible car parks”** seeks to provide electric vehicle charging points and secured cycle parking. This could encourage the use of electric vehicles and cycles, which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna, with a potential improvement in air quality and noise levels. However, the provision of car parks can be seen as encouraging car use, which is likely to result in increased traffic, a decline in air quality and an increase in noise levels that may disturb wildlife. This is likely to have a long term minor negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna.

4.21 Proposed CHAAP Policy **TH 2 “Well managed car parks”** looks to provide additional car parking to accommodate rail passenger growth forecasts. The provision of car parks can be seen as encouraging car use, which is likely to result in increased traffic, a decline in air quality and an increase in noise levels that may disturb wildlife. This is likely to have a long term minor negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna.

4.22 The introduction of bus priority measures through proposed CHAAP Policy **TH 3 “Bus priority”** could make the use of buses more attractive as priority measures will allow buses to avoid some areas of potential traffic congestion, reducing journey times as well as emissions from queuing traffic (improving air quality) and noise levels that may disturb wildlife. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna.

4.23 Proposed CHAAP Policy **TH 4 “Taxi and PHV areas”** seeks to provide electric vehicle charging points. This could encourage the use of electric vehicles, which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna, with a potential improvement in air quality and noise levels that may disturb wildlife.

Development areas

4.24 All the proposed development areas have been assessed with appraisal findings presented in Appendix F of this Report. There are two areas of the assessment that are considered to relate to biodiversity, flora and fauna — these being ecology and contamination; the development areas are considered under these headings.

Ecology

- All of the proposed development areas have the potential for a long term minor negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna, being assessed as amber. This is because they fall within Natural England’s SSSI Impact Risk Zone for Wybunbury Moss, and there is potential for bat roosting and breeding birds.
- All of the proposed policy principles require an element of green infrastructure, which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna.
- The high level HRA screening identified that part of proposed development area **DA 1 “Mill Street”** falls within 5km of Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 1 Ramsar and West Midlands Mosses SAC (component site Wybunbury Moss SSSI), therefore residential developments could lead to recreational impacts upon this European site. No hydrological or air quality impacts were identified due to the distance of this area from all European sites. **DA 1** has therefore been considered through an appropriate assessment in respect of recreation impacts on Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 1 Ramsar and West Midlands.
Mosses SAC. The appropriate assessment process has identified that there would be no adverse impact on site integrity.

- The high level HRA screening identified that proposed development area DA 2 "Gresty Road" falls within 5km of Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 1 Ramsar and West Midlands Mosses SAC (component site Wyburnbury Moss SSSI), therefore residential developments could lead to recreational impacts upon this European site. No hydrological or air quality impacts were identified due to the distance of this area from all European sites. DA 2 has therefore been considered through an appropriate assessment in respect of recreation impacts on Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 1 Ramsar and West Midlands Mosses SAC. The appropriate assessment process has identified that there would be no adverse impact on site integrity.

- Proposed policy principle DA 3 "Macon Way" requires enhancement of the Valley Brook river corridor.

- The high level HRA screening has not identified any recreational or hydrological impacts due to the distance that proposed development area DA 4 "Weston Road" is from the nearest European site and the lack of residential provision. However, the provision of 2,000 car parking spaces may encourage cars onto the main road network around Crewe, where it falls within 200m of the European sites. DA 4 has therefore been considered through an appropriate assessment in respect of air quality impacts on Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 1 Ramsar (Wyburnbury Moss SSSI), Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 2 Ramsar (Oakhanger Moss SSSI, Black Firs and Cranberry Moss SSSI) and West Midlands Mosses SAC (Wyburnbury Moss SSSI). The appropriate assessment process has identified that there would be no adverse impact on site integrity.

**Contamination**

- As all the development areas contain mainly brownfield land, it is assumed that there is a potential for contamination issues. The development areas are also close to railways, which can often be contaminated due to historic railway operations. Policy provides the opportunity to remediate contamination levels, for example LPS Policy SE 12 “Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability”.

**Appraisal of the draft plan as a whole**

4.25 Although there are no specific proposed policies in the Draft CHAAP that directly relate to the protection of biodiversity, flora and fauna, it is considered that the existing policies in the LPS look to offer a high level of protection for designated and non-designated sites of biodiversity importance and look to enhance provision wherever possible.

4.26 It is recommended that any proposal should seek a net gain for biodiversity, where possible.
Population and human health

General development policies

4.27 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 “Development strategy” seeks to deliver sufficient growth in order to meet residential needs arising from the demand to locate in a sustainable location served by a high frequency of rail and public transport services. The more housing an area is allocated could potentially mean that there are more opportunities to provide infrastructure (and therefore a long term positive effect) to enable healthy and active lifestyles. However, if the critical mass is not reached there will be a resulting increase in pressure on existing services, resulting in a long term negative effect. Although Crewe, as a Principal Town, is seen as a larger settlement, relative to the Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres, it is likely that services and facilities are within walking and cycling distance due to the potential links between the CHAAP area and the town centre. However, the significance of effects will be dependent on other CHAAP and LPS policies.

4.28 It is also worth noting that proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 also seeks to provide public realm improvements as well as green infrastructure including high quality recreation and open space to service the recreation and leisure needs of residents, for example.

4.29 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 3 "Supporting the Crewe Hub station and maximising opportunities" looks to maximise the provision of local employment opportunities, providing the chance for members of the community to access jobs. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on population and human health.

4.30 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 4 “Improving connections between the town centre and railway station” seeks to improve connections between the Crewe Hub station and the town centre, with physical access not impeded. This includes the provision of high quality pedestrian and cycle networks. This is considered to have a long term minor positive effect on population on human health; in particular promoting active travel is thought to contribute greatly to those with poor mental wellbeing, and could help those that are currently physically inactive or at risk of cardiovascular disease and obesity. Active travel can also help to reduce noise and air pollution from traffic.

4.31 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 5 “Enabling sustainable transport interchange” seeks to incorporate measures to facilitate the use of walking, cycling and public transport. This is considered to have a long term minor positive effect on population on human health; in particular promoting active travel is thought to contribute greatly to those with poor mental wellbeing, and could help those that are currently physically inactive or at risk of cardiovascular disease and obesity. Active travel and the use of public transport can also help to reduce noise and air pollution from traffic.

General design and heritage policies

4.32 Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 1 "Design and integration of development" looks to raise the design standards in the area. This includes improving the quality of design and the public realm. A well-designed public environment can contribute to a feeling of wellbeing. Therefore this proposed policy is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on population and human health. Policy DH 1 requires the provision of green infrastructure, which has the
potential for a long term minor positive effect on population and human health, as there are mental health benefits from access to green infrastructure as well as opportunities for recreation.

**General infrastructure policies**

4.33 Proposed CHAAP Policy **IN 1 "New infrastructure"** requires development to contribute to and/or make provision for, infrastructure. This includes social and green infrastructure. Therefore this proposed policy is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on population and human health as there are mental health benefits from access to green infrastructure as well as opportunities for recreation.

4.34 Proposed CHAAP Policy **IN 3 “Social infrastructure – local employment and skills based training”** seeks to maximise local employment opportunities and help address skills deficits, which provides the chance for members of the community to access jobs. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on population and human health.

4.35 Proposed CHAAP Policy **IN 4 “Green infrastructure”** requires the provision of green infrastructure, which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on population and human health as there are mental health benefits from access to green infrastructure as well as opportunities for recreation.

4.36 Proposed CHAAP Policy **IN 5 “Transport and highways infrastructure”** looks to provide a high quality public transport interchange that provides onward travel information to encourage integration with other transport modes including walking and cycling. This is considered to have a long term minor positive effect on population on human health; in particular promoting active travel is thought to contribute greatly to those with poor mental wellbeing, and could help those that are currently physically inactive or at risk of cardiovascular disease and obesity. Active travel can also help to reduce noise and air pollution from traffic. The proposed policy also supports schemes that reduce traffic emissions, with the potential for an improvement in air quality.

**General transport and highways policies**

4.37 Proposed CHAAP Policy **TH 1 “Accessible car parks”** seeks to provide secured cycle parking. This could encourage the use of cycles, and hence active transport, which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on population and human health.

**Development areas**

4.38 All the proposed development areas have been assessed with appraisal findings presented in Appendix F of this Report. There are three areas of the assessment that are considered to relate to population and human health – these being neighbouring uses, accessibility, and contamination; the development areas are considered under these headings.
Neighbouring uses

- Three of the proposed development areas are adjacent to a railway line (DA 1 “Mill Street”, DA 2 “Gresty Road”, and DA 3 “Macon Way”) LPS Policy SE 12 “Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability” will help to minimise the impact of this.
- Proposed policy principle DA 2 “Gresty Road” requires development that adjoins existing residential areas to the south of the development area to make sure that the amenity of existing occupiers is not harmed.

Accessibility

- All of the development areas meet the minimum standards for access to nearly all the services and facilities identified in the Accessibility Assessment (see Appendix G of this Report), with the potential for a long term minor positive effect.
- Proposed policy principle DA 1 “Mill Street” requires development to contribute directly or through financial contributions to the delivery of the Crewe Hub Green Link. This link will include pedestrian and cycleways.
- It is assumed through proposed policy principle DA 2 “Gresty Road” that the Crewe Alexandra Stadium will remain in place. The proposed policy principle also requires pedestrians and cycle access to the HS2 Hub Station entrance and for a high quality public realm to be easily accessible by pedestrians and cyclists.
- Proposed policy principle DA 3 “Macon Way” requires the creation of an arterial pedestrian and cycle route through the development area as well as access to the Valley Brook corridor to be enhanced.
- Public realm works are required to incorporate pedestrian access through proposed policy principles DA 4 “Weston Road” and DA 5 “Commercial Hub”.
- Pedestrian and cyclist access should be integrated into a new entrance to the HS2 Hub Station, as required through proposed policy principle DA 6 “Nantwich Road Corridor”. Priority should also be given to pedestrians and cyclists.

Contamination

- As all the development areas contain mainly brownfield land, it is assumed that there is a potential for contamination issues. The development areas are also close to railways, which can often be contaminated due to historic railway operations. Policy provides the opportunity to remediate contamination levels, for example LPS Policy SE 12 “Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability”.

Appraisal of the draft plan as a whole

4.39 The proposed policies in the Draft CHAAP, along with existing policies in the LPS, look to provide opportunities for active travel, and provision of green infrastructure.

4.40 It is recommended that any proposal should seek a net gain for green/open space where possible, along with further improvements to provide opportunities for active transport.

4.41 A Health Impact Assessment has been carried out for the Draft CHAAP (see Appendix I of this Report). It found that the Draft CHAAP, read alongside the LPS, seeks to meet the needs of all socioeconomic and equalities groups through policy. It has a positive impact
particularly for older persons, unemployed people, children aged 5 to 12, low income households, families with children, and people with restricted mobility, with any negative impacts mitigated through Policy or the use of planning conditions.
Water and soil

General development policies

4.42 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 “Development strategy” suggests an overall level of development for the Crewe Hub area. Due to the nature of the Crewe Hub area, development is highly likely to be directed to brownfield sites, which means that it is possible to minimise the loss of greenfield land. However, if development uses any of the limited greenfield land in the CHAAP boundary, this is likely to increase the area of paved surfaces, decreasing rainwater infiltration and increasing runoff. Additional development in Crewe will lead to an increase in demand for water as well. There is also likely to be an increase in the amount of waste produced from the additional development. Therefore there is potential for a long term negative effect on water and soil, the significance of which will be dependent on other CHAAP and LPS policies.

4.43 It is also worth noting the proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 also requires the provision of green infrastructure.

General design and heritage policies

4.44 Proposed Policy DH 1 “Design and integration of development” requires the provision of green infrastructure, which has the potential for a long term minor positive effect on water and soil, due to the possibility of an increase in rainwater infiltration and a decrease in run-off. An increase in building heights, as required by Policy DH 1 is likely to have a positive effect on soil, through the efficient use of land.

General infrastructure policies

4.45 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 1 "New infrastructure" requires development to contribute to and/or make provision for, infrastructure. This includes green and water infrastructure. Therefore this proposed policy is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on water and soil, through helping to increase rainwater infiltration and reduce run-off and taking into account future drainage needs.

4.46 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 4 “Green infrastructure” requires the integration of sustainable drainage and features designed to minimise surface water runoff, manage flood risk and maintain the natural water cycle. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on water and soil. Additionally, the proposed policy requires the provision of green infrastructure, which is also likely to have a long term minor positive effect on water and soil, through helping to increase rainwater infiltration and reduce run-off.

4.47 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 “Transport and highways infrastructure” looks to support highways measures, the majority of which would take place on brownfield land. There is potential for the proposed improvement scheme at Crewe Arms roundabout to use greenfield land that forms part of the existing roundabout, which is likely to have a long term minor negative effect on water and soil, through an increase in the area of paved surfaces, decreasing rainwater infiltration and increasing runoff.
General transport and highways policies

4.48 Proposed CHAAP Policy TH 1 "Accessible car parks" looks to provide car parks close to the proposed Crewe Hub Station entrance. If the car parking is on brownfield land then it is unlikely to have a negative effect on water and soil. However, if it uses any of the limited greenfield land in the CHAAP boundary, this is likely to increase the area of paved surfaces, decreasing rainwater infiltration and increasing runoff. The Policy requires the use of permeable materials and the incorporation of on-site attenuation to reduce runoff rates and aid infiltration. Therefore this policy is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on water and soil.

4.49 Proposed CHAAP Policy TH 2 “Well managed car parks” seeks to accommodate car parking in line with rail passenger forecasts. If the car parking is on brownfield land then it is unlikely to have a negative effect on water and soil. However, if it uses any of the limited greenfield land in the CHAAP boundary, this is likely to increase the area of paved surfaces, decreasing rainwater infiltration and increasing runoff.

Development areas

4.50 All the proposed development areas have been assessed with appraisal findings presented in Appendix F of this Report. There are five areas of the assessment that are considered to relate to water and soil – these being flooding/drainage, minerals, brownfield/greenfield, agriculture, and contamination; the development areas are considered under these headings.

Flooding/drainage

- The majority of the development areas do not have any known flooding or drainage issues, with the potential for long term minor positive effects on water and soil. As all of the development areas contain a large amount of brownfield land, there is an opportunity to introduce measures that can improve the ability of water to infiltrate into the ground through policies including LPS Policy SE 13 “Flood Risk and Water Management” and proposed CHAAP Policy IN 4 “Green infrastructure”.
- Around a third of development area DA 3 “Macon Way” is in flood zone 2, and there is also an area of DA 3 in flood zone 3. The proposed policy principle requires development to be located outside of the identified flood risk area, and for it to mitigate known flood risks and demonstrate how surface water can be appropriately managed.

Minerals

- All the sites are in a Minerals Safeguarding Area, with development areas DA 1 “Mill Street” and DA 3 “Macon Way” also in the 250m buffer zone for sand and gravel, with the potential for a long term minor negative effect on water and soil through the sterilisation of mineral resources when they are developed. However, as the development areas are, in the main, brownfield, they could already be considered to be sterilised and would therefore have a neutral effect.

Brownfield/greenfield

- All of the development areas are mainly made up of brownfield land, and contain very few greenfield areas. Development of these brownfield areas presents the opportunity,
through policies such as LPS Policy SE 13 “Flood Risk and Water Management” and proposed CHAAP policy IN 4 “Green Infrastructure” to reduce paved surface areas, increasing the ability of water to infiltrate into the ground, with the potential for a long term minor positive effect.

Agriculture

- None of the development areas include BMV agricultural land, with the potential for a neutral effect on water and soil.

Contamination

- As all the development areas contain mainly brownfield land, it is assumed that there is a potential for contamination issues. The development areas are also close to railways, which can often be contaminated due to historic railway operations. Policy provides the opportunity to remediate contamination levels, for example LPS Policy SE 12 “Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability”.

Appraisal of the draft plan as a whole

4.51 The proposed policies in the Draft CHAAP, along with existing policies in the LPS, look to reduce the risk of flooding and manage surface water runoff, where possible. Policies in the LPS also seek to remediate land contamination and protect water quality.

4.52 It is recommended that any proposal should seek a reduction in surface water runoff and minimise the risk from flooding, where possible.
Air

4.53 The main focus of the discussion is the consideration of the impacts on air quality from atmospheric pollution (which includes transport relate \( \text{CO}_2 \) emissions) and other sources. The topic of air has close ties to both the climatic factors and transport topics.

General development policies

4.54 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 “Development strategy” seeks to deliver sufficient growth in order to meet regeneration, employment and residential needs arising from the demand to locate in a sustainable location served by a high frequency of rail and public transport services. However, an increase in atmospheric pollution is likely to arise as a result of increased traffic through the delivery of housing, employment, retail and leisure uses, leading to the potential for a long term negative effect on air quality. Nevertheless, the significance of effects will be dependent on other CHAAP and LPS policies.

General design and heritage policies

4.55 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 4 “Improving connections between the town centre and the railway station” seeks to provide high quality pedestrian and cycle networks. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on air quality, with a potential decrease in atmospheric pollution.

4.56 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 5 “Enabling sustainable transport interchange” seeks to incorporate measures to facilitate the use of walking, cycling and public transport. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on air quality, with a potential decrease in atmospheric pollution.

General infrastructure policies

4.57 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 1 “New infrastructure” requires development to contribute to and/or make provision for, infrastructure. If this includes pedestrian and cycleways then this is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on air quality, with a potential decrease in atmospheric pollution.

4.58 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 2 “Energy infrastructure – net zero emissions” seeks to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from construction and operation, which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on air quality.

4.59 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 “Transport and highways infrastructure” looks to support improvements in air quality and the reduction of traffic emissions, which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on air quality. The proposed policy also promotes sustainable transport and requires the provision of a high quality public transport interchange that provides onward travel information to encourage integration with other transport modes including walking and cycling. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on air quality, with a potential decrease in atmospheric pollution.
General transport and highways policies

4.60 Proposed CHAAP Policy TH 1 “Accessible car parks” seeks to provide electric vehicle charging points and secured cycle parking. This could encourage the use of electric vehicles and cycles, which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on air quality, with a potential decrease in atmospheric pollution. However, the provision of car parks can be seen as encouraging car use, which is likely to result in increased traffic and an increase in atmospheric pollution. This is likely to have a long term minor negative effect on air quality.

4.61 Proposed CHAAP Policy TH 2 “Well managed car parks” looks to provide additional car parking to accommodate rail passenger growth forecasts. The provision of car parks can be seen as encouraging car use, which is likely to result in increased traffic and an increase in atmospheric pollution. This is likely to have a long term minor negative effect on air quality. However, parking charges are proposed, that should be reflective of the market, demand and supply and will not discourage public transport and sustainable mode choices.

4.62 The introduction of bus priority measures through proposed CHAAP Policy TH 3 “Bus priority” could make the use of buses more attractive as priority measures will allow buses to avoid some areas of potential traffic congestion, reducing journey times as well as emissions from queuing traffic. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on air quality.

4.63 Proposed CHAAP Policy TH 4 “Taxi and PHV areas” seeks to provide electric vehicle charging points. This could encourage the use of electric vehicles, which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on air quality, with a potential decrease in atmospheric pollution.

Development areas

4.64 All the proposed development areas have been assessed with appraisal findings presented in Appendix F of this Report. There are four areas of the assessment that are considered to relate to air – these being highways impact, neighbouring uses, AQMAs, and public transport; the development areas are considered under these headings.

Highways impact

- An increase in atmospheric pollution is likely to arise as a result of increased traffic through the delivery of housing and employment, leading to a long term minor negative effect. Policies including LPS Policies SE 12 “Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability” and CO 1 “Sustainable Travel and Transport”, and proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 “Transport and highways infrastructure” will help to minimise impact on air quality.
- Proposed policy principle DA 1 “Mill Street” requires development to contribute directly or through financial contributions to the delivery of the Crewe Hub Green Link. This link will include pedestrian and cycleways. The proposed policy principle also safeguards junctions for improvement.
- Proposed policy principle DA 2 “Gresty Road” requires pedestrians and cycle access to the HS2 Hub Station entrance and for a high quality public realm to be easily accessible by pedestrians and cyclists. The proposed policy principle also supports development
that improves the efficient highway operation of Gresty Road and safeguards junctions for improvement.

- Proposed policy principle DA 3 “Macon Way” requires the creation of an arterial pedestrian and cycle route through the development area. The proposed policy principle also supports proposals for the realignment of the local highways network incorporating improvements to the Crewe Road roundabout.
- Public realm works are required to incorporate pedestrian access through proposed policy principles DA 4 “Weston Road” and DA 5 “Commercial Hub”. Both of these proposed policy principles also look to support proposals for multi-storey car parks. Proposed policy principle DA 4 “Weston Road” also seeks to support proposals for the realignment of the local highways network incorporating improvements to the Crewe Road roundabout and Weston Road.
- Pedestrian and cyclist access should be integrated into a new entrance to the HS2 Hub Station, as required through proposed policy principle DA 6 “Nantwich Road Corridor”. Priority to be given to pedestrians and cyclists and appropriate and secure cycle storage is also required.

Neighbouring uses

- Three of the proposed development areas are adjacent to a railway line (DA 1 “Mill Street”, DA 2 “Gresty Road”, and DA 3 “Macon Way”). LPS Policy SE 12 “Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability” will help to minimise the impact of this.
- Proposed policy principle DA 2 “Gresty Road” requires development that adjoins existing residential areas to the south of the development area to make sure that the amenity of existing occupiers is not harmed.

AQMAs

- Proposed development areas DA 1 “Mill Street” and DA 2 “Gresty Road” are located in the Nantwich Road AQMA, with proposed development area DA 6 “Nantwich Road Corridor” located very close to it. Proposed development area DA 3 “Macon Way” is located close to the Earle Road AQMA. Policies including LPS Policies SE 12 “Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability” and CO 1 “Sustainable Travel and Transport”, and proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 “Transport and highways infrastructure” will help to minimise impact on air quality.

Public transport

- All of the proposed development areas are in walking distance of a commutable bus and/or rail service.

Appraisal of the draft plan as a whole

4.65 The proposed policies in the Draft CHAAP, along with existing policies in the LPS, look to provide opportunities to travel by means other than private vehicle, and seek to reduce the need to travel, where possible.

4.66 It is recommended that any proposal should seek to provide further opportunities for active transport.
Climatic factors

4.67 The potential to affect per capita transport related CO\textsubscript{2} emissions has been considered at length under the sustainability topic of air, and therefore it is not proposed to revisit this under the climatic factors sustainability topic. The discussion therefore focuses on the potential to affect built environment related CO\textsubscript{2} emissions.

General development policies

4.68 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 “Development strategy” suggests an overall level of development for the Crewe Hub area. As the amount of development proposed for the CHAAP area is substantial, it is possible that development proposals would be of a scale so as to contribute to the development of a strategic district heating network or any decentralised and renewable and low carbon resources. This means that there may be opportunities for a long term positive effect on climatic factors, the significance of which will be dependent on other CHAAP and LPS policies. It should also be noted that some proposals for various types of renewable energy fall within permitted development rights.

General design and heritage policies

4.69 In relation to proposed CHAAP Policy DH 2 "Safeguarding Crewe’s railway & built heritage", heritage assets such as Listed Buildings are much harder and more costly to install energy saving features, such as double glazing, cavity wall or loft insulation. There are also more constraints in the installation of renewable energy technology such as solar panels or micro turbines. This proposed policy does not set out to proactively address this issue; however as technologies improve over time, and installations become the norm, there will be more opportunities to retrofit existing properties with energy-saving and low carbon technology. The proposed policy is designed to enable alterations to such buildings provided their significance is preserved and their setting safeguarded (where appropriate).

General infrastructure policies

4.70 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 2 “Energy infrastructure – net zero emissions” seeks to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from construction and operation, through the use of an energy hierarchy. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on climatic factors.

General transport and highways policies

4.71 The theme is considered to have a neutral effect on climatic factors.

Development areas

4.72 All of the proposed development areas have been assessed, with appraisal findings presented in Appendix F of this Report. Points to note are:

- It is likely that there will be some opportunities to secure energy requirements from decentralised and renewable and low carbon sources, and to contribute to the development of a strategic district heating network.
Appraisal of the draft plan as a whole

4.73 The proposed policies in the Draft CHAAP, along with existing policies in the LPS, seek to mitigate and adapt to climate change and its impact, where possible.

4.74 It is recommended that any proposal should seek to provide renewable or low carbon energy, where possible.
Transport

4.75 The impact on the highways network has been considered at length under the sustainability topic of air, and therefore it is not proposed to revisit this under the transport sustainability topic. The discussion therefore focuses on the accessibility of services, sustainable transport modes, facilities and amenities for all members of the community.

General development policies

4.76 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 “Development strategy” seeks to deliver sufficient growth in order to meet regeneration, employment and residential needs arising from the demand to locate in a sustainable location served by a high frequency of rail and public transport services. It looks to deliver housing, employment, retail and leisure uses in a relatively small area (compared to the overall size of Crewe), leading to the potential for a long term positive effect on accessibility. However, the significance of effects will be dependent on other CHAAP and LPS policies.

4.77 It is also worth nothing that proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 also requires the provision of green infrastructure.

4.78 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 4 “Improving connections between the town centre and railway station” seeks to improve connections between the Crewe Hub station and Crewe town centre, with its services and facilities, and physical access is to not be impeded. This includes the provision of high quality pedestrian and cycle networks and is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on accessibility, through the provision of opportunities to travel by sustainable modes of transport.

4.79 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 5 “Enabling sustainable transport interchange” seeks to incorporate measures to facilitate the use of walking, cycling and public transport. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on accessibility, through the provision of opportunities to travel by sustainable modes of transport.

General design and heritage policies

4.80 Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 1 “Design and integration of development” looks to provide directly, or contribute to, a range of services and facilities; these are likely to be in walking or cycling distance, providing the opportunity to travel by sustainable modes of transport. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on accessibility.

General infrastructure policies

4.81 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 1 "New infrastructure" requires development to contribute to and/or make provision for, infrastructure. If this includes pedestrian and cycleways then this is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on accessibility, through the provision of opportunities to travel by sustainable modes of transport. Policy IN 1 does require the provision of green infrastructure, which could create areas of recreation or amenity value, providing opportunities for communities to access such areas. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on accessibility.
Proposed CHAAP Policy **IN 4 “Green infrastructure”** requires the provision of green infrastructure, which could create areas of recreation or amenity value, providing opportunities for communities to access such areas. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on accessibility.

Proposed CHAAP Policy **IN 5 “Transport and highways infrastructure”** looks to provide a high quality public transport interchange that provides onward travel information to encourage integration with other transport modes including walking and cycling. This is considered to have a long term minor positive effect on accessibility through the provision of opportunities to travel by sustainable modes of transport.

**General transport and highways policies**

Proposed CHAAP Policy **TH 1 “Accessible car parks”** seeks to provide secured cycle parking. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on accessibility, through encouraging travel by sustainable modes of transport.

**Development areas**

All the proposed development areas have been assessed with appraisal findings presented in Appendix F of this Report. There are three areas of the assessment that are considered to relate to transport – these being access, accessibility, and public transport; the development areas are considered under these headings.

**Access**

- There is an existing access into all of the proposed development areas.

**Accessibility**

- All of the development areas meet the minimum standards for access to nearly all the services and facilities identified in the Accessibility Assessment (see Appendix G of this Report), with the potential for a long term minor positive effect.
- Proposed policy principle **DA 1 “Mill Street”** requires development to contribute directly or through financial contributions to the delivery of the Crewe Hub Green Link. This link will include pedestrian and cycleways.
- It is assumed through proposed policy principle **DA 2 “Gresty Road”** that the Crewe Alexandra Stadium will remain in place. The proposed policy principle also requires pedestrians and cycle access to the HS2 Hub Station entrance and for a high quality public realm to be easily accessible by pedestrians and cyclists.
- Proposed policy principle **DA 3 “Macon Way”** requires the creation of an arterial pedestrian and cycle route through the development area.
- Public realm works are required to incorporate pedestrian access through proposed policy principles **DA 4 “Weston Road”** and **DA 5 “Commercial Hub”**.
- Pedestrian and cyclist access should be integrated into a new entrance to the HS2 Hub Station, as required through proposed policy principle **DA 6 “Nantwich Road Corridor”**. Priority should also be given to pedestrians and cyclists.
Public transport

- All of the proposed development areas are in walking distance of a commutable bus and/or rail service.

Appraisal of the draft plan as a whole

4.86 The proposed policies in the Draft CHAAP, along with existing policies in the LPS, seek to provide services, facilities and amenities in appropriate locations to provide opportunities for communities to access them.

4.87 It is recommended that any proposal should seek to provide services, facilities and amenities, where possible.
Cultural heritage and landscape

General development policies

4.88 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 “Development strategy” suggests an overall level of development for the Crewe Hub area. Due to the nature of the Crewe Hub area, development is highly likely to be directed to brownfield sites, which means that it is possible to minimise the loss of greenfield land. However, the scale of development proposed is likely to lead to an increase in building heights, with the potential to effect long distance views into and across Crewe from the surrounding area. It should also be noted that there are designated heritage assets and the potential for non-designated heritage assets in the CHAAP area. Therefore there is potential for a long term negative effect on cultural heritage and landscape, the significance of which will be dependent on other CHAAP and LPS policies.

4.89 It is also worth noting that proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 seeks to provide public realm improvements as well as green infrastructure.

General design and heritage policies

4.90 Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 1 “Design and integration of development” looks to raise design standards in the area and improve the quality of design and public realm, as well as provide green infrastructure. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on cultural heritage and landscape.

4.91 Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 2 “Safeguarding Crewe’s railway & built heritage” seeks to respect, retain and enhance Crewe’s railway and built heritage. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on cultural heritage and landscape.

General infrastructure policies

4.92 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 1 “New infrastructure” seeks to provide a range of infrastructure. If this development impacts on a heritage asset or its setting then this is likely to have a negative effect on cultural heritage and landscape.

4.93 Green and open spaces form an important part of the landscape and townscape and should be retained, where possible. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 4 “Green infrastructure” requires the provision of green infrastructure (as does proposed Policy IN 1), which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on the landscape and townscape. The proposed Policy also seeks to identify important features of the local character to reflect, make reference and enhance local distinctiveness and sense of place, which is also likely to have a long term minor positive effect on cultural heritage and landscape.

4.94 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 “Transport and highways infrastructure” seeks to provide a range of transport and highways infrastructure. If this development impacts on a heritage asset or its setting then this is likely to have a negative effect on cultural heritage and landscape.
General transport and highways policies

4.95 Proposed CHAAP Policies TH 1 “Accessible car parks” and TH 2 “Well managed car parks” seek to provide car parks. If the creation of the car parks impact on a heritage asset or its setting or if they are developed on any of the limited greenfield land in the CHAAP boundary, then the development of car parks are likely to have a negative effect on cultural heritage and landscape. However, it may be the case that they improve the existing area's visual impact, which is likely to provide a long term minor positive effect on cultural heritage and landscape.

Development areas

4.96 All the proposed development areas have been assessed with appraisal findings presented in Appendix F of this Report. There are six areas of the assessment that are considered to relate to cultural heritage and landscape – these being landscape, settlement character and urban form, Green Belt, Strategic Green gap, heritage assets and tree preservation orders; the development areas are considered under these headings.

Landscape

- All of the proposed development areas have an impact on landscape, through their visibility from main roads, for example, leading to a long term minor negative effect. Policies including LPS Policy SE 4 “The Landscape” and proposed CHAAP Policy DH 1 “Design and integration of development” will help to minimise the impact. It is worth noting that all of the proposed policy principles require an element of green infrastructure, which is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on landscape.
- Proposed policy principle DA 1 “Mill Street” seeks to form a gradual transition in building heights from Mill Street and Nantwich Road to the tallest elements. The proposed policy principle also requires green space, tree planting and landscaping.
- Proposed policy principle DA 2 “Gresty Road” looks to achieve the delivery of a high quality public realm as well as a landmark building on the site of the current Rail House and a gradual transition in building heights from Gresty Road eastward towards the railway line.
- Proposed policy principle DA 3 “Macon Way” seeks to enhance the Valley Brook river corridor and provide landmark buildings of high quality design in frontage locations along Crewe Road and Macon Way.
- Proposed policy principle DA 4 “Weston Road” looks to encourage the provision of landmark buildings and is open to public realm works.
- Proposed policy principle DA 5 “Commercial Hub” also looks to encourage the provision of landmark buildings in frontage locations.
- Proposed policy principle DA 6 “Nantwich Road Corridor” supports the provision of a high quality public realm.

Settlement character and urban form

- All of the proposed development areas are located wholly in the settlement.

Green Belt

- None of the proposed development areas are located in the Green Belt.
Strategic Green Gap

- None of the proposed development areas are located in the Strategic Green Gap.

Heritage assets

- Some of the proposed development areas have the potential for harm on designated or non-designated heritage assets, leading to a long term negative effect, the significance of which will be determined through a Heritage Impact Assessment or archaeological desk based assessment. Policies including LPS Policy SE 7 “The Historic Environment” and proposed CHAAP Policy DH 2 “Safeguarding Crewe’s railway and built heritage” will help to minimise the impact.
- Proposed policy principle DA 1 “Mill Street” seeks to retain and incorporate heritage assets, and buildings and features of local significance into development.
- Proposed policy principle DA 2 “Gresty Road” looks to retain heritage and character buildings on land bounded by South Street, Gresty Road and Nantwich Road.
- Proposed policy principle DA 3 “Macon Way” looks to support tall buildings that do not harm the heritage significance of the locally listed Crewe Arms Hotel or its setting.
- Proposed development area DA 4 “Weston Road” is locate close to the Grade II Listed Building of 1867 Buildings at Crewe Railway Station. The proposed policy principle supports development that does not cause harm to, or which better reveals the significance of, the Grade II Listed Buildings in Crewe Railway Station.

Tree Preservation Orders

- Proposed development area DA 5 “Commercial Hub” contains protected trees, however they can be readily accommodated in any development with sensitive design and layout. LPS Policy SE 5 “Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland” will help to minimise the impact.

Appraisal of the draft plan as a whole

4.97 The proposed policies in the Draft CHAAP, along with existing policies in the LPS, offer a high level of protection for the Borough’s landscape, townscape and historic environment and look to enhance these assets, where possible.

4.98 It is recommended that any proposal should seek to provide landscaping schemes where possible, along with sensitively designed development proposals.

4.99 A Rural Proofing Assessment has been carried out for the Draft CHAAP (see Appendix J of this Report). It found that there would be no negative impacts on rural areas.
Social inclusiveness

General development policies

4.100 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 “Development strategy” seeks to deliver sufficient growth in order to meet residential needs arising from the demand to locate in a sustainable location served by a high frequency of rail and public transport services. The more housing an area is allocated could potentially mean that there are more opportunities to provide infrastructure (and therefore a long term positive effect) to make sure that all sections of the community have access to the services and facilities that they require. However, if the critical mass is not reached there will be a resulting increase in pressure on existing services, resulting in a long term negative effect. Although Crewe, as a Principal Town, is seen as a larger settlement, relative to the Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres, it is likely that its services and facilities are within walking or cycling distance due to the potential links between the CHAAP area and the town centre. However, the significance of effects will be dependent on other CHAAP and LPS policies.

4.101 It is also worth noting that providing a mix of housing is important to support independent living and choice, as are homes designed to be flexible to adapt to meet the changing needs of residents over time. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 seeks to deliver a mix of unit sizes and types in a high quality residential environment. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on social inclusion. Policy GD 2 also looks to provide green infrastructure.

4.102 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 3 “Supporting the Crewe Hub station and maximising opportunities” looks to maximise the provision of local employment opportunities, providing the chance for members of the community to access jobs. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on social inclusiveness.

General design and heritage policies

4.103 Green/open space can help to tackle social exclusion and reduce anti-social behaviour. Such spaces can provide opportunities to gather and meet people, which can contribute to a sense of community. Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 1 “Design and integration of development” requires the provision of green infrastructure, which could create areas of recreation or amenity value, providing opportunities for communities to access such areas. This has the potential for a long term minor positive effect on social inclusion.

General infrastructure policies

4.104 Green/open space can help to tackle social exclusion and reduce anti-social behaviour. Such spaces can provide opportunities to gather and meet people, which can contribute to a sense of community. Proposed CHAAP Policies IN 1 “New infrastructure” and IN 4 “Green infrastructure” require the provision of green infrastructure, which could create areas of recreation or amenity value, providing opportunities for communities to access such areas. This has the potential for a long term minor positive effect on social inclusion. Proposed Policy IN 4 also requires development to be accessible for all, which should also have the potential for a long term minor positive effect on social inclusion.
Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 3 “Social infrastructure – local employment and skills based training” seeks to maximise local employment opportunities and help address skills deficits, which provides the chance for members of the community to access jobs. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on social inclusion.

General transport and highways policies

Proposed CHAAP Policy TH 1 “Accessible car parks” requires car parks operating in the CHAAP boundary to adhere to disabled parking space requirements identified in the LPS. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on social inclusion.

Development areas

All the proposed development areas have been assessed with appraisal findings presented in Appendix F of this Report. There are two areas of the assessment that are considered to relate to social inclusiveness – these being accessibility and public transport; the development areas are considered under these headings.

Accessibility

- All of the development areas meet the minimum standards for access to nearly all the services and facilities identified in the Accessibility Assessment (see Appendix G of this Report), with the potential for a long term minor positive effect.
- Proposed policy principle DA 1 “Mill Street” requires development to contribute directly or through financial contributions to the delivery of the Crewe Hub Green Link. This link will include pedestrian and cycleways.
- It is assumed through proposed policy principle DA 2 “Gresty Road” that the Crewe Alexandra Stadium will remain in place. The proposed policy principle also requires pedestrians and cycle access to the HS2 Hub Station entrance and for a high quality public realm to be easily accessible by pedestrians and cyclists.
- Proposed policy principle DA 3 “Macon Way” requires the creation of an arterial pedestrian and cycle route through the development area.
- Public realm works are required to incorporate pedestrian access through proposed policy principles DA 4 “Weston Road” and DA 5 “Commercial Hub”.
- Pedestrian and cyclist access should be integrated into a new entrance to the HS2 Hub Station, as required through proposed policy principle DA 6 “Nantwich Road Corridor”. Priority should also be given to pedestrians and cyclists.

Public transport

- All of the proposed development areas are in walking distance of a commutable bus and/or rail service.

Appraisal of the draft plan as a whole

The proposed policies in the Draft CHAAP, along with existing policies in the LPS, seek to achieve high levels of equality, diversity, and social inclusion, where possible.

It is recommended that any proposal should seek to provide a mix of housing types and tenures, with homes designed to be flexible to meet changing needs.
4.110 An Equality Impact Assessment has been carried out for the Draft CHAAP (see Appendix H of this Report). It found that the Draft CHAAP seeks to achieve improvements that will benefit all sections of the community; it promotes accessibility of services, facilities and jobs. Development would incorporate a suitable mix of housing types and tenures, and development opportunities are open to all. A Rural Proofing Assessment was also carried out for the Draft CHAAP (see Appendix J of this Report). It found that there would be no negative impacts on rural areas.
Economic development

General development policies

4.111 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 “Development strategy” seeks to deliver sufficient growth in order to meet regeneration and residential needs arising from the demand to locate in a sustainable location served by a high frequency of rail and public transport services. This could benefit those who are currently unable to access jobs. Therefore there is the potential for a long term minor positive effect on economic development, the significance of which will be dependent on other CHAAP and LPS policies.

4.112 It is also worth noting that Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 also seeks to protect the role and function of Crewe town centre and allows limited convenience provision that serves the needs of travellers and businesses as well as provide green infrastructure and public realm improvements. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on economic development.

4.113 Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 3 "Supporting the Crewe Hub station and maximising opportunities" looks to maximise the provision of local employment opportunities, providing the chance for members of the community to access jobs. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on economic development.

General design and heritage policies

4.114 Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 1 "Design and integration of development" looks to provide green infrastructure and to raise the design standards in the area. This includes improving the quality of design and the public realm. A well-designed public environment can contribute towards the creation of a pleasing environment for business growth, therefore this proposed policy is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on economic development.

4.115 Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 2 "Safeguarding Crewe's railway and built heritage" contributes to a high quality environment, helping to create a pleasing environment for business growth. This is likely to have a long term minor positive effect on economic development. The policy is also designed to enable alterations to such buildings, provided their significance is preserved and their setting safeguarded (where appropriate). This is important given that some heritage assets are converted successfully into businesses such as restaurants or visitor attractions, therefore having the potential for a long term minor positive effect on economic development. However, it is recognised that small or start-up businesses may struggle to afford the relatively higher cost of maintaining heritage assets, and such buildings may not be suitable for modern needs of businesses.

General infrastructure policies

4.116 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 1 "New Infrastructure" seeks to provide a range of infrastructure, including green infrastructure, which could have a long term minor positive effect on economic development in terms of attracting business who value their surroundings. However, the requirement to contribute to the cost of infrastructure may reduce the attractiveness of the area to some businesses, which has the potential for a long term minor negative effect on economic development.
4.117 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 3 “Social infrastructure – local employment and skills based training” looks to maximise the provision of local employment opportunities, which is likely to have long term minor positive effect on economic development.

4.118 Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 4 "Green Infrastructure" seeks to provide a range of infrastructure, including green infrastructure, which could have a long term minor positive effect on economic development in terms of attracting business who value their surroundings.

General transport and highways policies

4.119 Car parks serving transport facilities are essential to residents, workers and visitors, and to the proper functioning and attractiveness of these places. Proposed CHAAP Policies TH 1 "Accessible car parks” and TH 2 "Well managed car parks” refer to the provision of car parking facilities, which should have a long term minor positive effect on economic development.

Development areas

4.120 All the proposed development areas have been assessed with appraisal findings presented in Appendix F of this Report. There are two areas of the assessment that are considered to relate to economic development – these being employment loss and employment distance; the development areas are considered under these headings.

Employment loss

- Five of the proposed development areas seek to encourage employment development (DA 1 “Mill Street”, DA 2 “Gresty Road”, DA 3 “Macon Way”, DA 4 “Weston Road” and DA 5 “Commercial Hub”), with three already used for employment purposes (DA 3, DA 4 and DA 5).

Employment distance

- All of the proposed development areas are within 500m of an existing employment area.

Appraisal of the draft plan as a whole

4.121 The proposed policies in the Draft CHAAP, along with existing policies in the LPS, look to encourage economic development through providing an attractive environment.

4.122 It is recommended that any proposal should seek to provide attractive surroundings.

4.123 A Rural Proofing Assessment was also carried out for the Draft CHAAP (see Appendix J of this Report). It found that there would be no negative impacts on rural areas.

Conclusions and recommendations at this current stage

4.124 The appraisal has found that, generally, the Draft CHAAP is likely to have both residual long term minor positive and negative effects as a result of the proposed HS2 Hub Station and accompanying development on biodiversity, flora and fauna, water and soil, air quality, and cultural heritage and landscape. It has also found that the Draft CHAAP is likely to have residual long term minor positive effects as a result of the proposed HS2 Hub Station.
and accompanying development on population and human health, transport, social inclusiveness, and economic development. Policies in the LPS provide sufficient mitigation to make sure that there will not be any residual significant negative effects.

4.125 A number of positive effects of the Draft CHAAP relate to the provision of housing and employment opportunities, improvements to pedestrian links and cycleways (with the potential for reduced travel movements), and the requirement for the provision of green infrastructure as part of development proposals.
Chapter 5: Cumulative effects

Introduction

5.1 In addition to the appraisal of individual policies undertaken in SA/SEA, the SEA Directive requires the consideration of the overall effects of the plan, including the secondary, synergistic and cumulative effects of plan policies. It is important to note that the extant SEA guidance (ODPM, 2005) states that these terms, including secondary or indirect, cumulative and synergistic, are not mutually exclusive. Often the term cumulative effects is taken to include secondary and synergistic effects. This approach examines effects in a holistic way and, for example, considers how incremental effects that may have a small effect individually, may, in some circumstances, accrue to become significant.

5.2 Good practice SA/SEA requires that the analysis of cumulative effects consider interactions within/between plan policies (intra-plan effects) as well as the combined effects that may occur with other existing concurrent plans and projects (inter-plan effects). The following sections provide a summary of intra and inter-plan effects, highlighting those that have the potential to be significantly positive and/or negative for the framework of SA objectives set for the plan.

5.3 It should be noted that it is not always possible to accurately predict sustainability effects when considering plans at a strategic scale.

Summary of cumulative effects

Significant positive cumulative effects of the CHAAP (intra-plan effects)

5.4 The SA found that the majority of policies in the Draft CHAAP could have significant positive sustainability benefits for Crewe and the wider area. Table 5.1 summarises the significant positive effects identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key relevant SA topic</th>
<th>Positive effects identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusiveness</td>
<td>● The plan will have significant long-term positive effects through providing for a mix of housing types and sizes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● A significant positive effect on communities through improved access to homes, employment opportunities, community, health, leisure and education facilities and services. A coordinated approach to development will allow homes, jobs and other facilities to be located close to each other and provides the opportunity to reduce reliance on private transport and increase use of public transport. Policies require development to provide green infrastructure, providing opportunities to access areas with recreation or amenity value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>● A significant positive effect on the economy through policies that support the development of, and maximising the opportunities of, the HS2 Hub Station. A coordinated approach to development will allow homes, jobs and other facilities to be located close to each other and provides the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant negative or uncertain cumulative effects of the CHAAP (intra-plan effects)

5.5 Alongside the many positive effects of the plan, potential negative sustainability effects were also identified, although their effect is uncertain at this stage of the assessment and it is considered likely that these effects can be mitigated at a more detailed planning stage. These are summarised in Table 5.2 below.

### Table 5.2 Potentially significant negative effects of the Draft CHAAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key relevant SA topic</th>
<th>Negative effects identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Population and human health, water and soil, air, biodiversity, flora and fauna, cultural heritage and landscape, and transport | The cumulative effects of increased development, including housing, employment development and other infrastructure. These include:  
  - increased air pollution (local and regional)  
  - pressures on water resources and water quality  
  - increased noise pollution, particularly from traffic  
  - increased waste production  
  - implications for human health (for example from increased pollution, particularly in the short term during construction)  
  - incremental effects on landscape and townscape |
| Climatic factors |  
  - An increase in the contribution to greenhouse gas production is inevitable given proposed development, and includes factors such as increased transportation costs, embodied energy in construction materials and increased energy use from new housing and employment development. |

Interactions with other relevant plans and projects (inter-plan effects)

5.6 Appendix A of the SA Scoping Report (June 2017) identifies a list of related plans, policies and programmes at a national, regional and local level. In considering interactions with other relevant plans and programmes, the Council has identified the key documents that affect planning and development in the Borough and its neighbouring authorities, using Appendix A of the SA Scoping Report as a starting point and focusing on effects at a regional, sub-regional and local level. At a national level, the Draft CHAAP has sought to take account and be consistent with the objectives of national guidance, targets and frameworks, where applicable.

5.7 The aim of the analysis of inter-plan effects is to identify how other plans and key projects may affect the sustainability of the CHAAP area. Table 5.3 summarises key inter-plan cumulative effects.
Table 5.3 Inter-plan cumulative effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans, programmes or projects</th>
<th>Significant combined effects of Cheshire East’s CHAAP with other plans, projects and policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Cheshire East Local Transport Plan | **Positive**  
- Incremental improvements to sustainable transport networks, including walking and cycling.  
- Reduced congestion, improvements to key roads and junctions in the medium and longer term.  

**Negative**  
- Short term increase in greenhouse gas emissions from growth in the CHAAP; the policies in the LPS and Local Transport Plan should act to reduce this impact.  

The Cheshire East Sustainable Community Strategy | **Positive**  
- Improved delivery of neighbourhood level community services and facilities including extra facility provision.  
- Cumulative benefits for health and equality aims through improvements to access/provision of facilities.  
- Enhanced community cohesion through increased availability of affordable homes.  
- Supporting an increasingly older population.  
- Supporting the vitality and viability of Crewe.  

- Development proposals contribute positively to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan and Implementation Plan.  

**Negative**  
- Increased pressure on existing assets from recreation, disturbance and direct development.  

Cheshire East Housing Strategy 2018 - 2023 | **Positive**  
- Development proposals/policies supporting a range of sizes, house types and tenures in different locations, including for older persons housing.  

**Conclusion**

5.8  For many potential cumulative effects, the nature and significance of the cumulative effect is uncertain at this stage. The policy approaches proposed by the Draft CHAAP will help reduce the significance of any negative or in-combination effects. Monitoring of the CHAAP and SA will make sure that unforeseen adverse environmental effects are highlighted, and remedial action can be taken where needed.
Chapter 6: Next steps

Introduction

6.1 The aim of this Chapter is to explain next steps in the plan-making/SA process.

Next steps

6.2 The Council may undertake further consultation under Regulation 18 as additional evidence is prepared and the ideas presented in the Draft CHAAP are developed and refined.

6.3 The Council will then prepare a Submission Version of the CHAAP for publication, which will be accompanied by an SA Report. This will be the version of the CHAAP that the Council will submit to the Secretary of State ready for a public examination by an independent Planning Inspector. Once published, and prior to submitting to the Secretary of State, there will be a further six week period to submit formal representations on the soundness of the document. At the end of the representation period, the Council will collate any representations made during the appropriate period and will submit them along with the CHAAP and supporting documents to the Secretary of State. The CHAAP will then be considered at public examination by an independent Planning Inspector.

6.4 The Council may ask the Inspector to recommend additional changes that may be necessary to make the CHAAP sound and will need to publish any main modifications for comment before the Inspector completes her/his report.

6.5 If the Inspector concludes that the CHAAP complies with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act and the associated Regulations, and is sound in terms of section 20(5)(b) of the Act and meets the tests of soundness in the NPPF, with or without modifications, then the Council will be able to adopt the CHAAP. At the time of adoption an SA Statement will be published that sets out:

a. how environmental (and sustainability) considerations have been integrated into the Local Plan;
b. how the SA Report has been taken into account during preparation of the plan;
c. the reasons for choosing the plan as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with;
d. how the opinions expressed by the public and consultation bodies during consultation on the plan and SA Report have been taken into account; and
e. the measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant effects identified for the Local Plan.

Monitoring

6.6 At the current time there is only a need to present a description of the measures envisaged.
6.7 The Council has prepared a monitoring and implementation framework, which is included in Section 16 of the LPS. The Council also monitors an extensive range of local indicators in its annual Authority Monitoring Reports (“AMRs”)(6). Table 6.1 sets out some of the potential monitoring measures that the Council could use to monitor each of the sustainability topics. References in brackets refer to the indicator’s reference in the AMRs.

Table 6.1 Potential monitoring measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability topic</th>
<th>Proposed indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</td>
<td>• Creation and loss of areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value (MF14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and human health</td>
<td>• Provision of infrastructure (MF1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provision of outdoor sports facilities (MF12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provision of indoor sports facilities (MF13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to social, economic and green infrastructure (I1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and soil</td>
<td>• Percentage of empty homes in the borough (MF5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mineral provision and landbanks (MF11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Waste arisings and the amounts of waste recycled, recovered or going for disposal (MF16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New and converted dwellings on previously developed land (SE1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Total amount of employment floorspace on previously developed land (SE2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of planning applications approved contrary to Environment Agency advice on water quality grounds (SE3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of planning applications approved contrary to Environment Agency advice on flood risk (SE4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Renewable energy generation (SE5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sales of primary land-won aggregates (SE6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Produced and handled construction, demolition and excavation waste (SE7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacity of new waste management facilities (SE8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Household waste collection per head per annum (SE17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Households served by kerbside collection (SE18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Density of new housing developments (SE19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Brownfield land register (SE20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>• Highest, lowest and average air quality in air quality management areas (SE15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climatic factors</td>
<td>• Fuel poverty (SC8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Renewable energy generation (SE5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Housing energy efficiency rating (SE9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Average CO₂ emissions per person (SE22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>• Provision of infrastructure (MF1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Progress on key highways schemes listed in policy CO 2 (MF17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New major developments within 500m of a bus stop served by a commercial bus service (MF18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unemployment rates (PG10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to social, economic and green infrastructure (I1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability topic</th>
<th>Proposed indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Cultural heritage and landscape** | - Listed buildings at risk of loss (MF15)  
- Number of heritage listings (SE10)  
- Heritage at risk (SE11)  
- Number of conservation area appraisals undertaken (SE12)  
- Locally important buildings lost (SE13)  
- Landscape types and coverage (SE14) |
| **Social inclusiveness**    | - Provision of infrastructure (MF1)  
- Housing completions (MF2)  
- Five-year housing land supply (MF3)  
- Gross total of affordable housing units provided (MF4)  
- Percentage of empty homes in the borough (MF5)  
- Net additional pitches for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople (MF6)  
- Percentage of premises (business/residents) that have access to fibre broadband services (>24Mbs) (MF10)  
- Provision of outdoor sports facilities (MF12)  
- Provision of indoor sports facilities (MF13)  
- New major developments within 500m of a bus stop served by a commercial bus service (MF18)  
- Plan period and housing targets (PG1)  
- Managed housing delivery target (PG2)  
- Location of completed dwellings (PG4)  
- Housing completions by location from 2010 (PG5)  
- Access to social, economic and green infrastructure (I1)  
- Progress on major regeneration schemes (EG8)  
- Most deprived lower layer super output areas in England (EG14)  
- Lower layer super output areas with the most deprived living environment in England (EG15)  
- Number of crimes (SC1)  
- Percentage of working age population whose highest qualification is NVQ level 1/2/3/4+/other/none (SC2)  
- Average (mean) house price in the borough (SC4)  
- Type of dwelling completed (SC5)  
- Size of dwelling completed (SC6)  
- New assembly and leisure facilities (use class D2) completed (SC7)  
- Brownfield land register (SE20) |
| **Economic development**    | - Provision of infrastructure (MF1)  
- Net takeup of employment land (MF7)  
- Net jobs growth rate (MF8)  
- Total amount of land last used for employment purposes lost to other uses (MF9)  
- Percentage of premises (business/residents) that have access to fibre broadband services (>24Mbs) (MF10)  
- Employment land available (PG3) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability topic</th>
<th>Proposed indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count of active enterprises (PG9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployment rates (PG10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs density (PG12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment by occupation (PG13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to social, economic and green infrastructure (I1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total amount of additional employment floorspace (EG1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total amount of floorspace completed for town centre uses (EG2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant retail units in town centres (EG3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail floorspace on the key town centres (EG4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand for floorspace in the key town centres (EG5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breakdown of use classes of buildings in town centres (EG6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visitor numbers to popular attractions (EG7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Progress on major regeneration schemes (EG8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average residence based earnings (SC3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New assembly and leisure facilities (use class D2) completed (SC7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices
Appendix A: Regulatory requirements

A.1 This SA will also be fulfilling the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive - Schedule 2 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 explains the information that must be contained in the SA Report; it is therefore important to make sure that all of the requirements have been met and fully integrated into the SA process. This will be done using a Checklist (Table A.1) to signpost where the regulatory requirements are met in this Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory requirement</th>
<th>Discussion of how requirement is met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 2 of the regulations lists the information to be provided in the SA Report</td>
<td>The purpose of the CHAAP is set out in Chapter 1 of this Report. Its relationship with other plans and programmes is set out in Section 3 and Appendix A of the Scoping Report and Appendix B of this Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;</td>
<td>A summary of the baseline information is provided in Appendix B of this Report. The current state of the environment is set out along with relevant comparators and trends. The likely evolution of the baseline without the Local Plan or ‘future baseline’ is also set out in Appendix B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme;</td>
<td>The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected;</td>
<td>The environmental characteristics of the areas likely to be affected are set out in Appendix B of this Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC;</td>
<td>The summary of the baseline information provided in Appendix B of this Report identifies a number of existing environmental problems that are relevant to the CHAAP. This includes identifying sites designated pursuant to Birds and Habitats Directives. Key sustainability issues are identified in Chapter 2, Table 2.1 of this Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) The environmental protection, objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental, considerations have been taken into account during its preparation;</td>
<td>A comprehensive range of plans and programmes have been reviewed and the implications for the CHAAP and SA are clearly set out in Appendix A of the Scoping Report. A list of regional/sub-regional and local plans are included in Appendix B of this Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. (Footnote: These effects should include secondary, cumulative,</td>
<td>Chapter 3 and Appendices C, D, E and F of this Report set out the findings of the appraisal for the reasonable alternatives. Chapters 4 and 5 set out the findings of the appraisal for the Draft Plan, including cumulative effects. As explained in the various methodology sections, as part of appraisal work, consideration has been given to the SA scope, and the need to consider the potential for various effect characteristics/dimensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory requirement</td>
<td>Discussion of how requirement is met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects;</td>
<td>Measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and offset (as fully as possible) any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme;</td>
<td>The SA has appraised all reasonable alternatives as presented in Chapter 3, Chapter 4, Appendix C, Appendix D, Appendix E, and Appendix F of this Report. This includes details on how the reasonable alternatives were developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information;</td>
<td>Monitoring measures envisaged can be found in Chapter 6 of this Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Art. 10;</td>
<td>A non-technical summary has been published separately to this Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) A non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SA Report must be published alongside the draft plan, in-line with the following regulations

Authorities with environmental responsibility and the public, shall be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme (Art. 6.1, 6.2).

The Scoping Report was sent to statutory consultees and available for public consultation between 27 February 2017 and 10 April 2017. This SA Report will be sent to statutory consultees and accompany the Draft CHAAP on public consultation.

The SA Report must be taken into account, alongside consultation responses, when finalising the plan.

The environmental report prepared pursuant to Article 5, the opinions expressed pursuant to Article 6 and the results of any transboundary consultations entered into pursuant to Article 7 shall be taken into account during the preparation of the plan or programme and before its adoption or submission to the legislative procedure.

The Council has taken into account this Interim SA Report when finalising the Draft CHAAP for publication. Further SA work will be carried out to inform the development of the Regulation 19 version of the Plan.
Appendix B: Context and baseline review

Related Plans and Policies

B.1 The SA process requires the review of relevant policies, plans and programmes. The purpose of this review is to:

- identify any external social, environmental or economic objectives that should be taken into account in the SA
- identify other external factors, including sustainability issues, which might influence the preparation of the Local Plan
- determine whether other policies, plans and programmes might give rise to cumulative effects, either positive or negative, when combined with the Local Plan
- make sure that the Local Plan and its SA are in line with the requirements of relevant policies, plans and programmes and through this identify inconsistencies or constraints that will need to be addressed
- identify sustainability objectives, key indicators, and baseline data that should be reflected in the SA
- suggest ideas as to how any constraints can be addressed, and to help identify the sustainability objectives

B.2 A detailed list of policies, plans and programmes that have been identified as part of this review are identified in Appendix A of the SA Scoping Report (June 2017), and include national, regional and local policies, plans and programmes. It is also worth noting that a revised National Planning Policy Framework was published in February 2019. However, as this Report is an appraisal of an Area Action Plan (“AAP”) additional national policies, plans and programmes relevant to the area covered need to be taken into account, namely ‘Rebalancing Britain from HS2 towards a national transport strategy’ (2014). It is also worth noting that a revised National Planning Policy Framework was published in 2018. The large range of international plans are considered to have been covered by national plans. Table B.1 includes an updated list of the regional/sub-regional and local policies, plans, and programmes that were reviewed in Appendix A of the SA Scoping Report (June 2017), taking into account the subject matter of the AAP.

Table B.1 Regional/sub-regional and local policies, plans and programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional/sub-regional policies, plans and programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unleashing the Potential of Cheshire and Warrington - Draft Sub-Regional Strategy (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure Framework for North East Wales, Cheshire and Wirral (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire Historic Landscape Characterisation Project (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Plans of adjacent Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transport Plans (full and implementation plans) of adjacent Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire Replacement Minerals Local Plan, 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional/sub-regional policies, plans and programmes

- Cheshire Replacement Waste Local Plan, 2007
- Greater Manchester Spatial Framework Revised Draft - January 2019

### Local policies, plans and programmes

- Crewe Hub. Improving capacity and connectivity for our customers (2016)
- Ambition for All - The Cheshire East Sustainable Community Strategy 2010
- Cheshire East Council Corporate Plan 2017 to 2020
- Cheshire East Local Transport Plan (2011)
- Cheshire East Local Transport Plan: Implementation Plan (2011)
- Cheshire East Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2011-2026
- Cheshire East Local Economic Assessment (2011)
- Housing Strategy 2018 to 2023
- Cheshire East Council Homelessness Strategy 2018 to 2021
- Local Air Quality Management Action Plan (2011)
- Local Air Quality Strategy for Cheshire East Council 2018
- Cycling Strategy 2017-2027
- Cheshire East Visitor Economy Strategy 2016-2020
- Crewe Civic and Cultural Quarter (2013)
- Parish Plans produced in Cheshire East
- Village Design Statements produced in Cheshire East
- Neighbourhood Plans made in Cheshire East
- Local Area Partnerships
- Cheshire East Local Plan Evidence Base documents
- Crewe Town Centre Regeneration Delivery Framework for Growth (2015)
- Conservation Area Appraisals
- Conservation Area Guides
- Cheshire East landscape Character Assessment (2018)
- Cheshire East Local Plan Strategy (2017)
Baseline information

B.3 The SA process requires the collection of baseline information focusing on the social, economic and environmental characteristics of the Borough. This information is collected in order to:

- identify current baseline conditions in the area
- find out trends in the data for the area
- identify sustainability problems and opportunities
- identify ways of dealing with problems and taking opportunities that exist in the area
- predict likely effects resulting from the implementation of the Plan
- inform the development of the Local Plan

B.4 As there were three CHAAP boundary options under consideration, the Council collected baseline information, where available, using the boundary option that covered the largest area, which was Option 3 Opportunity and market led (herein referred to as the 'scoping boundary'). This is considered to be a proportional approach and seeks to make sure that:

- all relevant sustainability issues are considered
- the SA Framework and appraisal is tailored to the CHAAP

B.5 Once the Local Plan is implemented, selected baseline data will also provide the basis for monitoring the sustainability effects resulting from the plan. This list is subject to revision as the plan progresses. Monitoring is performed to enable a clearer understanding of how situations are changing and will assist in identifying problems and alternative ways of dealing with them.

B.6 The baseline data collected for Cheshire East and the scoping boundary has been classified into nine categories, reflecting key areas for consideration identified in the Strategic Environmental Assessment guidance. These are:

- Biodiversity, flora and fauna
- Population and human health
- Water and soil
- Air
- Climatic factors
- Transport
- Cultural heritage and landscape
- Social inclusiveness
- Economic development

B.7 The Borough of Cheshire East is bounded by Cheshire West and Chester to the west, Warrington and the Manchester conurbation to the north, Shropshire and The Potteries conurbation to the south, and the Peak District National Park to the east.
### Biodiversity, flora and fauna

**B.8** The Borough benefits from a diverse range of flora and fauna, much of which need conservation measures due to threats to their numbers nationally. Some of the most significant can be found in Table B.2 (2011)\(^7\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Species/Habitats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amphibians</td>
<td>Great crested newt, natterjack toad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td>Adder, slow-worm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invertebrates</td>
<td>Bees and wasps (sand wasp, cuckoo bee and the vernal colletes, mining bee), belted beauty, club-tailed dragonfly, depressed river mussel, downy emerald, lesser silver water beetle, mud snail, ringlet, sandhill rustic, small pearl-bordered frillitary, spotted yellow/black leaf beetle, variable damselfly, white clawed crayfish, white-letter hairstreak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>Barn owl, black necked grebe, farmland seed-eating birds (bullfinch, corn bunting, grey partridge, house sparrow, lapwing, linnet, reed bunting, skylark, song thrush, starling, tree sparrow, yellowhammer), spotted flycatcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td>Atlantic grey seal, bats (common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle, noctule, brown long eared, whiskered and brandts, daubentons, leislers, natterers, serotine), brown hare, dormouse, harvest mouse, otter, polecat, small cetaceans (harbour porpoise, bottlenose dolphin, risso's dolphin, white beaked dolphin, common dolphin), water vole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td>Black poplar, bluebell, isle of man cabbage, ivy-leaved water-crowfoot, mackay's horsetail, river water-crowfoot, rock sea-lavender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habits</td>
<td>Arable field margins, coastal and floodplain grazing marsh, coastal sand dune, coastal saltmarsh, dry stone walls, gardens and allotments, heathland, lime beds, hedgerows, lowland fen, lowland raised bog, meres, intertidal mudflats, ponds, reedbeds, rivers, roadside verges, traditional orchards, unimproved grassland, waxcap grasslands, woodland, wood-pasture and parkland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B.9** The flora and fauna exist in a range of varying environments, many of which have received some form of environmental designation in recognition of their importance.

**B.10** The most prominent environmental designations in Cheshire East are:

- **388 Local Wildlife Sites** (LWS) (2019) - locally valued sites of biological diversity\(^8\)
- **23 Local Geological Sites** (2018) - locally valued sites of geological or geomorphological value\(^9\)
- **eight Local Nature Reserves** (2019) - locally important sites established to protect the most important areas of wildlife habitat and geological formations in Britain\(^10\)
- **34 Sites of Special Scientific Interest** (SSSI) (2019) - nationally important sites, designated as they are felt to represent the very best wildlife and geological sites in the country\(^11\)
- **two National Nature Reserves** (2019) - nationally important sites established to protect the most important areas of wildlife habitat and geological formations in Britain\(^12\)

---

8 Cheshire East Council Environmental Planning Service
9 Cheshire East Council Environmental Planning Service
10 Natural England
11 Natural England
12 Natural England
one Special Protection Area (SPA) (2019) - designated as a result of its importance as a habitat for rare and vulnerable birds and is of international importance\(^{(13)}\)

two Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) (2019) - designated due to their potential to contribute towards the conservation of 189 habitat types and 788 species, identified as requiring conservation at a European level (excluding birds). These sites are internationally valued\(^{(14)}\)

three Ramsar designations (2019) - wetlands of international importance designated under the Ramsar Convention;\(^{(15)}\)

one National Park designation (2019) (Peak District National Park) due to its outstanding beauty, and its ecological, archaeological, geological and recreational value.\(^{(16)}\)

B.11 There are no internationally, nationally or locally designated biodiversity sites in the scoping boundary. Mere Gutter with Basford Brook LWS is located about 30m from the southern scoping boundary; this is separated by a railway line. Quakers Coppice Site of Biological importance is located just outside the scoping boundary, to the south east.

B.12 SSSI Impact Risk Zones (IRZ) are a GIS tool developed by Natural England to make a rapid initial assessment of the potential risks to SSSIs posed by development proposals. They define zones around each SSSI, which reflect the particular sensitivities of the features for which it is notified and indicate the types of development proposal that could potentially have adverse impacts. Natural England is a statutory consultee on development proposals that might impact on SSSIs. The scoping boundary is in the IRZ for SSSIs and it is possible that the IRZs relate to the types of development that could occur in the CHAAP boundary.

B.13 The distribution of key environmental designations is illustrated in Figure B.1.
B.14 There are several issues that are currently affecting European sites within the influence of the Cheshire East Local Plan: (17)

- Hydrological changes
- Inappropriate water levels
- Water pollution
- Managed rotational burning
- Low breeding success/poor recruitment
- Inappropriate management practices
- Public access/disturbance
- Air pollution: impact of atmospheric nitrogen distribution
- Wildfire/arson
- Vehicles
- Overgrazing
- Undergrazing
- Invasive species
- Changes in species distributions
- Inappropriate scrub control
- Game management: pheasant rearing
- Forestry and woodland management

17 Site Improvement Plans by Region, Natural England
Habitat fragmentation
Fertiliser use
Inappropriate weirs, dams and other structures
Disease
Climate change
Direct impact from third party
Planning permissions
Peat extraction
Siltation

Key issues

- There are priority species and habitats in the Borough, most of which need conservation measures due to threats to their numbers nationally.
- There are European designated sites located in the Borough boundary. There are no European designated sites (SPA/SAC or Ramsar sites) in the scoping boundary.
- There is a LWS (Mere Gutter with Basford Brook) located outside of the scoping boundary, to the south, and Quakers Coppice Site of Biological Importance is located just outside of the scoping boundary to the south east.
- The scoping boundary falls in the IRZ for SSSIs.

Summary of future baseline

B.15 Habitats and species have the potential to come under increasing pressure from the provision of new housing, employment and infrastructure in the Borough, including at designated sites. This could be from increased disturbance (recreational, noise and light induced) and atmospheric pollution, as well as the loss of habitats and fragmentation of biodiversity networks. The loss and fragmentation of habitats will be exacerbated by the effects of climate change, which has the potential to lead to changes in the distribution and abundance of species and changes to the composition and character of habitats.

Population and human health

B.16 Cheshire East has a population of 378,800 (2017); 51% (193,400) are female and 49% (185,400) are male.\(^{(18)}\) The Borough has a population density of 3.2 people per hectare.\(^{(19)}\)

B.17 The proportions of the population in all older age groups (45-54, 55-64, 65-74, 75-84 and 85 and above) are all higher in Cheshire East than in the North West or the UK as a whole. Conversely, all the younger age groups (0-15, 16-24, 25-34 and 35-44) make up a lower share of the population in Cheshire East than in the North West or UK; this is particularly so for the 16-24 and 25-34 bands. The population estimates also indicate that Cheshire East has an ageing population: for example, between 2001 and 2017, the population aged 65 and above grew by 43.0%, whilst the number aged 16 to 64 increased only 1.0% and the 0-15 population fell by 1.6%.\(^{(20)}\)

\(^{(18)}\) Office for National Statistics (“ONS”) mid-year population estimates for 2017 (June 2018 release). ONS Crown Copyright 2018. ONS licensed under the Open Government Licence v.3.0


\(^{(20)}\) ONS mid-year population estimates for 2001-17 (June 2018 release).
B.18 Current population forecasts indicate that Cheshire East’s population will increase by 58,100 between 2010 and 2030, leading to an overall population figure of 427,100.\(^{(21)}\)

B.19 There is limited ethnic diversity amongst Cheshire East’s population (2011); 93.6% of residents are White British, a further 3.2% are from Other White groups, 1.6% are Asian/Asian British, 0.4% are Black/Black British, 1.0% are of mixed/multiple ethnicity and 0.2% are from other ethnic groups.\(^{(22)}\)

B.20 In relation to religion, between 2001 and 2011 the proportion of Christians and Other religions has decreased, and the proportion of Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs has increased, whilst the percentage who are Buddhist or Jewish has remained the same.\(^{(23)}\)

B.21 Deprivation is lower than the England average but in 2016 6,380 (10.2%) of children aged under 16 were living in poverty.\(^{(24)}\) Life expectancy for both men and women in 2015-17 was higher than the England average, at 80.3 and 83.7 years respectively.\(^{(25)}\) However, at MSOA level the gap between the lowest and highest male life expectancy is 10.9 years and the equivalent gap for females is 11.3 years.\(^{(26)}\)

B.22 21.6% of reception age children and 30.2% of Year 6 children were overweight or obese in 2017/18. This is lower than the England average for both age groups, but represents an increase on the previous year.\(^{(27)}\)

B.23 An estimated 16.4% of adults smoke (2017), which is similar to the England average\(^{(28)}\) In 2016/17 59.4% of adults in Cheshire East were classed as overweight or obese. This is similar than the national average of 61.3%.\(^{(29)}\) During the same time period, 69.2% of adults were physically active, which is similar to the national and regional average.\(^{(30)}\)

B.24 Cheshire East has a higher incidence rate of malignant melanoma than the England average, but the mortality rate from the disease is similar to the England average.\(^{(31)}\) Incidence of and mortality from the other major cancers – lung, breast, bowel and upper GI – are similar to the England average. However, this masks differences across Cheshire East, with higher

\(^{(22)}\) Table KS201EW (Ethnic Group), 2011 Census, Office for National Statistics (“ONS”). ONS Crown Copyright 2018. ONS licensed under the Open Government Licence v.3.0.
\(^{(23)}\) 2011 Census Table KS209EW (Religion) and 2001 Census Table KS007 (Religion), ONS. ONS Crown Copyright 2018. ONS licensed under the Open Government Licence v.3.0.
incidence and mortality rates for some cancers in more deprived areas.\(^{(32)}\) Cheshire East also has lower rates of mortality from cardiovascular and respiratory disease in those aged under 75, when compared with England and the North West.\(^{(33)}\)

**B.25** In 2015-17, Cheshire East had a higher rate of casualties killed or seriously injured on the roads, with 47.5 casualties per 100,000 population.\(^{(34)}\) This may simply reflect the large road network in the borough and, in particular, the high number of rural roads.

**B.26** Cheshire East has seen an increase in crime rates between 2014/15 and 2017/18; the rates in the different crime types have fluctuated over this period.\(^{(35)}\) One of the main reasons behind the increase is due to improved crime recording processes, which were brought in to make sure that victims of crime receive the service they deserve. The changes have meant that incidents that may previously been recorded as anti-social behaviour, are now recorded as disorder in a public area. These improvements are most notable in incidents such as public order offences and violent offences. Cheshire Constabulary has also continued to see an increase in the number of reported sex offences. Much of this increase can be attributed to a rise in the reporting of non-recent sexual offences as confidence increases among those who have not felt they can report the abuse previously.

### Table B.3 Number of Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence/person</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>4,364</td>
<td>5,746</td>
<td>8,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug offences</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual offences</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>2,778</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>3,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>1,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle offences</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>1,304</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>1,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession/weapons</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public order</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>2,918</td>
<td>5,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft/stolen goods</td>
<td>4,421</td>
<td>4,097</td>
<td>4,689</td>
<td>5,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other offences</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15,995</td>
<td>16,639</td>
<td>20,575</td>
<td>28,323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key issues**

- The Borough has an ageing population.
- There is limited ethnic diversity in the Borough.

32 Cheshire East Joint Strategic Needs Assessment – All Cancers, Lung Cancer, Bowel Cancer.

https://fingertips.phe.org.uk/profile/public-health-outcomes-framework/data?page=0&grid=1000044&pat=6&par=E12000002&at=102&are=E06000004&iid=1001&age=298&sex=4

34 Department for Transport, Public Health Outcomes Framework.
https://fingertips.phe.org.uk/profile/public-health-outcomes-framework/data?page=0&grid=1000041&pat=6&par=E12000002&at=102&are=E06000049&iid=1001&age=1&sex=4

35 Source: Cheshire Constabulary
Generally the health of the Borough’s population is varied.

- The proportion of overweight/obese reception age and Year 6 children has increased.
- There is an association between deprivation and health inequality reflected in higher incidences and mortality rates for some cancers in more deprived areas.
- There has been an increase in crime rates.

Summary of future baseline

B.27 Population increases experienced in the Borough are likely to continue. Population trends will result in a further increase in the proportion of older people in the Borough.

B.28 Broadly speaking, the health of the population in the Borough is varied and this situation is likely to continue. Ongoing budget pressures to community services have the potential to lead to effects on health and wellbeing over the longer term.

B.29 Obesity is seen as an increasing issue by health professionals, and one that will contribute to significant health impacts for individuals, including increasing the risk of a range of diseases (including heart disease, Type 2 diabetes and some forms of cancer).

B.30 The Borough has an ageing population; this trend is likely to continue and has the potential to increase pressures on healthcare services.

Water and soil

B.31 Cheshire East has a diverse aquatic environment focused on the range of larger and smaller rivers in the Borough. Some of the larger rivers in the Borough include the Weaver, Wheelock, Croco, Dean, Bollin and Dane. The location of these and other rivers and their tributaries, along with the areas of flood risk is indicated in Figure B.2.

B.32 The Cheshire East Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2013) identifies flood risk associated with Valley Brook (a main river); there is an area of flood risk (flood zones 2 and 3) in the north east of the scoping boundary; however the majority of the scoping boundary is in flood zone 1, which has a low risk of flooding.

---

B.33 Cheshire East is located in two river catchment areas; these are the Weaver/Gowy and the Upper Mersey. There are priority issues outlined in the North West River Basin District River Basin Management Plan (2015) for both river catchment areas:\(^{37}\)

- Weaver/Gowy - pollution from rural areas, waste water, and physical modifications
- Upper Mersey - diffuse pollution (urban and rural), pollution from waste water, and physical modifications

B.34 The North West River Basin District River Basin Management Plan\(^{38}\) sets out: the current state of the water environment; pressures affecting the water environment; environmental objectives for protecting and improving the waters; a programme of measures, and actions needed to achieve the objectives; and progress since the 2009 plan. Ecological river quality has appeared to improve between 2015 and 2016 from 31% moderate, 46% poor and 23% to 3% good, 57% moderate, 32% poor and 8% bad. Chemical river quality has declined slightly between 2015 and 2016 from 100% good to 98% good and 2% fail.\(^{39}\)

B.35 According to United Utilities, Cheshire East is divided into two water extraction areas; the South and West, and the North and East, with water extracted from a mixture of boreholes and surface water sources. The diverse sources of water used in the Borough mean that changes to water usage can have implications beyond the Borough boundary.

B.36 Mineral resources currently extracted in Cheshire East include silica (or industrial) sand, construction sand and gravel, sandstone (hard/crushed rock), salt (brine) and peat. Permitted extraction sites are situated across the Borough.\(^{40}\) The location of these sites is indicated in Figure B.3.\(^{41}\)

---

37 Defra and Environment Agency  
40 Cheshire East Council Strategic Planning Service  
41 Draft Local Aggregates Assessment 2018
B.37 Sales of land-won aggregate sand and gravel have fluctuated since 2008 with the overall trend being one of a steady decline from the start of the period (2008) of 470,000 tonnes to a low point in 2011 of 260,000 tonnes, followed by a steady rise to a peak in 2014 of 750,000 tonnes. Annual sales reduced to 290,000 tonnes by the end of 2017, a decrease of over 58% compared to 2016 sales of 460,000 tonnes.\(^{(42)}\)

B.38 Cheshire East (10.9%) has proportionately more high quality Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land than the North West (7.4%), but less than England (17.4%). In terms of Grade 3 agricultural land however, Cheshire East (67.4%) has proportionately more than both the North West (34.8%) and England (49.6%).\(^{(43)}\) In total, Cheshire East has proportionately more Grade 1, 2 and 3 agricultural land than the North West and England. The scoping boundary area is located in the ‘urban’ land classification.

\(^{(42)}\) Local Aggregate Assessment 2018

\(^{(43)}\) Cheshire East Council - Report on the Role of the Best and Most Versatile Land in Cheshire East. Local Plan Exam Library Ref [PC B025]
B.39 In 2017/18, 194,878 tonnes of waste material was collected by Cheshire East, of which 183,750 tonnes was collected from households across the Borough. This marks a decrease from the previous year of 8,018 tonnes. Of the total amount, 55.8% was sent for either recycling or composting. 44.1% was sent to landfill or incinerated (with energy generated) with an additional 0.1% (355 tonnes) treated by other unspecified treatment processes.  

B.40 The amount of household waste collected per head has decreased from 500kg in 2016/17 to 480kg in 2017/18.

B.41 Key issues

- There is an area of flood risk in the north east of the scoping boundary.
- Pollution is an issue for the Weaver/Gowy and Upper Mersey river catchment areas.
- Ecological river quality in the Borough has improved, however chemical river quality has slightly declined.
- Cheshire East has 15 permitted mineral extraction sites with resources such as silica (or industrial) sand, construction sand and gravel, sandstone (hard/crushed rock), salt (brine) and peat.
- The Borough has proportionately more Grade 1, 2 and 3 agricultural land than the North West and England. The scoping boundary area is located in the 'urban' classification.
- There has been a decrease in the amount of waste collected from the Borough’s households.

B.42 Summary of future baseline

B.43 Existing planning policy encourages the efficient use of land and a preference for the development of brownfield land where possible. Future housing, employment and infrastructure growth is likely to result in further loss of greenfield and agricultural land. In line with the NPPF, the Council should seek to use areas of poorer agricultural land in preference to those of higher quality.

B.44 Due to increasing legislative and regulatory requirements, there are increasing pressures to improve recycling and composting rates and move towards zero waste to landfill. However, potential population increases in the Borough may increase pressures on recycling and waste management facilities. Furthermore, Defra’s estimation for waste growth shows that national waste growth and estimates of future waste arisings are expected to remain consistent with current levels. This is because widespread initiatives to reduce waste and improve material’s reuse and recycling are likely to reduce long-term production of waste.

B.45 Water availability in the wider area may be affected by regional increases in population and an increased occurrence of drought, which is estimated to become increasingly prevalent as a result of climate change.

---


B.46 Water quality is likely to continue to be affected by pollution incidents in the area and physical modifications to water bodies. In the short to medium term, the requirements of the Water Framework Directive are likely to lead to improvements to water quality in watercourses in the wider area.

Air

B.47 There has been a growing body of evidence to suggest that poor air quality may have a negative effect on sensitive individuals. Air pollutants can also impact on vegetation, disrupt natural ecosystems and lead to the corrosion of buildings and monuments. Additionally, many pollutants are also greenhouse gases, which contribute to climate change.

B.48 Those areas with the poorest air quality, with levels of nitrogen dioxide that relate to traffic levels and congestion, must be declared as Air Quality Management Areas. Following this declaration the Local Authority must produce an Air Quality Action Plan, showing how it intends to work towards achieving the national air quality objectives.

B.49 In Cheshire East there are 17 Air Quality Management Areas ("AQMA") (2018). These are shown in Table B.4. The scoping boundary contains part of the Nantwich Road AQMA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Quality Management Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A556 Chester Road, Mere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A523 London Road, Macclesfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A34 West Road, Congleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nantwich Road, Crewe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A50 Manchester Road, Knutsford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A34 Lower Heath, Congleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wistaston Road, Crewe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earle Street, Crewe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 Market Street, Disley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A54 Rood Hill, Congleton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5022/A534, Sandbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Street, Nantwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester Road, Middlewich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Cross Macclesfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibel Road, Macclesfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Lane, Macclesfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlewich Road, Sandbach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.50 The main cause of air quality issues in Cheshire East is road traffic. Car and van ownership in Cheshire East is significantly higher than that for the North West and England, whilst the distances travelled to work driving a car or van are also high (2011).

Key issues

- There are areas in the Borough that suffer from poor air quality. The scoping boundary contains part of the Nantwich Road AQMA.
- Road traffic is the main source of air quality issues in the Borough.

Summary of future baseline

---

46 Cheshire East Council Environmental Protection Service
48 Office for National Statistics
49 Table DC7701EWia (Method of travel to work (2001 specification) by distance travelled to work), 2011 Census, ONS. ONS Crown Copyright 2016. ONS licensed under the Open Government Licence v. 1.0.
B.51 New housing and employment provision in the Borough and sub-regionally has the potential to have adverse effects on air quality through increasing traffic flows and associated levels of pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide. Areas of particular sensitivity to increased traffic flows are likely to be routes with the largest congestion issues, including those with designated AQMAs.

Climatic factors

B.52 Climate change is the formal term given to the fluctuation of the Earth’s temperature and the impact of this on the natural environment. Although some of this fluctuation is natural, the average temperature of the Earth’s surface is now about 1°C above the average for the pre-industrial era.\(^{(50)}\)

B.53 This change is largely the result of increasing emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, leading to a ‘greenhouse effect’ that warms up the Earth and its oceans and creates more extreme weather conditions. Scientific evidence demonstrates that these increased emissions are almost entirely due to human activities, particularly the burning of fossil fuels, deforestation, agricultural activities and certain manufacturing processes.\(^{(51)}\) Due to this a number of targets have been set for the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions (the most abundant greenhouse gas) and for limiting rises in global temperature.

B.54 Total emissions (including the domestic sector) fell by 13% between 2013 and 2016 (the latest year for which data are available), though most of this change occurred during 2013-14 (see Table B.5). However, \(\text{CO}_2\) emissions from road transport grew by 6% during 2013-16.\(^{(52)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry and commercial</td>
<td>1,063.8</td>
<td>853.6</td>
<td>852.8</td>
<td>790.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>900.9</td>
<td>754.1</td>
<td>733.1</td>
<td>701.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road transport</td>
<td>1,127.9</td>
<td>1,152.4</td>
<td>1,191.6</td>
<td>1,195.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use, land use change &amp; forestry</td>
<td>-7.9</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
<td>-11.6</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,084.7</td>
<td>2,750.0</td>
<td>2,765.9</td>
<td>2,675.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.55 Reducing greenhouse gas emissions will primarily be achieved through a combination of reducing emissions from buildings, (through changes to building construction methods and materials, building uses and improved build standards), reducing emissions from transport (encouraging modal shift and reducing need to travel) and energy use (shifting to low carbon forms of energy and reducing energy consumption) and changes to manufacturing processes (to make them less carbon-intensive).


\(^{(51)}\) ‘Climate change explained’, Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy, October 2014.

Improvements have already been achieved to build standards, linked to changes to building regulations. During the 2017/18 monitoring period, the average Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) rating received by new build dwellings across Cheshire East was 82; this compares to 81 in the 2016/17 monitoring period. This is significantly higher than the average for existing dwellings across Cheshire East of 55.

Key issues

- CO₂ emissions from road transport in the Borough have increased.
- Build standards have improved in the Borough, with an increase in the average SAP rating.

Summary of future baseline

Climate change has the potential to increase the occurrence of extreme weather events in the Borough, with increases in mean summer and winter temperatures, increases in mean precipitation in winter and decreases in mean precipitation in summer. Carbon dioxide emissions are likely to decrease as energy efficiency measures, renewable energy production and new technologies become more widely adopted. This relates to transport for example, as increased take up of more energy efficient vehicles and electric vehicles takes place. However, increases in the built footprint of the Borough may lead to increases in overall emissions if efficiency measures do not keep pace.

Transport

The extensive road network in the Borough includes the M6, which runs north to south through the centre of Cheshire East and the M56 running east to west. The M56 links to the M6 in the north of the Borough. There are also 14 primary 'A' roads in Cheshire East. The scoping boundary includes A534 Crewe Road/Nantwich Road, A532 Macon Way/Weston Road, and A5019 Mill Street (the principal road link between Crewe Railway Station and the town centre). Crewe Green roundabout is the principal route into Crewe from the north, east and south for both local traffic and strategic network traffic originating from junctions 16 and 17 of the M6 motorway. Improvements have recently taken place to ease congestion at the junction, improve local and strategic access issues and provide increased road network capacity to support the Local Plan up to 2030. They will also unlock growth potential and improve access to a number of development sites in and around Crewe.

The rail network is accessible from 22 Railway Stations across the Borough. Apart from Middlewich, all of Cheshire East’s towns have a Railway Station and most of these are located on one the rail lines radiating from Crewe. These are the West Coast Main Line to Glasgow and London, the Stoke-on-Trent/Derby Line, the Shrewsbury/South Wales Line, the Chester/Holyhead Line, and the Greater Manchester line. Macclesfield is on the West Coast Main Line - Stoke-on-Trent route, giving access to Greater Manchester and London Euston.

53 Ratings are expressed on a scale of 1 to 100 - the higher the number, the better the rating
54 Cheshire East Council - Civicance
57 Estimates of Station Usage Time Series - 1997-98 to 2016-17, Office of Rail and Road (ORR), December 2017
Crewe Railway Station is included in the scoping boundary.

The Government has proposed a high-speed rail line (HS2), connecting:

- London to the West Midlands (Phase 1)
- West Midlands to Leeds and Manchester
- West Midlands to Crewe (Phase 2a)
- from Crewe to Greater Manchester and from the West Midlands to Yorkshire (Phase 2b)

The latest HS2 announcements place Crewe central to the plans; the route will pass through various parts of Cheshire East, with a Hub Station at Crewe and Rolling Stock Depot north of Crewe.\(^{(59)}\)

The bus network in Crewe is focused on Crewe Bus Station, outside of the scoping boundary. Several bus routes, including the 3, 6/6E, 8S, 12, 37, 38, 39 and 85 connect the scoping boundary area with Northwich, Hanley (both outside of the Borough), Shavington, Nantwich, and Macclesfield (in the north of the Borough). All services operate at peak hours, with the exception of service 39, with most operating some services at off-peak times.

The reliance on private transport remains high, however. The estimated miles driven by vehicles in Cheshire East was 2.243m in 2017. This is lower than the figures for 2014-16 (which ranged from 2.249m to 2.257m), but still higher than the totals for 2009-13.\(^{(60)}\)

Crewe Railway Station is in walking distance of Crewe town centre, however the route is indirect and unattractive, taking pedestrians along busy roads that need to be crossed, and passing through a mix of commercial and residential areas that are not particularly unique in character. There is a national cycle route running along the Railway Station frontage, but this does not run to the town centre.

Key issues

- The Borough has an extensive road network, including the M6 and M56 motorways.
- The boundary includes Crewe Railway Station, which is on the West Coast Main Line.
- The Government has proposed that HS2 will pass through Crewe, with the potential for the development of a Hub Station at Crewe Railway Station.
- Bus routes that serve the scoping boundary connect this area with other parts of the Borough and beyond.
- There is a high reliance on private transport in the Borough.
- There is an unattractive pedestrian route and poor cycle links between Crewe Railway Station and Crewe town centre.


\(^{(60)}\) Department for Transport traffic counts data (obtained in October 2017 from [https://www.dft.gov.uk/traffic-counts/area.php?region=North+West&la=East+Cheshire](https://www.dft.gov.uk/traffic-counts/area.php?region=North+West&la=East+Cheshire)).
Summary of future baseline

B.67 Given the rural nature of the majority of the Borough and high levels of car ownership, the car is likely to remain a dominant form of transport in the Borough over the coming years. New housing and employment provision also has the potential to increase traffic flows without appropriate locational policies and interventions. As such, congestion is likely to continue to be an issue for parts of the Borough. Whilst negative effects of new development on the transport network are likely to be mitigated to a degree, there will be a continuing need for development to be situated in accessible locations that limit the need to travel by private car.

Cultural heritage and landscape

B.68 Cheshire East contains a valued, varied and unique heritage, which includes a number of cultural and environmental assets. These assets include Crewe's railway heritage, Macclesfield's industrial heritage, Little Moreton Hall, Tatton Park, Lyme Park, Quarry Bank Mill, Tegg's Nose, the canal network, historic towns and parts of the Peak District National Park, amongst others. Other unique attractions include a wealth of historic Parks and Gardens and Jodrell Bank Radio Telescope.

B.69 Formal cultural designations in Cheshire East include:

- **76 Conservation Areas** of varying size and scale (2018) designated as a result of the special character of development that has taken place in them. In and adjoining these Areas there is a statutory duty to pay 'special attention' to development with the intention of preserving/enhancing its character or appearance

- **Listed Buildings** (2019) - those of particular merit, for reason of architectural quality, their social or economic history, association with well known characters or events or because of their group value with other Listed Buildings. There are 2,646 listings covering a number of different gradings

- **105 Scheduled Monuments** (2019) - historically important sites and monuments

- **17 historic Parks and Gardens** (2019) viewed as a distinctive and much cherished part of our inheritance

- **ten areas of archaeological potential** (2018) - parts of the country where it is deemed likely that buried archaeology has survived and

- **one registered battlefield** (2019) designated as a result of the importance of events that took place there

B.70 In terms of designated heritage assets, there are two Grade II Listed Buildings in the scoping boundary. These are the 1867 buildings at Crewe Railway Station, and the Delaney Building at Crewe and Alsager College.

B.71 There is also the potential for non-designated (or local heritage) assets, and unrecorded archaeology on some sites.

---

61 Cheshire East Council Environmental Planning Service
62 Historic England
63 Historic England
64 Historic England
65 Cheshire Archaeology Planning Advisory Service
66 Historic England
B.72 Cheshire contains 12 historic land classifications,\(^{(67)}\) based on the presence or absence of features in the landscape in 2007:

- Settlement: about 12% (about 31,405ha)
- Woodland: about 3.4% (about 8,997ha)
- Non-improved: about 4.2% (about 11,116ha)
- Ornamental Landscape: about 2.6% (about 6,797ha)
- Ancient Fields: about 18.0% (about 46,586ha)
- Post Medieval Fieldscape: about 27.8% (about 73,049ha)
- Military: about 0.3% (about 829ha)
- C20th Fieldscape: about 16.0% (about 41,698ha)
- Communications: about 1.9% (about 4,899ha)
- Water Bodies: about 0.5% (about 1,414ha)
- Industry: about 5.0% (about 123,991ha)
- Recreation: about 2.6% (about 6,943ha)

B.73 The scoping boundary includes five historic land classifications; settlement, recreation, industry, communications and ornamental.

B.74 Cheshire East’s landscape is dominated by the flat topography of the Cheshire Plains, containing a number of meres, ponds and marshes; however variety is provided as a result of the closeness of the Peak District to the east and the Mid-Cheshire Ridge to the west. There were 14 landscape character types in Cheshire East in 2018: LCT 1 Sandstone Ridge, LCT 2 Sandstone Fringe, LCT 3 Undulating Farmland, LCT 4 Cheshire Plain East, LCT 5 Wooded Estates and Meres, LCT 6 Woodland, Heaths, Meres and Mosses, LCT 7 Lower Wooded Farmland, LCT 8 Salt Flashes, LCT 9 Mossland, LCT 10 River Valleys, LCT 11 Higher Wooded Farmland, LCT 12 Upland Footslopes, LCT 13 Enclosed Gritstone Upland, LCT 14 Moorland Hill and Ridges\(^{(68)}\) The scoping boundary includes a small area of LCT 7 Lower Wooded Farmland (the playing fields of the former Manchester Metropolitan University buildings off Crewe Road). This landscape character type covers a large area and is divided into seven character areas extending from High Leigh and Arley in the north, east to Poynton and Congleton and as far south as Audlem. This very gently rolling landscape type has many similarities with the Cheshire plain, yet it has a greater concentration of woodland and a slightly higher settlement density with more nucleated hamlets and settlements. Land use is a mix of arable and pasture, while settlement largely retains its dispersed pattern. Intensive reorganisation during the post-medieval period saw the dilution of some medieval field patterns. The landscape is very rural, although has been impacted in places by the presence of major transport routes and nearby large urban areas.

B.75 Trees contribute to the identified landscape character of an area. The scoping boundary contains two areas where trees are subject to Tree Preservation Orders:

---

68 Cheshire East Landscape Character Assessment, LUC, May 2018 http://cheshireeast-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/cs/sadpo/evidence
• western corner of the A534 Crewe Road and Gateway, which contains sycamore, cherry, lime, pine, oak, and willow
• Quakers Coppice/land adjacent to University Way, which contains mixed deciduous and coniferous species including ash, oak, pine, elder, willow, alder, larch, wild cherry, field maple, and birch

B.76 Green Gap is a local designation, introduced to achieve similar objectives to Green Belt; Cheshire East has 1,212.31ha of land identified as Strategic Green Gap in the south of the Borough (2017). The scoping boundary is not included in the Strategic Green Gap.

B.77 The Borough contains large areas of designated open space including within settlements and 40,140ha of land designated as Green Belt (2018), however, with its urban character, there are limited areas of designated open space in the scoping boundary.

Key issues

• The Borough contains a number of cultural and environmental assets, including designated heritage assets.
• Two Grade II Listed Buildings and five historic land classifications are located in the scoping boundary.
• The scoping boundary includes a small part of LCT 7 Lower Wooded Farmland landscape character type.
• Two areas in the scoping boundary are subject to Tree Preservation Orders.
• The character of the scoping boundary area is urban, with limited areas of greenspace.

Summary of future baseline

B.78 New development in the Borough has the potential to impact on the fabric and setting of cultural heritage assets. This includes through inappropriate design and layout. It should be noted, however, that existing historic environment designations will offer a degree of protection to cultural heritage assets and their settings. Also new development need not be harmful to the significance of a heritage asset; new development may be an opportunity to enhance the setting of an asset and better reveal its significance. There may also be opportunities to enhance non-designated heritage assets.

B.79 New development has the potential to lead to incremental changes in landscape and townscape character and quality in and around the Borough. This includes from the loss of landscape features and visual impact. There may also be potential effects on landscape/townscape character and quality in the vicinity of the road network due to an incremental growth in traffic flows.

Social inclusiveness

B.80 In 2017, Cheshire East contained 172,930 dwellings. Of these, 88.3% were private sector, 11.7% were operated by a private registered provider and 0.1% were owned by the Local Authority or another public sector body.

---

69 Cheshire East Council Strategic Planning Service
70 Local authority Green Belt statistics for England: 2017 to 2018, MHCLG
71 Table 100 (Number of dwellings by tenure and district, England), Live tables on dwelling stock, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, May 2018.
B.81 The Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) (2015) for Cheshire East is 36,000 dwellings over the Local Plan period (2010 to 2030), which equates to 1,800 dwellings per year.\(^{(72)}\)

B.82 After a downturn around the time of the 2008-9 global financial crisis, average (mean) house prices across Cheshire East rose in each consecutive year from 2013 onwards. By January 2019, the average price in the Borough was £223,600 (up 30% on the same month of 2012), which is lower than the England average (£244,600), but well above the North West (£160,800).\(^{(73)}\)

B.83 23 of Cheshire East’s 234 Lower layer Super Output Areas (“LSOAs”) rank among the most deprived 25% of English LSOAs (unchanged from 2010) and six of these are among England’s most deprived 10% (up from five in 2010, when Cheshire East had only 231 LSOAs).\(^{(74)}\)

B.84 120 of the Borough’s LSOAs are amongst England’s least deprived 25% and 63 of these are within England’s least deprived 10%. This is a decrease in the overall number of Cheshire East LSOAs that rank amongst England’s least deprived (in 2010, 121 of the Borough’s LSOAs were amongst the country’s least deprived 25% and 71 of these fell within the country’s least deprived 10%).

B.85 The statistics suggest little change (between 2010 and 2015) in the relative deprivation of Cheshire East (compared to other parts of England). However, these statistics do not measure absolute deprivation and it is not possible to draw conclusions from them about how deprivation has changed in absolute terms.

B.86 Table B.6 lists the 23 most deprived LSOAs in 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSOA</th>
<th>Settlement(1)</th>
<th>Percentile(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E01018476</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018462</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018466</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018459</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018445</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>9.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018486</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018400</td>
<td>Congleton</td>
<td>10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018485</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>10.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018640</td>
<td>Macclesfield</td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## Percentile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSOA</th>
<th>Settlement(1)</th>
<th>Percentile(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E01018596</td>
<td>Wilmslow</td>
<td>12.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018484</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>13.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018498</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>13.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018467</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>14.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018388</td>
<td>Alsager</td>
<td>14.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018463</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>15.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018477</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>18.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018478</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>18.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018645</td>
<td>Macclesfield</td>
<td>18.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018497</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>20.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018631</td>
<td>Macclesfield</td>
<td>20.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018487</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>20.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018594</td>
<td>Handforth</td>
<td>22.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E01018423</td>
<td>Middlewich</td>
<td>23.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The geographical definitions used for each settlement are those set out in Appendix 6 of the Cheshire East ‘LDF Background Report: Determining the Settlement Hierarchy’, Cheshire East Council, November 2010 (Local Plan Examination Library document [BE 046]).

2. These percentiles indicate the proportion of English LSOAs that are more deprived than the LSOA in question. For example, LSOA E01018459 in Crewe has a percentile value of 7.64, which means it is outside England’s most deprived 7%, but inside England’s most deprived 8%.

### Key issues

- LSOAs E01018445 and E1018400, which contain part of the scoping boundary, are some of the most deprived in England.
- Average house prices in the Borough are higher than the North West, but lower than the England average.
- The majority of dwellings in the Borough are private sector.

### Summary of future baseline

**B.87** The suitability of housing for local requirements depends in part on the successful implementation of appropriate housing policies taken forward through the Local Plan. However, without interventions, the affordability, suitability and quality of housing in the Borough may continue to be an issue. Unplanned development may also have wider implications in terms of transport and access to infrastructure or the natural environment.

### Economic development

**B.88** Jobs density is defined as the number of filled jobs in an area divided by the number of working-age residents in that area. High job densities indicate that demand for labour exceeds supply. The shortfall may be met by inward commuting. Conversely, many of those
living in areas with a low jobs density may have to commute to work in other areas. The latest (2017) figures put the Borough’s jobs density at 1.00, which is considerably higher than the densities for the North West (0.83) and the UK (0.85). (75)

B.89 Survey data for 2017 suggest that over two fifths (45.7%, or about 102,100) of Cheshire East’s 16-64 year-olds have a qualification at Level 4 (first degree level or equivalent) or above. This proportion exceeds the figures for both the North West (34.5%) and the UK (38.4%) by statistically significant margins (in other words, it cannot be attributed solely to survey sampling error). (76)

B.90 Of those people working in the Borough in 2017/18, nearly half (49.6%) were employed in high-skill occupations (managerial, professional and associate professional/technical occupations). This proportion is above the UK average (45.8%). The proportion working in skilled trades occupations (10.9%) is similar to the national average (10.2%), as is the share contributed by caring, leisure, sales and customer service occupations (16.6% locally and 16.8% in the UK). The proportions working in administrative & secretarial jobs (8.2% locally and 10.2% for the UK) and in low-skill or elementary occupations (14.7% locally, against 17.0% for the UK) are each below the UK average. (77) The percentage of working-age (16-64 year-old) residents in employment (76.4% in 2017/18) is higher than both the regional and UK averages (73.8% and 75.0% respectively). (78) The proportion of the economically active population aged 16 and above who are unemployed – people who are available for and actively seeking work, but not necessarily claiming out-of-work benefits – is also low (3.2% in 2017/18, compared to 4.1% for the North West and 4.2% in Great Britain). (79) So is the claimant count rate (the proportion of working-age people claiming out-of-work benefits): 1.8% in Cheshire East in February 2019, against 3.3% and 2.6% for the North West and UK respectively. (80)

B.91 Almost half of the scoping boundary area is made up of the existing strategic employment site of Weston Road/Crewe Gates/Quakers Coppice (ES - CR02), which is a large and prominent industrial and commercial area offering a wide range of leasehold and freehold office, industrial and warehousing premises. (81) The scoping boundary area also includes parts of the strategic employment sites of University Way (ES-CR03) and Gresty Bridge Works (ES-CR08). (82)

---

75 Jobs density data, ONS, NOMIS. Crown Copyright 2019.
77 Annual Population Survey workplace analysis, October 2017 – September 2018, Office for National Statistics (“ONS”), NOMIS. Crown Copyright 2019. For the purposes of this commentary, “2017/18” means the 12-month period ending in September 2018. The analysis described above is based on ONS’ Standard Occupational Classification 2010 (SOC2010) Major Groups: “high-skill” occupations means SOC2010 Major Groups 1-3 and “low-skill or elementary occupations” means Major Groups 8-9, whilst “caring, leisure, sales and customer service occupations” means Major Groups 6-7, “administrative & secretarial” is Major Group 4 and “skilled trades occupations” is Major Group 5.
80 Source: [1] Claimant Count, Office for National Statistics (ONS), NOMIS. Crown Copyright 2019. Rates based on Office for National Statistics (ONS) mid-year population estimates for 2017 (June 2018 release). ONS licensed under the Open Government Licence v. 3.0. Note: Because this claimant count measure includes all out-of-work Universal Credit (UC) claimants as well as all Jobseeker’s Allowance (JSA) claimants, it results in higher claimant counts and rates than the previous measure (which covered JSA alone).
In Cheshire East 29,100 residents travelled at least 20km to work (2011), which equates to 16.0% of the Borough’s working residents, and is significantly higher than for the North West (11.4%) and England & Wales (13.8%).

Key issues

- The Borough has a high jobs density.
- The proportion of 16 to 64 year olds in the Borough with a first degree or equivalent qualification exceeds the figures for the North West and UK.
- Almost half of the people working in the Borough are employed in high-skill occupations.
- The proportion working in skilled trades and low-skill or elementary occupations are slightly below the UK average.
- There is a relatively high proportion of residents in employment and a low proportion of economically active population aged 16 and above unemployed.
- The scoping boundary contains three strategic employment sites.

Summary of future baseline

B.93 The Borough has a relatively high proportion of people employed in high-skill occupations compared to the proportion of people working in administrative and secretarial jobs, skilled trades occupations and in low-skill or elementary occupations; this situation is likely to continue in the absence of a major shift in the nature of the local economy.

B.94 The rural economy will continue to play a large part in the economic vitality of the Borough.

B.95 The Borough also has an important tourism offer and historic legacy, which provides significant opportunities for the economy.

B.96 Homeworking, self-employment and home based businesses, along with other flexible ways of working, are likely to have an influence on the Borough’s economic landscape in forthcoming years.
Appendix C: Objectives

C.1 The Draft CHAAP identifies a Vision and eight aims, with four objectives to deliver them, which were drawn up based on current planning guidance, the existing policy framework, consideration of relevant evidence and the outcomes of consultations. There is no regulatory requirement to develop reasonable alternatives for Development Plan Document Objectives, only that they be tested against the SA Framework ("SAF"). Therefore the four Objectives subject to testing are:

**Objective 1: Maximising economic opportunities**

Provide a new commercial district; the Crewe Commercial Hub, and mixed use commercial and residential development in other locations to support and enable the delivery of a HS2 Hub Station.

This will be delivered by:

a. Supporting the delivery of new employment floorspace  
b. Enabling the delivery of new homes, leisure and cultural facilities, enhanced public realm and a limited amount of ancillary retail  
c. Capitalising on accessibility by supporting improved transport infrastructure  
d. Supporting the on-going regeneration of Crewe town centre through:
   
i. New and improved pedestrian links between the town centre and the HS2 Hub Station  
   ii. A retail offer that serves the needs of travellers, visitors and new residents, but which does not compete with the existing town centre  
   iii. The extensive regeneration of the Mill Street area, creating vibrant new neighbourhoods connected to both the town centre and the HS2 Hub Station

**Objective 2: Improving connectivity**

Development across the Crewe Hub will embed advanced digital infrastructure and vastly improve physical connectivity and accessibility to, from and around the Crewe Hub Station, and across the wider sub-region.

This will be achieved through:

a. Integrating digital and smart technology in the fabric of new development  
b. The delivery of a HS2 Hub Station with:
   
i. Rail infrastructure to accommodate 5/7 HS2 trains per hour and that enables enhanced operational capacity to improve local and regional rail connectivity  
   ii. A primary entrance on Weston Road providing main vehicular access and a local transport hub  
   iii. A reconfigured entrance on Nantwich Road focussed on pedestrian and cyclist access
iv. A new pedestrian access at Gresty Road creating a transfer deck and pedestrian link through the railway station to Weston Road
v. An improved public realm adjoining the railway station
c. Successfully managing increased vehicular demand through:
   i. Minimising conflicts with local trips by ensuring that vehicles are directed to both the Strategic Road Network and major road network
   ii. Increasing highway capacity to unlock development land and allow efficient operation of the highway network, particularly in relation to vehicle movements crossing the West Coast Mainline within the Crewe Hub
   iii. Future proofing the transport network to ensure that it can fully adapt and capitalise on emerging opportunities (such as electric, self driving and on-demand vehicles) that improve journey time reliability and reduce vehicle emissions
   iv. Consolidation of local parking provision and increased parking capacity close to the railway station
   v. Creating a safe, high quality journey experience and maximising the use of sustainable transport modes by walking, cycling, bus and rail through new and improved links
   vi. Establishing a local transport interchange adjoining the HS2 Hub Station on Weston Road, connecting the town centre

Objective 3: Delivering sustainable development

Development across the Crewe Hub will be underpinned by appropriate environmental and social infrastructure that also contributes to sustainable place making.

This will be delivered by:

a. Ensuring new development delivers zero net greenhouse gas emissions through a range of measures both on and off site
b. The provision of social, health, education and green infrastructure across the Crewe Hub
c. Creating new and unique homes through a variety and mix of modern, excellently designed apartments and town houses as part of a mixed use development in walking distance of the HS2 Hub Station; reducing the need to travel
d. Supporting skills and jobs by levying contributions to local education and skills-based training associated with the delivery needs of HS2 and other development across the Crewe Hub
e. Ensuring development supports and enables healthier and positive lifestyles through an improved leisure, recreation, sport and cultural offer
f. A net gain in biodiversity through a network of green infrastructure that retains, improves and provides new valuable habitats
g. Creating a sustainable solution to the water environment and improving overall water quality in the area
Objective 4: Improving environmental quality

A new innovative design dynamic will be promoted across the Crewe Hub with an emphasis on enhancing environmental quality through development that is coherent, connected and makes best use of local character and heritage to establish a sense of place.

This will be achieved through:

a. Outstanding station design including exceptionally high quality frontages that create a positive transition between the HS2 Hub Station and the local area
b. Creating a new townscape with active ground floor use and skyline of increased height and quality
c. An improved urban landscape, more recognisably connected to Cheshire’s countryside through integrated green infrastructure
d. The delivery of a high quality public realm
e. Retaining and integrating valuable heritage in new development
f. Delivering landmark buildings of exceptional design quality in key locations
g. Building design that fully integrates environmentally sustainable measures and that improves the image and function of the Crewe Hub

Method

C.2 The sustainability objectives and topics identified in Chapter 2 of this Report, and adapted from the SA Scoping Report (June 2017) to make them relevant to the CHAAP(84) form the basis for the SA work carried out on the four Objectives. The Objectives of the CHAAP were tested against the SAF. This identified, at an early stage, potential synergies or inconsistencies that needed to be considered further through the appraisal. Naturally, there is a level of uncertainty here as the compatibility of the CHAAP Objectives and the SAF will depend on how they are taken forward, both through final policy proposals and subsequent implementation. Effects are predicated taking into account the criteria in the Regulations;(85) (duration, frequency and reversibility of effects are considered, as well as cumulative effects). This considered the baseline information (presented in Appendix B of this report) and any available updated evidence, together with professional judgement where appropriate. In the appraisal, green shading is used to indicate significant positive effects and red shading is used to indicate significant negative effects. General comments are made on the relative merits of the Objectives where significant effects can't be predicted based on reasonable assumptions.

C.3 It should be noted mitigation measures have also considered policies contained in the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan ("CNLP") recognising that the SADPD will replace a number of policies in the CNLP once the SADPD has been adopted. This approach will be kept under review during the development of the CHAAP.

84 https://www.cheshireeast.gov.uk/planning/spatial_planning/cheshire_east_local_plan/local_plan_consultations/sustainability_appraisal.asp
86 Chapter 5 of this Report
**Appraisal findings**

**C.4** Tables C.1 to C.9 detail the appraisal findings for each Objective, under each specific sustainability topic. A separate section summarises the appraisal findings for the Objectives.

**Biodiversity, flora and fauna**

The role of green infrastructure in minimising the loss of greenfield land (and as a result, green infrastructure), which can provide valuable habitat. However, it should be noted that brownfield land can be highly valuable for certain forms of biodiversity, as it can also be the best or only available habitat for rare and endangered species. Development can lead to an increase in traffic and therefore an increase in atmospheric pollution; noise from increased traffic can disturb wildlife. There can also be an increase in the disturbance of biodiversity and geodiversity as a result of recreational activity.

Looking at the Objectives, all of them look to instigate development and are therefore likely, overall, to have a negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna. However, each Objective includes further detail with regards to how it will be delivered or achieved, which in some cases is likely to lessen the negative effect. Therefore, Objective 1 looks to improve pedestrian links between the HS2 Hub Station and the town centre, which could limit the amount of traffic in this area, with a likely reduced negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna. Objective 2 seeks to promote sustainable travel options, which could limit an anticipated increase in traffic in the AAP boundary and the surrounding area, which is likely to reduce the negative effect. Objective 3 is likely to have a lesser negative effect in those areas in walking distance of the HS2 Hub Station that do not contain homes, and in those areas that have no existing biodiversity value, through the provision of green infrastructure. Objective 3 is also likely to have a lesser negative effect in those areas that have valuable habitats, through their retention and improvement. This Objective also seeks to deliver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail and significance</th>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>Objective 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1</strong></td>
<td>Provide a new commercial district; the Crewe Commercial Hub, and mixed use commercial and residential development in other locations to support and enable the delivery of a HS2 Hub Station</td>
<td>Development across the Crewe Hub will embed advanced digital infrastructure and vastly improve physical connectivity and accessibility to, from and around the Crewe Hub Station, and across the wider sub-region</td>
<td>Development across the Crewe Hub will be underpinned by appropriate environmental and social infrastructure that also contributes to sustainable place making</td>
<td>A new innovative design dynamic will be promoted across the Crewe Hub with an emphasis on enhancing environmental quality through development that is coherent, connected and makes best use of local character and heritage to establish a sense of place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

A key consideration is the potential for impacts on internationally important sites including Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 1 Ramsar, Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 2 Ramsar, the West Midland Mosses SAC, nationally important sites (for example Sites of Special Scientific Interest), and locally important sites (for example Local Wildlife Sites (“LWS”)), as well as Priority Habitats and species. There are several issues that affect internationally important sites, which are highlighted in Appendix B of this Report, and include public access/disturbance, hydrological changes and habitat fragmentation. The HRA will determine if the CHAAP will have a significant effect on European Sites. International, national and local nature conservation areas are located throughout the Borough, however there are none located in the scoping boundary. Mere Gutter with Basford Brook LWS is located about 30m from the southern scoping boundary; this is separated by a railway line. Quakers Coppice Site of Biological Importance is located just outside of the scoping boundary to the south east. The precise location of development is not known at this stage and therefore there is uncertainty with regard to the nature and significance of the effects.

The scoping boundary contains a number of previously developed areas, which means that it is possible for the Objectives to minimise the loss of greenfield land (and as a result, green infrastructure), which can provide valuable habitat. However, it should be noted that brownfield land can be highly valuable for certain forms of biodiversity, as it can also be the best or only available habitat for rare and endangered species. Development can lead to an increase in traffic and therefore an increase in atmospheric pollution; noise from increased traffic can disturb wildlife. There can also be an increase in the disturbance of biodiversity and geodiversity as a result of recreational activity.

**Table C.1 Sustainability topic: biodiversity, flora and fauna**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>Objective 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a new commercial district; the Crewe Commercial Hub, and mixed use</td>
<td>Development across the Crewe Hub will embed advanced digital infrastructure</td>
<td>Development across the Crewe Hub will be underpinned by appropriate</td>
<td>A new innovative design dynamic will be promoted across the Crewe Hub with an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial and residential development in other locations to support and</td>
<td>and vastly improve physical connectivity and accessibility to, from and</td>
<td>environmental and social infrastructure that also contributes to sustainable</td>
<td>emphasis on enhancing environmental quality through development that is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enable the delivery of a HS2 Hub Station</td>
<td>around the Crewe Hub Station, and across the wider sub-region</td>
<td>place making</td>
<td>coherent, connected and makes best use of local character and heritage to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>establish a sense of place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix B of this Report**

Includes public access/disturbance, hydrological changes and habitat fragmentation. The HRA will determine if the CHAAP will have a significant effect on European Sites. International, national and local nature conservation areas are located throughout the Borough, however there are none located in the scoping boundary. Mere Gutter with Basford Brook LWS is located about 30m from the southern scoping boundary; this is separated by a railway line. Quakers Coppice Site of Biological Importance is located just outside of the scoping boundary to the south east. The precise location of development is not known at this stage and therefore there is uncertainty with regard to the nature and significance of the effects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>Objective 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a net gain in biodiversity, providing new valuable habitats. Objective 4 looks to integrate environmentally sustainable measures into the design of buildings, which is likely to lessen the negative effect throughout the AAP area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitigation could be provided through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. LPS Policy SE 3 "Biodiversity and Geodiversity", seeks to make sure that development does not negatively impact on biodiversity and geodiversity, and that mitigation, compensation, and offsetting is effective. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 4 "Green infrastructure" looks to deliver biodiversity net gain, making sure that where possible, new provision is linked to existing habitats.

Mitigation could be also provided through LPS policy CO 1 "Sustainable Travel and Transport, which seeks to reduce the need to travel and make sure development gives priority to walking, cycling and public transport. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 4 "Improving connections between the town centre and railway station looks to provide high quality pedestrian and cycle networks, with proposed CHAAP Policy GD 5 "Enabling sustainable transport interchange", seeking to facilitate the use of walking and cycling. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 looks to improve air quality and support the reduction of traffic emissions and seeks to encourage cycling and walking.

Taking the above into account, it is found that all of the Objectives do not perform that well under this sustainability topic. However, detailed wording of the Objectives enhances performance in some circumstances, for example Objective 1 looks to improve pedestrian links between the HS2 Hub Station and the town centre. It should be noted however, that there is a level of uncertainty for all Objectives until the precise location of development is known, although it is acknowledged that all of the Objectives seek to instigate development in some form. It is considered that there is suitable mitigation provided through LPS Policies, proposed CHAAP Policies, and available at the implementation level to make sure that none of the Objectives would have a significant negative effect on this topic.
## Population and Human Health

### Table C.2 Sustainability topic: Population and Human Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail and Significance</th>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>Objective 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a new commercial district; the Crewe Commercial Hub, and mixed use commercial and residential development in other locations to support and enable the delivery of a HS2 Hub Station</td>
<td>Development across the Crewe Hub will embed advanced digital infrastructure and vastly improve physical connectivity and accessibility to, from and around the Crewe Hub Station, and across the wider sub-region</td>
<td>Development across the Crewe Hub will be underpinned by appropriate environmental and social infrastructure that also contributes to sustainable place making</td>
<td>A new innovative design dynamic will be promoted across the Crewe Hub with an emphasis on enhancing environmental quality through development that is coherent, connected and makes best use of local character and heritage to establish a sense of place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary

The health of the Borough is varied (Appendix B of this Report), with obesity seen as an increasing issue, therefore opportunities for active lifestyles through access to greenspaces and leisure facilities, and the potential for active transport (for example walking and cycling) can help those that are currently physically inactive or at risk from cardiovascular disease and obesity. The Borough also has an ageing population, which could increase pressure on healthcare services. In this context, Objectives that seek to deliver a mix of new homes could potentially mean that there are more opportunities to provide infrastructure (and therefore enhanced positive effects) to enable healthy and active lifestyles. However, if this critical mass is not reached there will be a resulting increase in pressure on existing services.

Looking at the Objectives, Objective 1 looks to deliver new homes, along with leisure facilities and improved pedestrian links between Crewe town centre and the HS2 Hub Station. If the critical mass is reached to deliver healthcare services, for example, there is likely to be a positive effect on population and human health, conversely if the critical mass is not reached then there will be an increase pressure on services in Crewe. This would lead to the likelihood of a negative effect on population and human health. Providing improved pedestrian links gives an opportunity to reduce reliance on private vehicles and take part in active travel; this would provide a positive effect for Objective 1 throughout the AAP area, as would the provision of leisure facilities. Objective 2 also provides the opportunity for active travel through new and improved pedestrian and cycle links, which is likely to have a positive effect on population and human health. Objective 3 looks to deliver new homes and to provide accompanying social, health and education infrastructure, which is likely to have a positive effect on population and human health if the provision of accompanying infrastructure is at a quantum to meet the needs of the new residents. If this is not the case, and a critical mass is not reached to deliver the required infrastructure, then there is likely to be a resulting increase in pressure on services in Crewe, leading to the likelihood of a negative effect. Objective 3 also seeks to provide green infrastructure and a net gain in biodiversity – there are mental health benefits from access to nature and green space, which provides the opportunity for physical exercise. Objective 3 is likely to have a positive effect in those areas that do not have access to green spaces, leisure, sport and recreation facilities. Objective 4 seeks to provide green infrastructure, which will provide mental health benefits and the opportunity for physical exercise, providing a positive effect in those areas that do not have access to green infrastructure.

Mitigation could be provided through LPS, proposed CHAAP and CNLP Policies. LPS Policy IN 1 "Infrastructure" seeks to make sure that new and improved social and community facilities, utilities and other infrastructure is provided in a timely manner to meet the needs of new development as they arise. LPS Policy IN 2 "Developer Contributions" looks to secure appropriate developer contributions to make sure that the necessary physical, social, public realm, economic and green infrastructure is in place to support sustainable development. LPS Policy SC 3 "Health and Well-Being" seeks to create and safeguard opportunities for safe, healthy, fulfilling and active lifestyles. LPS policy CO 1 "Sustainable Travel and Transport" seeks to reduce the need to travel and make sure development gives priority to walking, cycling and public transport, with LPS policy...
SE 6 "Green Infrastructure" and SC 2 "Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities" looking to protect and enhance existing open spaces and sport and recreation facilities and provide adequate green space. LPS Policy SE 1 "Design" seeks to encourage a sense of place with new development, managing design quality and designing in safety. Policy BE1 'Amenity' in the CNLP should make sure that new development does not prejudice the amenity of future and current occupiers. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 4 “Improving connections between the town centre and railway station” seeks to provide high quality pedestrian and cycle networks. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 3 “Social infrastructure – local employment and skills based training” looks to maximise the provision of local employment opportunities, providing the chance for members of the community to access jobs. Proposed CHAAP Policies GD 2 "Development strategy", DH 1 “Design and integration of development", IN 1 "New infrastructure" and IN 4 “Green infrastructure” require the provision of green infrastructure. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 looks to support the reduction of traffic emissions and seeks to encourage cycling and walking.

Taking the above into account, it is found that Objectives 1 and 2 perform fairly well under this sustainability topic through the provision of opportunities for active travel and resulting health benefits. Objective 1 also seeks to provide housing growth, which could provide the required infrastructure, as does Objective 3, which also requires infrastructure provision. Both Objectives 3 and 4 seek the provision of green infrastructure. It should be noted, however, that there is an element of uncertainty for all Objectives until the precise location of development is known and whether a critical mass to deliver additional infrastructure and services would be reached or needs met through proposed infrastructure.
**Water and soil**

**Table C.3 Sustainability topic: water and soil**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>Objective 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detail and significance</strong></td>
<td>Provide a new commercial district; the Crewe Commercial Hub, and mixed use commercial and residential development in other locations to support and enable the delivery of a HS2 Hub Station</td>
<td>Development across the Crewe Hub will embed advanced digital infrastructure and vastly improve physical connectivity and accessibility to, from and around the Crewe Hub Station, and across the wider sub-region</td>
<td>A new innovative design dynamic will be promoted across the Crewe Hub with an emphasis on enhancing environmental quality through development that is coherent, connected and makes best use of local character and heritage to establish a sense of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td>As detailed in Appendix B of this Report, the Borough has a range of larger and smaller rivers, which are improving in ecological quality and slightly declining in chemical river quality. There are also several areas of flood risk (a key source of evidence being the Cheshire East Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (&quot;SFRA&quot;) (August 2013)) in the Borough. The SFRA identifies flood risk associated with Valley Brook (a main river); there is an area of flood risk (flood zones 2 and 3) in the north east of the scoping boundary. The majority of the scoping boundary is, however, in flood zone 1, which has a low risk of flooding. In terms of water supply and waste water, it is the statutory duty of water providers to make sure that adequate water supply and waste water infrastructure are provided for in a development. United Utilities have not indicated that their wastewater infrastructure is under pressure in the scoping boundary. The scoping boundary contains a number of previously developed areas, which means that it is possible for Objectives to minimise the loss of greenfield land. If any greenfield land is developed this is likely to result in an increase in paved surface areas, reducing the ability of water to infiltrate into the ground and increasing surface water runoff. However, Objectives that look to provide further green infrastructure have a greater likelihood of a positive effect on water. The scoping boundary area is located in the ‘urban’ land classification and therefore does not contain any agricultural land. The amount of household waste being collected has decreased over the past year (Appendix B of this Report), however 56% was sent for either recycling or composting. This is likely to increase during the Plan period. Minerals resources including silica (or industrial sand), construction sand and gravel, sandstone (hard/ crushed rock), salt (brine) and peat are located throughout the Borough. However, as the majority of the land included in the scoping boundary is brownfield, this could be seen as sterilised and would therefore have a neutral effect on mineral supply. Looking at the Objectives, all of them look to instigate development and therefore it is likely that there will be a negative effect on water and soil through increased paved surface areas. However, Objectives 3 and 4 are likely to have a positive effect in those areas that are currently developed, through the provision of green infrastructure. Objective 3 is also likely to have a positive effect in areas of flood risk and poor water quality through creating a sustainable solution to the water environment and improvement of overall water quality in the area. Increasing building heights, as alluded to in Objective 4, is likely to have a positive effect on soil, through the efficient use of land. Mitigation could be provided through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. LPS Policy SE 13 &quot;Flood Risk and Water Management&quot; looks to reduce flood risk, and avoid an adverse impact on water quality and quantity. LPS Policy SE 2 &quot;Efficient Use of Land&quot; encourages the redevelopment/re-use of previously developed land and buildings. LPS Policy SE 11 &quot;Sustainable Management of Waste&quot; looks to manage waste sustainably through several measures including use of the Waste Hierarchy. A separate Minerals and Waste Development Plan Document is being prepared that will include...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
specific policies and the allocation of sites for waste development in Cheshire East. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 4 "Green infrastructure" seeks to integrate sustainable drainage and features design to minimise surface water, manage flood risk and maintain the natural water cycle.

Taking the above into account, it is found that Objective 3 performs fairly well under this sustainability topic as it looks to manage and mitigate flood risk, improve water quality and provide green infrastructure. Objective 4 also performs fairly well as it seeks to increase building heights and provide green infrastructure. Objectives 1 and 2 perform less well as they only seek to instigate development, in relation to this topic. It should be noted, however, that there is an element of uncertainty for all Objectives until the precise location of development is known, although it is acknowledged that the majority of development is likely to take place on brownfield land. As a precautionary approach it is considered that there is an overall potential for a negative effect, however it is considered that there is suitable mitigation provided through LPS Policies, proposed CHAAP Policies, and available at the implementation level to make sure that none of the Objectives would have a significant negative effect on this topic.
### Table C.4 Sustainability topic: air

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>Objective 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detail and significance</td>
<td>Provide a new commercial district; the Crewe Commercial Hub, and mixed use commercial and residential development in other locations to support and enable the delivery of a HS2 Hub Station</td>
<td>Development across the Crewe Hub will embed advanced digital infrastructure and vastly improve physical connectivity and accessibility to, from and around the Crewe Hub Station, and across the wider sub-region</td>
<td>A new innovative design dynamic will be promoted across the Crewe Hub with an emphasis on enhancing environmental quality through development that is coherent, connected and makes best use of local character and heritage to establish a sense of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>A key consideration is atmospheric pollution, which is likely to arise as a result of increased traffic through the delivery of housing and employment. Therefore any Objectives that seek to deliver housing and employment are likely to have a negative effect on atmospheric pollution. Road traffic is the main source of air quality issues in the Borough, with car and van ownership in the Borough being significantly higher than that for the North West and England, whilst the distances travelled to work are also high (Appendix B of this Report). There are 17 Air Quality Management Areas (&quot;AQMAs&quot;) located around the Borough; the scoping boundary contains part of the Nantwich Road AQMA. Therefore Objectives that seek to reduce the amount of motorised vehicle movements in this area have a greater likelihood of a positive effect on air quality. Generally, locating housing where there is sustainable transport (and existing services and facilities) provides the opportunity to reduce the reliance on private vehicles. Therefore Objectives that focus development in areas that have good access to public transport, with opportunities for walking and cycling, and a good range of services and facilities, have a greater likelihood of a positive effect on air quality. The provision of employment land provides opportunities for residents to work close to where they live, reducing the need to travel. Therefore Objectives that seek to deliver employment land have a greater likelihood of a positive effect on air quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the Objectives, the delivery of the HS2 Hub Station (Objectives 1 and 2) and accompanying development (all Objectives) is highly likely to result in an increased amount of traffic in the area, which would, in all likelihood, lead to a negative effect on air quality. However, Objective 1 is likely to have a positive effect through the provision of employment floorspace (as well as new homes, retail, leisure and cultural facilities), providing the opportunity to reduce the need to travel. It also seeks to improve pedestrian links between the HS2 Hub Station and the town centre, making walking a more attractive proposal, with a likelihood for a positive effect in this area. Objective 2 is likely to have a positive effect as it seeks to reduce reliance on private vehicles by maximising the use of sustainable transport modes through the provision of new and improved pedestrian and cycle links for example. Objective 2 also looks to allow the efficient operation of the highway network through increasing highway capacity and seeks to capitalise on emerging opportunities that reduce vehicle emissions. Objective 3 is likely to have a positive effect on air quality in those areas that have no social, health, education, leisure, recreation, sport or cultural infrastructure, as this could provide the opportunity to reduce reliance on private vehicles. Objective 3 also looks to deliver new homes in walking distance of the HS2 Hub Station, which is also likely to have a positive effect on air quality. Objective 4 is likely to have a negative effect on air quality in those areas that are currently at a low density, as it aims to intensify development though increased building height. Mitigation could be provided through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. LPS Policy SE 12 "Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability" seeks to make sure that development does not result in a harmful or cumulative impact on air quality, with possible pollution from or relating...

to the development minimised or mitigated. LPS Policy CO 1 "Sustainable Travel and Transport" encourages a modal shift away from car travel to public transport, cycling and walking, with LPS Policy CO 2 "Enabling Business Growth Through Transport Infrastructure" seeking to minimise the need to travel. CNLP Policy Tran 7 "Crewe Railway Station" supports an extensive modernisation of Crewe Railway Station including improved access for pedestrians, cyclists and passenger facilities. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 4 "Improving connections between the town centre and railway station" seeks to provide high quality pedestrian and cycle networks. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 5 "Enabling sustainable transport interchange" seek to facilitate the use of walking and cycling. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN5 looks to improve air quality and support the reduction of traffic emissions and seeks to encourage cycling and walking.

Taking the above into account, it is found that Objectives 1 and 3 perform well under this sustainability topic as they seek to provide employment, services and facilities, with the opportunity to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle and reduce atmospheric pollution. Objective 2 also performs well as it looks to reduce the reliance on private vehicles. Objective 4 does not perform as well as it seeks to intensify development. It should be noted however, that Objectives that seek to instigate development have the potential for a negative effect on air quality as a result of increased traffic. It is considered that there is suitable mitigation provided through LPS Policies, proposed CHAAP Policies, and available at the implementation level to make sure that none of the Objectives would have a significant negative effect on this topic.
## Table C.5 Sustainability topic: climatic factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>Objective 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detail and significance</strong></td>
<td>Provide a new commercial district; the Crewe Commercial Hub, and mixed use commercial and residential development in other locations to support and enable the delivery of a HS2 Hub Station.</td>
<td>Development across the Crewe Hub will embed advanced digital infrastructure and vastly improve physical connectivity and accessibility to, from and around the Crewe Hub Station, and across the wider sub-region.</td>
<td>A new innovative design dynamic will be promoted across the Crewe Hub with an emphasis on enhancing environmental quality through development that is coherent, connected and makes best use of local character and heritage to establish a sense of place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commentary</strong></td>
<td>As detailed in Appendix B of this Report, total CO$_2$ emissions (including the domestic sector) fell by 13% between 2013 and 2016 (the latest year for which data are available), though most of this change occurred during 2013-14; a reduction in greenhouse gases will be primarily achieved through reducing emissions from buildings and transport. Build standards have already improved, however reliance on private transport remains high (Appendix B of this Report). The reliance on private transport has been considered at length under the sustainability topic of air, and therefore it is not proposed to revisit it under the climatic factors sustainability topic. All of the Objectives have some potential to support renewable or low carbon energy infrastructure, which would minimise per capita CO$_2$ emissions from the built environment. Specifically Objective 3 is likely to have a positive effect on climatic factors by making sure that new development delivers zero net greenhouse gas emissions. It should be noted that small-scale sites provide fewer opportunities for incorporating renewable or low carbon energy infrastructure. Mitigation could be provided through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. LPS Policy SE 8 &quot;Renewable and Low Carbon Energy&quot; seeks to support such schemes, whilst LPS Policy SE 9 &quot;Energy Efficient Development&quot; looks to achieve high energy efficiency ratings. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 2 &quot;Energy infrastructure&quot; requires new development to be net carbon zero. Taking the above into account, it is found that all of the Objectives perform fairly well under this sustainability topic as they have some potential to support renewable or low carbon energy infrastructure. However, Objective 3 specifically looks to support energy efficient development and schemes that seek to provide renewable and low carbon energy. As climate change is a global issue it is not possible to conclude on the significance of local actions and in turn the significance of effects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

As detailed in Appendix B of this Report, total CO$_2$ emissions (including the domestic sector) fell by 13% between 2013 and 2016 (the latest year for which data are available), though most of this change occurred during 2013-14; a reduction in greenhouse gases will be primarily achieved through reducing emissions from buildings and transport. Build standards have already improved, however reliance on private transport remains high (Appendix B of this Report). The reliance on private transport has been considered at length under the sustainability topic of air, and therefore it is not proposed to revisit it under the climatic factors sustainability topic. All of the Objectives have some potential to support renewable or low carbon energy infrastructure, which would minimise per capita CO$_2$ emissions from the built environment. Specifically Objective 3 is likely to have a positive effect on climatic factors by making sure that new development delivers zero net greenhouse gas emissions. It should be noted that small-scale sites provide fewer opportunities for incorporating renewable or low carbon energy infrastructure. Mitigation could be provided through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. LPS Policy SE 8 "Renewable and Low Carbon Energy" seeks to support such schemes, whilst LPS Policy SE 9 "Energy Efficient Development" looks to achieve high energy efficiency ratings. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 2 "Energy infrastructure" requires new development to be net carbon zero. Taking the above into account, it is found that all of the Objectives perform fairly well under this sustainability topic as they have some potential to support renewable or low carbon energy infrastructure. However, Objective 3 specifically looks to support energy efficient development and schemes that seek to provide renewable and low carbon energy. As climate change is a global issue it is not possible to conclude on the significance of local actions and in turn the significance of effects.
## Transport

### Table C.6 Sustainability topic: transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detail and significance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 1</td>
<td>Provide a new commercial district; the Crewe Commercial Hub, and mixed use commercial and residential development in other locations to support and enable the delivery of a HS2 Hub Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2</td>
<td>Development across the Crewe Hub will embed advanced digital infrastructure and vastly improve physical connectivity and accessibility to, from and around the Crewe Hub Station, and across the wider sub-region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3</td>
<td>Development across the Crewe Hub will be underpinned by appropriate environmental and social infrastructure that also contributes to sustainable place making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4</td>
<td>A new innovative design dynamic will be promoted across the Crewe Hub with an emphasis on enhancing environmental quality through development that is coherent, connected and makes best use of local character and heritage to establish a sense of place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary

The key consideration is to reduce the amount of traffic congestion in the Borough by reducing the need to travel through good access to jobs, services, facilities, and sustainable forms of transport. There are opportunities to travel on public transport, for example there are 22 Railway Stations across the Borough (including Crewe Railway Station, which is located in the scoping boundary). However, although the estimated miles driven by vehicles in Cheshire East has fallen in 2017, it is still higher than the totals for 2009 to 2013. Generally, locating housing where there is sustainable transport (and existing services and facilities) provides the opportunity to reduce the reliance on private vehicles. Therefore Objectives that focus development in areas that have good access to public transport, with opportunities for walking and cycling, and existing services and facilities, have a greater likelihood of a positive effect on congestion. The provision of employment land provides opportunities for residents to work close to where they live, reducing the need to travel and having a potential positive effect on congestion. Therefore Objectives that seek to deliver employment land have a greater likelihood of a positive effect on congestion.

Looking at the Objectives, the delivery of the HS2 Hub Station (Objectives 1 and 2) and accompanying development (all Objectives) is highly likely to result in an increased amount of traffic in the area, which would, in all likelihood, lead to a negative effect on congestion. However, Objective 1 is likely to have a positive effect through the provision of employment floorspace (as well as new homes, retail, leisure and cultural facilities), providing the opportunity to reduce the need to travel. It also seeks to improve pedestrian links between the HS2 Hub Station and the town centre, making walking a more attractive proposal, with a likelihood for a positive effect in this area. Objective 2 is likely to have a positive effect as it seeks to reduce reliance on private vehicles by maximising the use of sustainable transport modes through the provision of new and improved pedestrian and cycle links for example. Objective 2 also looks to allow the efficient operation of the highway network through increasing highway capacity and seeks to capitalise on emerging opportunities that reduce vehicle emissions. Objective 3 is likely to have a positive effect on congestion in those areas that have no social, health, education, leisure, recreation, sport or cultural infrastructure. Objective 3 also looks to deliver new homes in walking distance of the HS2 Hub Station, which is also likely to have a positive effect on congestion. Objective 4 is likely to have a negative effect on congestion in those areas that are currently at a low density, as it aims to intensify development through increased building height.

Mitigation could be provided through LPS, proposed CHAAP, and CNLP Policies. LPS Policy IN 2 "Developer Contributions" looks to secure appropriate developer contributions to make sure that the necessary physical, social, public realm, economic and green infrastructure is in place to support sustainable development. LPS Policy CO 1 "Sustainable Travel and Transport" seeks to encourage a modal shift away from car travel to public transport, cycling and walking, with LPS Policy CO 2 "Enabling Business Growth Through Transport Infrastructure" seeking to minimise the need to travel. Policy Tran 7 "Crewe Railway Station" of the CNLP supports an extensive modernisation of Crewe Railway Station including improved access for pedestrians, cyclists and passenger facilities. CNLP Policy S.12.2 "Mill Street" notes that proposals at the Mill Street site will be expected
to provide improved links to Crewe Railway Station and Crewe town centre. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 4 "Improving connections between the town centre and the railway station" seeks to improve connections between the Crewe Hub station and Crewe town centre, with its services and facilities, and physical access is to not be impeded, as well as provide high quality pedestrian and cycle networks. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 5 "Enabling sustainable transport interchange" seeks to facilitate the use of walking and cycling. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 looks to encourage cycling and walking.

Taking the above into account, it is found that Objectives 1 and 3 perform well under this sustainability topic as they seek to provide employment, services and facilities, with the opportunity to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle and reduce congestion. Objective 2 also performs well as it looks to reduce the reliance on private vehicles. Objective 4 does not perform as well as it seeks to intensify development. It should be noted however, that Objectives that seek to instigate development have the potential for a negative effect on congestion as a result of increased traffic. It is considered that there is suitable mitigation provided through LPS Policies, CNLP Policies, proposed CHAAP Policies, and available at the implementation level to make sure that none of the Objectives would have a significant negative effect on this topic.
### Cultural heritage and landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail and significance</th>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>Objective 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a new commercial district; the Crewe Commercial Hub, and mixed use commercial and residential development in other locations to support and enable the delivery of a HS2 Hub Station</td>
<td>Development across the Crewe Hub will embed advanced digital infrastructure and vastly improve physical connectivity and accessibility to, from and around the Crewe Hub Station, and across the wider sub-region</td>
<td>Development across the Crewe Hub will be underpinned by appropriate environmental and social infrastructure that also contributes to sustainable place making</td>
<td>A new innovative design dynamic will be promoted across the Crewe Hub with an emphasis on enhancing environmental quality through development that is coherent, connected and makes best use of local character and heritage to establish a sense of place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Borough has an extensive historic environment, with many designated (and non-designated) heritage assets (as detailed in Appendix B of this Report). There are two Grade II Listed Buildings in the scoping boundary. These are the 1867 buildings at Crewe Railway Station, and the Delaney Building at Crewe and Alsager College. Development can lead to pressure on historic cores/Conservation Areas through increased traffic. All landscapes in Cheshire East have an identified character, with varying degrees of importance and sensitivity; the Borough contains several historic land classifications and landscape character types (see Appendix B of this Report). The scoping boundary includes five historic land classifications (settlement, recreation, industry, communications and ornamental) and one landscape character type (LCT 7 Lower Wooded Farmland). The Borough also contains Local Landscape Designation Areas, none of which are located in the scoping boundary. Trees contribute to the identified landscape character of an area; the scoping boundary contains two areas where trees are subject to Tree Preservation Orders (western corner of the A534 Crewe Road and Gateway, and Quakers Coppice/land adjacent to University Way). As the majority of land in the scoping boundary is brownfield, Objectives that seek to provide green infrastructure are likely to have a positive effect. Looking at the Objectives, Objective 1 is likely to have a positive effect if the proposed development is in an area of little or no cultural or landscape value. Conversely, if the area is of cultural or landscape value then there is a greater likelihood of a negative effect. Objective 2 is likely to have a negative effect on the historic environment due to proposed development at Crewe Railway Station, which contains Listed Buildings. However, Objective 2 also requires an improved public realm adjoining the Railway Station, with a likely positive effect. As the majority of the scoping boundary includes brownfield land, the delivery of green infrastructure (Objectives 3 and 4) is likely to have a positive effect on the landscape in those areas lacking in green infrastructure, as could the provision of new and valuable habitats (Objective 3). Objective 4 is likely to have a positive effect on cultural heritage and landscape as it seeks to improve environmental quality, integrate and protect valuable trees and retain and integrate valuable heritage, as well as deliver a high quality public realm. Objective 4 also looks to improve the urban landscape and create an innovative design dynamic, which is likely to have a positive effect on cultural heritage and landscape. However, Objective 4 also seeks to increase building height, which, on the one hand could be an improvement on existing, depending on where it takes place (with likely positive effects), but on the other, it may effect long distance views into and across Crewe from the surrounding area (with a likely negative effect). Mitigation could be provided through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. LPS Policy SE 7 &quot;The Historic Environment&quot; seeks to protect the historic environment. Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 2 “Safeguarding Crewe’s railway and built heritage” looks to respect, retain and enhance Crewe’s railway and built heritage. LPS Policy IN 2 &quot;Developer Contributions&quot; looks to secure appropriate developer contributions to make sure that the necessary physical, social, public realm, economic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and green infrastructure is in place to support sustainable development. LPS Policy SE 4 "The Landscape" looks to conserve the landscape character and quality of the Borough, and for the historic, natural and man-made features to be enhanced and effectively managed. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 "Development strategy" seeks to provide green infrastructure and public realm improvements. Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 1 "Design and integration of development" seeks to raise design standards and looks for a significant improvement in the quality of design and public realm and the provision of green infrastructure. Proposed CHAAP IN 1 “New infrastructure” and IN 4 "Green infrastructure" also require the provision of green infrastructure.

Taking the above into account, Objective 4 performs well under this sustainability topic as design and environmental quality forms the basis of this Objective. Objective 3 performs fairly well as there is the potential to improve the existing area in landscape terms through the provision of green infrastructure. Objective 1 also performs fairly well as the delivery of new development can be an improvement on what is there already. Objective 2 does not perform as well as it proposes development in the vicinity of Listed Buildings, although it does require public realm improvements adjoining the Railway Station. It should be noted, however, that there is an element of uncertainty for all Objectives until the precise location and building height of development is known. It is considered that there is suitable mitigation provided through LPS Policies, proposed CHAAP Policies, and available at the implementation level to make sure that none of the Objectives would have a significant negative effect on this topic.
### Social inclusiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table C.8 Sustainability topic: social inclusiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detail and significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a new commercial district; the Crewe Commercial Hub, and mixed use commercial and residential development in other locations to support and enable the delivery of a HS2 Hub Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

Development in areas with lower access to public transport, services and facilities could result in higher social exclusion. Therefore Objectives that direct growth to areas with poor access to public transport, services and facilities have a greater likelihood of a negative effect on social inclusion.

There is a need to provide a mix of housing types and tenures (including affordable homes) in the Borough. Housing growth provides the opportunity for affordable housing to be provided; as detailed in Appendix B of this Report only about 12% of homes were operated by a private registered provider, with an increase in average (mean) house prices since 2013. Housing growth can also lead to funding being made available to provide new or upgraded infrastructure to enable communities to be more socially inclusive (for example, meeting places, opportunities to access training, public transport provision, footways and cycleways), however, if the critical mass is not reached there will be a resulting increase in pressure on existing services. The Borough contains Lower Super Output Areas that are some of the most deprived in England, reflected in the Index of Multiple Deprivation (2015). Two of the Lower Super Output Areas (E01018445 and E1018400), which contain part of the scoping boundary, are some of the most deprived in England.

Looking at the Objectives, Objective 1 looks to deliver new homes, with retail, employment, leisure and cultural facilities; this is likely to have a positive effect on social inclusion in areas where these new services/facilities and employment are provided close to existing (as well as new) housing developments, although it is uncertain at this time as to whether this new infrastructure would meet the needs of residents. If this is not the case, then there is likely to be a negative effect on social inclusion, unless a critical mass is reached to deliver additional infrastructure. Objective 2 is likely to have a positive effect on social inclusion through the delivery of new pedestrian and cycling links (to Crewe town centre, for example) and a pedestrian link through the HS2 Hub Station to Weston Road. Objective 3 looks to deliver new homes and to provide accompanying social, health and education infrastructure, as well as support skills and jobs, which is likely to have a positive effect on social inclusion if the provision of accompanying infrastructure is at a quantum to meet the needs of the new residents. If this is not the case, then there is likely to be a negative effect on social inclusion, unless a critical mass is reached to deliver additional infrastructure. Objective 4 is likely to have a neutral effect on social inclusion.

Mitigation could be provided through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. LPS Policy IN 1 "Infrastructure" seeks to make sure that new and improved social and community facilities, utilities and other infrastructure is provided in a timely manner to meet the needs of new development as they arise. LPS Policy IN 2 "Developer Contributions" looks to secure appropriate developer contributions to make sure that the necessary physical, social, public realm, economic and green infrastructure is in place to support sustainable development. LPS Policy CO 1 "Sustainable Travel and Transport" seeks to encourage a modal shift away from car travel to public transport, cycling and walking, with LPS Policy CO 2 "Enabling Business Growth Through Transport Infrastructure" seeking to minimise the need to travel. LPS Policy SE 1 "Design" seeks to encourage a sense of place with new development, managing design quality and designing in safety. LPS Policy SC 3
"Health and Well-Being", requires development to be designed to create safe environments, education and skills training should be improved, and existing community infrastructure should be protected, with the provision of a network of community facilities and opportunities to access services. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 3 "Social infrastructure – local employment and skills based training" looks to maximise the provision of local employment opportunities, providing the chance for members of the community to access jobs. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 "Transport and infrastructure" looks to encourage cycling and walking.

Mitigation could also be provided through LPS Policy SC 4 "Residential Mix" which looks to provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes, with LPS Policy SC 5 "Affordable Homes" seeking the provision of affordable homes as part of residential developments. LPS Policy SC 7 "Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople" seeks to meet the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 "Development strategy" looks to provide a range of housing types and sizes.

Taking the above into account it is found that Objectives 1 and 3 perform well under this sustainability topic through the provision of new homes and the delivery of infrastructure. Objective 2 performs fairly well through the delivery of new and pedestrian and cycling links. It should be noted, however, that there is an element of uncertainty for all Objectives until the precise location of development is known and whether a critical mass would be reached or needs met through proposed infrastructure.
### Economic development

#### Table C.9 Sustainability topic: economic development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>Objective 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a new commercial district; the Crewe Commercial Hub, and mixed use commercial and residential development in other locations to support and enable the delivery of a HS2 Hub Station</td>
<td>Development across the Crewe Hub will embed advanced digital infrastructure and vastly improve physical connectivity and accessibility to, from and around the Crewe Hub Station, and across the wider sub-region</td>
<td>Development across the Crewe Hub will be underpinned by appropriate environmental and social infrastructure that also contributes to sustainable place making</td>
<td>A new innovative design dynamic will be promoted across the Crewe Hub with an emphasis on enhancing environmental quality through development that is coherent, connected and makes best use of local character and heritage to establish a sense of place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary

As detailed in Appendix B of this Report, the Borough has a high jobs density, with above average skills levels and a relatively high proportion of residents in employment and people employed in high-skill occupations. However, a relatively high proportion of people in the Borough travel over 20km to work (Appendix B of this Report). Therefore Objectives that provide employment opportunities are likely to have a positive effect on economic development. Housing growth could support business growth, especially in town and larger village centres, through increased footfall and allowing businesses to base themselves close to employees.

A more pleasant local environment that includes, for example green and open space and areas of landscape value, has the ability to attract more businesses. All landscapes in Cheshire East have an identified character, with varying degrees of importance and sensitivity; the Borough contains several historic land classifications and landscape character types (see Appendix B of this Report). The scoping boundary includes five historic land classifications (settlement, recreation, industry, communications and ornamental) and one landscape character type (LCT 7 Lower Wooded Farmland). The Borough also contains Local Landscape Designation Areas, none of which are located in the scoping boundary. Trees contribute to the identified landscape character of an area; the scoping boundary contains two areas where trees are subject to Tree Preservation Orders (western corner of the A534 Crewe Road and Gateway, and Quakers Coppice/land adjacent to University Way). As the majority of land in the scoping boundary is brownfield, Objectives that seek to provide green infrastructure are likely to have a positive effect with regards to creating a pleasing environment for business growth. The Borough also has an important tourism offer and historic environment, which provides significant opportunities for the economy (Appendix B of this Report). There are two Grade II Listed Buildings in the scoping boundary. These are the 1867 buildings at Crewe Railway Station, and the Delaney Building at Crewe and Alsager College.

Looking at the Objectives, Objective 1 is likely to have a positive effect on economic development through the delivery of new employment floorspace, and the creation of the Crewe Commercial Hub. Objective 2 is likely to have a positive effect through the delivery of the HS2 Hub Station and any associated economic benefits as well as an improved public realm adjoining the Railway Station. Objective 3 is also likely to have a positive effect through supporting skills and jobs, as well as the provision of green infrastructure, and the retention and improvement of valuable habitats, which could help to create a pleasing environment for business growth in those areas lacking in green infrastructure. A positive effect is likely on economic development through Objective 4, which seeks to enhance environmental quality, including the retention and integration of valuable heritage, and the provision of green infrastructure providing the opportunity to create a pleasing environment for business growth in those areas lacking in outstanding design.

Mitigation could be provided through LPS, proposed CHAAP and CNLPP Policies. LPS Policy EG 1 “Economic Prosperity” looks to support employment development in the Borough, LPS Policy EG 4 “Tourism” seeks to protect and enhance the unique features of the Borough that attract visitors. In terms of town centres, LPS Policy EG 5 “Promoting a Town Centre Approach to Retail..."
### Summary findings and conclusion

**C.5** Objective 1 focuses on the development of a new commercial district (the Crewe Commercial Hub), which could have a negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna, and water and soil through the instigation of development; however mitigation is available through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. Objective 1 was found to have a potential positive effect against topics relating population and human health, air quality, transport, cultural heritage and landscape, social inclusiveness and economic development as there may be potential for a critical mass to be reached in terms of infrastructure provision, opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle and the visual improvement of the existing area.

**C.6** Objective 2 focuses on connectivity and accessibility, including the delivery of the HS2 Hub Station. This could provide the circumstances to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle and take part in active travel, with the potential to improve air quality, reduce inequality and improve human health for example, with positive effects against topics relating to population and human health, air quality, transport, social inclusiveness and economic development. However, it does result in negative effects on biodiversity, flora and fauna, water and soil, and cultural heritage and landscape through the instigation of development and potential impact on Listed Buildings; but mitigation is available through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies.

**C.7** Objective 3 focuses on sustainable development. This could provide a range of infrastructure (including green infrastructure) to meet the needs of existing and new residents with the potential to reduce inequality, improve human health, improve air quality, with positive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>Objective 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and Commerce&quot; seeks to promote the vitality and viability of town and other centres. Policy S9 &quot;Nantwich Road, Crewe&quot; of the CNLP supports development of a scale appropriate to the character and function of the Nantwich Road Shopping Area. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD2 &quot;Development strategy&quot; seeks to protect the role and function of Crewe town centre and allows limited convenience provision that services the needs of travellers and businesses. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 3 &quot;Social infrastructure – local employment and skills based training&quot; looks to maximise the provision of local employment opportunities, providing the chance for members of the community to access jobs. Mitigation can also be provided through Policies that seek to protect the historic environment including LPS Policy SE 7 &quot;The Historic Environment&quot;, and proposed CHAAP Policy DH 2 &quot;Safeguarding Crewe’s railway and built heritage&quot; looks to respect, retain and enhance Crewe’s railway and built heritage. LPS Policy SE 4 &quot;The Landscape&quot; looks to conserve the landscape character and quality of the Borough, and for the historic, natural and man-made features to be enhanced and effectively managed. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 &quot;Development strategy&quot; seeks to provide green infrastructure and public realm improvements. Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 1 &quot;Design and integration of development&quot; seeks to raise design standards and looks for a significant improvement in the quality of design and public realm and the provision of green infrastructure. Proposed CHAAP IN 1 “New infrastructure” and IN 4 “Green infrastructure” also require the provision of green infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
effects against topics relating to population and human health, water and soil, air quality, climatic factors, transport, cultural heritage and landscape, social inclusiveness, and economic development. However, it does result in potential negative effects on biodiversity, flora and fauna; but mitigation is available through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies.

C.8 Objective 4 focuses on environmental quality. This could provide the circumstances to create pleasing environments for business growth and efficiently use land through an increase in building heights, with a positive effect against topics relating to water and soil, cultural heritage and landscape, and economic development. However, it does result in potential negative effects on biodiversity, flora and fauna, and air quality through intensification of development; but mitigation is available through LPS, proposed CHAAP Policies, and CNLP Policies.

C.9 In conclusion, the appraisal has found that, read as a whole, the objectives of the CHAAP are unlikely to have any significant negative effects. Ultimately, the nature and significance of effects against the majority of topics will be dependent on how they are taken forward, both through final policy proposals and subsequent implementation. It is considered that mitigation provided through Local Plan Policies and available at the project level should make sure that there are no significant negative effects.
Appendix D: Development Options

D.1 The LPS sets out the policy context in which the CHAAP is being prepared and in particular, Strategic Location LPS 1 "Central Crewe" establishes a series of detailed principles that should underpin development in a broad area of Crewe including the existing Railway Station and the town centre.

D.2 The Crewe Masterplan 2017 further investigated many of these issues in seeking to understand a high level approach to enabling HS2 growth for Crewe. In particular, this work helped refine the issues of connectivity between Crewe’s key centres and set out a series of ‘key moves’ that could improve the urban structure of the town and unlock growth potential.

D.3 In October 2018 the Constellation Partnership published its HS2 Growth Strategy identifying the potential to deliver some 3,700 homes and 20,000 jobs close to the future HS2 Hub Station.

D.4 In November 2018 the Council embarked on its first consultation toward the development of a Crewe Station Hub Area Action Plan by publishing an Issues Paper. This identified a series of key issues the AAP could consider and sought input on the approach that could be taken in developing a planning framework to manage growth around the Railway Station.

D.5 The issues explored through the LPS, Crewe Masterplan and CHAAP Issues Paper were refined to put forward a vision for the area, a series of objectives, emerging policies and land use ideas based on delivering the aspirational growth opportunities identified in the Constellation Partnerships HS2 Strategy.

D.6 Based on the Constellation Partnership's growth aspirations to deliver 3,700 homes and 20,000 jobs in the area around a HS2 Hub Station, a series of residential and employment quantum options were developed. This was done through the establishment of a potential level of residential and office-use floorspace, by considering development opportunities in the land blocks around the Railway Station. The overall gross external area of each land use was calculated and then, using established approaches to calculating job densities and the Nationally Described Space Standards, converted into residential units or potential number of jobs. Further information on how the number of units were calculated is set out in the 'Developing the Crewe Hub Area Action Plan Boundary and Development Options' paper.

D.7 The quantum options have been developed at a high level by using standard recognised assumptions but do not represent a finalised position on growth capacity either from a position of supporting what is desirable or what is deliverable in land use terms. Further work is required to understand the detailed level of development that could be accommodated, and the figures presented represent a meaningful, rather than precise, approach to understanding the difference between what each option is capable of delivering. In terms of retail floorspace, this was calculated at 0.5% of the total site area for each boundary option.

D.8 The boundary options have been established through investigating the wider urban context of Crewe and its functionality, in particular developing an understating of how its key centres relate to one another. This was investigated in detail through the Crewe Masterplan 2017, which further highlighted the current disconnection and severance between key centres that, if addressed, could help to unlock Crewe’s potential.
D.9 Focusing on the relationship of the HS2 Hub Station to the town centre and Grand Junction Retail Park then led to an investigation of the development opportunities around the Railway Station itself.

D.10 To provide some context and structure in which to form ideas, a series of ‘broad opportunity areas’ were developed based on distance and time from the Railway Station and the potential to accommodate key land use issues associated with the Objectives.

D.11 Subsequently, four opportunity areas were identified, further information on which is set out in the 'Developing the Crewe Hub Area Action Plan Boundary and Development Options' paper:

1. Core Station Hub
2. Primary Opportunity Area
3. Secondary Opportunity Area
4. Peripheral Opportunity Area

D.12 Each opportunity area could perform a different function supporting delivery of specific land uses identified in the CHAAP Objectives. Accordingly, a high level development strategy was set out to describe the potential role and function of each area, and then used alongside the development quantum options to establish the potential development Options.

D.13 Therefore, taking into account the boundary Options and quantum Options, three development Options were identified, which were developed to take account of three factors:

1. Delivering the growth aspirations established through the Constellation Partnership’s HS2 Growth Strategy
2. Understanding broad opportunity areas – the spatial geographies in which Objectives of the CHAAP could potentially be delivered
3. Developing a high level development strategy, which has been applied across the opportunity areas. The configuration of each Option captures different opportunities presented by this strategy

D.14 The Options are:

- Option 1: Commercial and regeneration led - investigates using a restrained boundary to deliver a lower quantum of development, but which satisfies growth aspirations and the emerging Vision, aims and Objectives
- Option 2: Mixed use led - uses an extended boundary to exceed growth aspirations, enables more flexibility of land supply and the ability to plan for wider opportunities
- Option 3: Opportunity and market led - hybrid of Options 1 and 2, which exceeds growth aspirations over a land area and offers a balance of key opportunities

D.15 The development Options needed to take into account the Vision, aims and Objectives of the CHAAP, and be achievable. They also should have addressed any issues identified. Table D.1 explains in further detail the three Options that were subject to testing.
### Table D.1 Development Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land use type</th>
<th>Option 1: Commercial and regeneration led</th>
<th>Option 2: Mixed use led</th>
<th>Option 3: Opportunity and market led</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area (excluding rail tracks)</strong></td>
<td>31ha</td>
<td>128ha</td>
<td>149ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office use</strong></td>
<td>25,300 jobs</td>
<td>26,150 jobs</td>
<td>35,300 jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential</strong></td>
<td>1,500 homes</td>
<td>3,700 homes</td>
<td>6,550 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail</strong></td>
<td>1,550sq.m</td>
<td>6,400sq.m</td>
<td>7,450sq.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary description</strong></td>
<td>● a level of development that meets growth aspirations</td>
<td>● a level of development that meets and exceeds growth aspirations</td>
<td>● a level of development that significantly exceeds growth aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● focus on office led development and mixed use regeneration</td>
<td>● development dispersed across the primary and secondary opportunity areas</td>
<td>● development dispersed over primary, secondary and peripheral opportunity areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● restraint applied to residential development</td>
<td>● high levels of mixed use led schemes, including residential</td>
<td>● high levels of mixed use led schemes, including residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● office led development to be more intensely focused in the primary opportunity area, with mixed use regeneration in the secondary opportunity area to the north west</td>
<td></td>
<td>● peripheral opportunity areas included to enable a market led approach and establish a delivery framework for highways and other infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Method

**D.16** The sustainability objectives and topics identified in Chapter 2 of this Report, and adapted from the SA Scoping Report (June 2017) to make them relevant to the CHAAP\(^{88}\) form the basis for the SA work carried out on the three reasonable development Options. A comparative appraisal examining the significant effects of the alternatives was carried out using the baseline information (presented in Appendix B of this Report) and any available updated evidence, together with professional judgement where appropriate. Effects are predicated taking into account the criteria in the Regulations;\(^ {89}\) (duration, frequency and reversibility of effects are considered, as well as cumulative effects)\(^ {90}\). In the appraisal, green shading is used to indicate significant positive effects and red shading is used to indicate significant negative effects. The alternatives are also ranked in terms of relative performance; where it is not possible to differentiate between all alternatives ‘=’ is used. General comments are made on the relative merits of the alternatives where significant effects can't be predicted based on reasonable assumptions.

### Appraisal findings

**D.17** Tables D.2 to D.10 detail the appraisal findings for each Option, under each specific sustainability topic. Table D.11 summarises the appraisal findings for the Options.

---


89 Schedule 1 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

90 Chapter 5 of this Report
### Biodiversity, flora and fauna

**Table D.2 Sustainability topic: biodiversity, flora and fauna**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank and significance</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary

A key consideration is the potential for impacts on internationally important sites including Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 1 Ramsar, Midland Meres and Mosses Phase 2 Ramsar, the West Midland Mosses SAC, nationally important sites (for example Sites of Special Scientific Interest), and locally important sites (for example LWS), as well as Priority Habitats and species. There are several issues that affect internationally important sites, which are highlighted in Appendix B of this Report, and include public access/disturbance, hydrological changes and habitat fragmentation. The HRA will determine if the CHAAP will have a significant effect on European Sites. International, national and local nature conservation areas are located throughout the Borough, however there are none located in the scoping boundary. Mere Gutter with Basford Brook LWS is located about 30m from the southern scoping boundary; this is separated by a railway line. Quakers Coppice SBI is located just outside of the scoping boundary to the south east. The precise location of development is not known at this stage and therefore there is uncertainty with regard to the nature and significance of the effects.

The scoping boundary contains a number of previously developed areas, which means that it is possible for all Options to minimise the loss of greenfield land (and as a result, green infrastructure), which can provide valuable habitat. However, it should be noted that brownfield land can be highly valuable for certain forms of biodiversity, as it can also be the best or only available habitat for rare and endangered species. Development can lead to an increase in traffic and therefore an increase in atmospheric pollution; noise from increased traffic can disturb wildlife. It is likely that all of the Options could result in an increase in traffic, although the effect may be lessened slightly in those areas that have good access to services and facilities, providing the opportunity to reduce the need to travel. There can also be an increase in the disturbance of biodiversity and geodiversity as a result of recreational activity, which is likely to occur with all of the Options.

Looking at the Options (and with reference to their relationship with the opportunity areas), all of them look to instigate development and are therefore likely, overall, to have a negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna. Option 1 is likely to have a greater negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna in the primary opportunity area ("POA"), which contains amenity greenspace, and is where development is focused. This Option proposes less development in the secondary opportunity area ("SOA"), however.

Option 2 is likely to have a greater negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna in the POA and SOA, which both contain amenity greenspace and is where development is focused. The SOA is also adjacent to an area of natural and semi natural urban greenspace, which contains a watercourse, therefore there is potential for a negative effect on this area.

Option 3 is likely to have a greater negative effect in the POA, SOA and peripheral opportunity area ("PeOA"), with development distributed across all three opportunity areas. The PeOA contains a green corridor and is located close to Mere Gutter with Basford Brook LWS, and Quakers Coppice SBI, therefore it is possible that development could occur close to these areas. An area of natural and semi natural urban greenspace containing a watercourse also runs adjacent to the PeOA, therefore there is potential for a negative effect on this area.

Mitigation could be provided through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. LPS Policy SE 3 "Biodiversity and Geodiversity", seeks to make sure that development does not negatively impact on biodiversity and geodiversity, and that mitigation, compensation, and offsetting is effective. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 4 "Green infrastructure" looks to deliver biodiversity net gain, making sure that where possible, new provision is linked to existing habitats.
Mitigation could be also provided through LPS policy CO 1 “Sustainable Travel and Transport, which seeks to reduce the need to travel and make sure development gives priority to walking, cycling and public transport. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 4 “Improving connections between the town centre and railway station looks to provide high quality pedestrian and cycle networks, with proposed CHAAP Policy GD 5 “Enabling sustainable transport interchange”, seeking to facilitate the use of walking and cycling. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 looks to improve air quality and support the reduction of traffic emissions and seeks to encourage cycling and walking.

Taking the above into account, it is found that Option 1 is the best performing option under this sustainability topic, as the effects are contained in a smaller area. Option 3 does not perform as well as the effects are spread over a wider area than Options 1 and 2, with potential for impacts on a LWS and SBI. It should be noted, however, that there is an element of uncertainty for all Options until the precise location of development is known, although it is acknowledged that there will be a quantum of development on greenfield sites with all Options. It is considered that there is suitable mitigation provided through LPS Policies, proposed CHAAP Policies and available at implementation level to make sure that none of the Options would have a significant negative effect on this topic.
The health of the Borough is varied (Appendix B of this Report), with obesity seen as an increasing issue, therefore opportunities for active lifestyles through access to greenspaces and leisure facilities, and the potential for active transport (for example walking and cycling) can help those that are currently physically inactive or at risk from cardiovascular disease and obesity. The Borough also has an ageing population, which could increase pressure on healthcare services. In this context, Options that seek to deliver new homes could potentially mean that there are more opportunities to provide infrastructure (and therefore enhanced positive effects) to enable healthy and active lifestyles, compared to those that don’t. However, if this critical mass is not reached there will be a resulting increase in pressure on existing services.

Looking at the Options (and with reference to their relationship with the opportunity areas), Option 1 looks to focus development in the POA, with additional development in part of the SOA, and would include around 1,500 new homes. If the critical mass for infrastructure is reached then there is the likelihood of a positive effect on population and human health in these areas. However, if the critical mass is not reached, and hence services and facilities will be under pressure, there is a likelihood of a negative effect on population and human health. Option 1 does look to provide pedestrian links to the town centre and Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station, through the inclusion of the POA and part of the SOA. This provides the opportunity to reduce the reliance on private vehicles and take part in active travel; this is likely to have a positive effect for this Option.

Option 2 looks to focus development in the POA and SOA and would include around 3,700 homes. If the critical mass for infrastructure is reached then there is the likelihood of a positive effect on population and human health in these areas. However, if the critical mass is not reached, and hence services and facilities will be under pressure, there is a likelihood of a negative effect on population and human health. Option 2 also looks to provide pedestrian links to the town centre and Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station, through the inclusion of the POA and SOA. This provides the opportunity to reduce the reliance on private vehicles and take part in active travel; this is likely to have a positive effect for this Option.

Option 3 looks to distribute development across all three opportunity areas, and would include around 6,550 new homes. Out of the three Options, Option 3 is considered to be the most likely to reach a critical mass to deliver infrastructure improvements, which is likely to have a positive effect on population and human health in all of the opportunity areas. However, if the critical mass is not reached, and hence services and facilities will be under pressure, there is a likelihood of a negative effect on population and human health. Option 3 seeks to provide pedestrian links to the town centre and Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station. This provides the opportunity to reduce the reliance on private vehicles and take part in active travel; this is likely to have a positive effect for this Option.

Mitigation could be provided through LPS, proposed CHAAP, and CNLP Policies. LPS Policy IN 1 “Infrastructure” seeks to make sure that new and improved social and community facilities, utilities and other infrastructure is provided in a timely manner to meet the needs of new development as they arise. LPS Policy IN 2 “Developer Contributions” looks to secure appropriate developer contributions to make sure that the necessary physical, social, public realm, economic and green infrastructure is in place to support sustainable development. LPS Policy SC 3 “Health and Well-Being” seeks to create and safeguard opportunities for safe, healthy, fulfilling and active lifestyles. LPS policy CO 1 “Sustainable Travel and Transport” seeks to reduce the need to travel and make sure development gives priority to walking, cycling and public transport, with LPS policy SE 6 “Green Infrastructure” and SC 2 “Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities” looking to protect and enhance existing open spaces and sport and recreation facilities and provide adequate green

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank and significance</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The health of the Borough is varied (Appendix B of this Report), with obesity seen as an increasing issue, therefore opportunities for active lifestyles through access to greenspaces and leisure facilities, and the potential for active transport (for example walking and cycling) can help those that are currently physically inactive or at risk from cardiovascular disease and obesity. The Borough also has an ageing population, which could increase pressure on healthcare services. In this context, Options that seek to deliver new homes could potentially mean that there are more opportunities to provide infrastructure (and therefore enhanced positive effects) to enable healthy and active lifestyles, compared to those that don’t. However, if this critical mass is not reached there will be a resulting increase in pressure on existing services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at the Options (and with reference to their relationship with the opportunity areas), Option 1 looks to focus development in the POA, with additional development in part of the SOA, and would include around 1,500 new homes. If the critical mass for infrastructure is reached then there is the likelihood of a positive effect on population and human health in these areas. However, if the critical mass is not reached, and hence services and facilities will be under pressure, there is a likelihood of a negative effect on population and human health. Option 1 does look to provide pedestrian links to the town centre and Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station, through the inclusion of the POA and part of the SOA. This provides the opportunity to reduce the reliance on private vehicles and take part in active travel; this is likely to have a positive effect for this Option.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 looks to focus development in the POA and SOA and would include around 3,700 homes. If the critical mass for infrastructure is reached then there is the likelihood of a positive effect on population and human health in these areas. However, if the critical mass is not reached, and hence services and facilities will be under pressure, there is a likelihood of a negative effect on population and human health. Option 2 also looks to provide pedestrian links to the town centre and Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station, through the inclusion of the POA and SOA. This provides the opportunity to reduce the reliance on private vehicles and take part in active travel; this is likely to have a positive effect for this Option.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 looks to distribute development across all three opportunity areas, and would include around 6,550 new homes. Out of the three Options, Option 3 is considered to be the most likely to reach a critical mass to deliver infrastructure improvements, which is likely to have a positive effect on population and human health in all of the opportunity areas. However, if the critical mass is not reached, and hence services and facilities will be under pressure, there is a likelihood of a negative effect on population and human health. Option 3 seeks to provide pedestrian links to the town centre and Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station. This provides the opportunity to reduce the reliance on private vehicles and take part in active travel; this is likely to have a positive effect for this Option.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation could be provided through LPS, proposed CHAAP, and CNLP Policies. LPS Policy IN 1 “Infrastructure” seeks to make sure that new and improved social and community facilities, utilities and other infrastructure is provided in a timely manner to meet the needs of new development as they arise. LPS Policy IN 2 “Developer Contributions” looks to secure appropriate developer contributions to make sure that the necessary physical, social, public realm, economic and green infrastructure is in place to support sustainable development. LPS Policy SC 3 “Health and Well-Being” seeks to create and safeguard opportunities for safe, healthy, fulfilling and active lifestyles. LPS policy CO 1 “Sustainable Travel and Transport” seeks to reduce the need to travel and make sure development gives priority to walking, cycling and public transport, with LPS policy SE 6 “Green Infrastructure” and SC 2 “Indoor and Outdoor Sports Facilities” looking to protect and enhance existing open spaces and sport and recreation facilities and provide adequate green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
space. LPS Policy SE 1 “Design” seeks to encourage a sense of place with new development, managing design quality and designing in safety. Policy BE1 ‘Amenity’ in the CNLP should make sure that new development does not prejudice the amenity of future and current occupiers. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 “Development strategy” looses to provide green infrastructure. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 4 “Improving connections between the town centre and railway station” seeks to provide high quality pedestrian and cycle networks. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 3 “Social infrastructure – local employment and skills based training” looks to maximise the provision of local employment opportunities, providing the chance for members of the community to access jobs. Proposed CHAAP Policies DH 1 “Design and integration of development”, IN 1 “New infrastructure” and IN 4 “Green infrastructure” require the provision of green infrastructure. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 looks to support the reduction of traffic emissions and seeks to encourage cycling and walking.

Taking the above into account, it is found that Option 3 is the best performing under this sustainability topic as it is the most likely to provide the critical mass to enable the provision of infrastructure, and also provides the opportunity for active travel and resulting health benefits. It is difficult to differentiate between Options 1 and 2 as they both perform similarly, and relatively well, providing the opportunities for active travel. It should be noted, however, that there is an element of uncertainty for all Options until the precise location of development is known and whether a critical mass to deliver additional infrastructure and services would be reached.
As detailed in Appendix B of this Report, the Borough has a range of larger and smaller rivers, which are improving in ecological quality and slightly declining in chemical river quality. There are also several areas of flood risk (a key source of evidence being the SFRA (August 2013) in the Borough. The SFRA identifies flood risk associated with Valley Brook (a main river); there is an area of flood risk (flood zones 2 and 3) in the north east of the scoping boundary. The majority of the scoping boundary is, however, in flood zone 1, which has a low risk of flooding. Options that focus development in or near the areas of flood risk have a greater likelihood of a negative effect on water (in relation to managing flood risk), compared to those that direct development to other areas. In terms of water supply and waste water, it is the statutory duty of water providers to make sure that adequate water supply and waste water infrastructure are provided for in a development. United Utilities have not indicated that their wastewater infrastructure is under pressure in the scoping boundary.

The scoping boundary contains a number of previously developed areas, which means that it is possible for the Options to minimise the loss of greenfield land. If any greenfield land is developed this is likely to result in an increase in paved surface areas, reducing the ability of water to infiltrate into the ground and increasing surface water runoff. However, Options that look to provide further green infrastructure have a greater likelihood of a positive effect on water, compared to those that don’t. The scoping boundary area is located in the ‘urban’ land classification and therefore does not contain any agricultural land. The amount of household waste being collected has decreased over the past year (Appendix B of this Report), however 56% was sent for either recycling or composting. This is likely to increase during the Plan period. Minerals resources including silica (or industrial sand), construction sand and gravel, sandstone (hard/crushed rock), salt (brine) and peat are located throughout the Borough. However, as the majority of the land included in the scoping boundary is brownfield, this could be seen as sterilised and would therefore have a neutral effect on mineral supply.

Looking at the Options (and with reference to their relationship with the opportunity areas), Option 1 looks to focus development in the POA, with additional development in part of the SOA; both these areas include a small amount of greenfield land, therefore there is potential for a negative effect on water and soil through an increase in paved surfaces, which reduces the ability of water to infiltrate into the ground. However, as the majority of the land in the parts of the opportunity areas under consideration is brownfield, there is the opportunity to remediate land contamination, which is likely to have a positive effect on water and soil.

Option 2 looks to focus development in the POA and SOA; both these areas include a small amount of greenfield land, therefore there is potential for a negative effect on water and soil through an increase in paved surfaces, which reduces the ability of water to infiltrate into the ground. The SOA also includes an area of flood risk (flood zones 2 and 3), therefore any intensification of development in this area may exacerbate the risk of flooding. However, as the majority of the land in the POA and SOA is brownfield there is the opportunity to remediate land contamination, which is likely to have a positive effect on water and soil.

Option 3 looks to distribute development across all three opportunity areas; all these areas include a small amount of greenfield land, therefore there is potential for a negative effect on water and soil through an increase in paved surfaces, which reduces the ability of water to infiltrate into the ground. The SOA and PeOA also include an area of flood risk (flood zones 2 and 3), therefore any intensification of development in this area may exacerbate the risk of flooding. However, as the majority of the land in the opportunity areas is brownfield land there is the opportunity to remediate land contamination, which is likely to have a positive effect on water and soil.
Mitigation could be provided through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. LPS Policy SE 13 "Flood Risk and Water Management" looks to reduce flood risk, and avoid an adverse impact on water quality and quantity. LPS Policy SE 2 "Efficient Use of Land" encourages the redevelopment/re-use of previously developed land and buildings. LPS Policy SE 11 "Sustainable Management of Waste" looks to manage waste sustainably through several measures including use of the Waste Hierarchy. A separate Minerals and Waste Development Plan Document is being prepared that will include specific policies and the allocation of sites for waste development in Cheshire East. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 4 "Green infrastructure" seeks to Integrate sustainable drainage and features design to minimise surface water, manage flood risk and maintain the natural water cycle.

Taking the above into account, it is found that Option 1 is the best performing under this sustainability topic, as it does not contain areas at risk from flooding and provides the opportunity to remediate contaminated land, albeit at a smaller scale than the other Options. Option 1 also spreads development over a smaller area, lessening the effects. It is difficult to differentiate between Options 2 and 3 as they both perform similarly, and not as well, due to the inclusion of flood zones in their boundaries. But, both Options 2 and 3 provide greater opportunities for the remediation of contaminated land. It should be noted, however, that there is an element of uncertainty for all Options until the precise location of development is known. As a precautionary approach it is considered that there is an overall potential for a negative effect, however it is considered that there is suitable mitigation provided through LPS policies, proposed CHAAP Policies, and available at implementation level to make sure that none of the Options would have a significant negative effect on this topic.
A key consideration is atmospheric pollution, which is likely to arise as a result of increased traffic through the delivery of housing and employment. Therefore all Options are likely to have a negative effect on atmospheric pollution as they look to deliver housing and employment. Road traffic is the main source of air quality issues in the Borough, with car and van ownership in the Borough being significantly higher than that for the North West and England, whilst the distances travelled to work are also high (Appendix B of this Report). There are 17 Air Quality Management Areas ("AQMAs") located around the Borough; the scoping boundary contains part of the Nantwich Road AQMA. Therefore Options that seek to reduce the amount of motorised vehicle movements in this area have a greater likelihood of a positive effect on air quality, compared to those that don't. Generally, locating housing where there is sustainable transport (and existing services and facilities) provides the opportunity to reduce the reliance on private vehicles. Therefore Options that focus development in areas that have good access to public transport, with opportunities for walking and cycling, and a good range of services and facilities, have a greater likelihood of a positive effect on air quality, compared to those that focus development to other areas. The provision of employment land provides opportunities for residents to walk to where they live, reducing the need to travel. Therefore Options that seek to deliver employment land have a greater likelihood of a positive effect on air quality, compared to those that don't.

Looking at the Options (and with reference to their relationship with the opportunity areas), it is noted that they would all provide an HS2 Hub Station, which is highly likely to result in an increased amount of traffic in the area and would lead to a negative effect on air quality. It is also noted that there is an intention to intensify development in all Options, which could increase the amount of traffic in the area as well. Option 1 looks to focus development in the POA, with additional development in part of the SOA, and would include the creation of around 25,300 new jobs. This could reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the POA and part of the SOA, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on air quality. However, it is recognised that the creation of new jobs can also bring people into the area, with the potential for an increased amount of traffic. This Option also seeks to provide 1,550sq.m of retail floorspace and leisure facilities as well as pedestrian links to the town centre and the Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station. These provide opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the POA and part of the SOA, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on air quality.

Option 2 looks to focus development in the POA and SOA and would include the creation of around 26,150 new jobs. This could reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the POA and SOA, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on air quality. However, it is recognised that the creation of new jobs can also bring people into the area, with the potential for an increased amount of traffic. This Option also seeks to provide 6,400sq.m of retail floorspace and leisure facilities as well as pedestrian links to the town centre and the Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station. These provide opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the POA and the SOA, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on air quality.

Option 3 looks to distribute development across all three opportunity areas and would include the creation of 35,300 new jobs. This could reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in all the opportunity areas, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on air quality. However, it is recognised that the creation of new jobs can also bring people into the area, with the potential for an increased amount of traffic. This Option also seeks to provide 7,450sq.m of retail floorspace and leisure facilities as well as pedestrian links to the town centre and the Crewe Commercial Hub.

Table D.5 Sustainability topic: air

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank and significance</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>A key consideration is atmospheric pollution, which is likely to arise as a result of increased traffic through the delivery of housing and employment. Therefore all Options are likely to have a negative effect on atmospheric pollution as they look to deliver housing and employment. Road traffic is the main source of air quality issues in the Borough, with car and van ownership in the Borough being significantly higher than that for the North West and England, whilst the distances travelled to work are also high (Appendix B of this Report). There are 17 Air Quality Management Areas (&quot;AQMAs&quot;) located around the Borough; the scoping boundary contains part of the Nantwich Road AQMA. Therefore Options that seek to reduce the amount of motorised vehicle movements in this area have a greater likelihood of a positive effect on air quality, compared to those that don't. Generally, locating housing where there is sustainable transport (and existing services and facilities) provides the opportunity to reduce the reliance on private vehicles. Therefore Options that focus development in areas that have good access to public transport, with opportunities for walking and cycling, and a good range of services and facilities, have a greater likelihood of a positive effect on air quality, compared to those that focus development to other areas. The provision of employment land provides opportunities for residents to walk to where they live, reducing the need to travel. Therefore Options that seek to deliver employment land have a greater likelihood of a positive effect on air quality, compared to those that don't. Looking at the Options (and with reference to their relationship with the opportunity areas), it is noted that they would all provide an HS2 Hub Station, which is highly likely to result in an increased amount of traffic in the area and would lead to a negative effect on air quality. It is also noted that there is an intention to intensify development in all Options, which could increase the amount of traffic in the area as well. Option 1 looks to focus development in the POA, with additional development in part of the SOA, and would include the creation of around 25,300 new jobs. This could reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the POA and part of the SOA, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on air quality. However, it is recognised that the creation of new jobs can also bring people into the area, with the potential for an increased amount of traffic. This Option also seeks to provide 1,550sq.m of retail floorspace and leisure facilities as well as pedestrian links to the town centre and the Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station. These provide opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the POA and part of the SOA, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on air quality. Option 2 looks to focus development in the POA and SOA and would include the creation of around 26,150 new jobs. This could reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the POA and SOA, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on air quality. However, it is recognised that the creation of new jobs can also bring people into the area, with the potential for an increased amount of traffic. This Option also seeks to provide 6,400sq.m of retail floorspace and leisure facilities as well as pedestrian links to the town centre and the Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station. These provide opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the POA and SOA, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on air quality. Option 3 looks to distribute development across all three opportunity areas and would include the creation of 35,300 new jobs. This could reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in all the opportunity areas, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on air quality. However, it is recognised that the creation of new jobs can also bring people into the area, with the potential for an increased amount of traffic. This Option also seeks to provide 7,450sq.m of retail floorspace and leisure facilities as well as pedestrian links to the town centre and the Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station. These provide opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the POA and SOA, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on air quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station. These provide opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in all the opportunity areas, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on air quality.

Mitigation could be provided through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. LPS Policy SE 12 "Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability" seeks to make sure that development does not result in a harmful or cumulative impact on air quality, with possible pollution from or relating to the development minimised or mitigated. LPS Policy CO 1 "Sustainable Travel and Transport" encourages a modal shift away from car travel to public transport, cycling and walking, with LPS Policy CO 2 "Enabling Business Growth Through Transport Infrastructure" seeking to minimise the need to travel. CNLP Policy Tran 7 "Crewe Railway Station" supports an extensive modernisation of Crewe Railway Station including improved access for pedestrians, cyclists and passenger facilities. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 4 “Improving connections between the town centre and railway station” seeks to provide high quality pedestrian and cycle networks. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 5 “Enabling sustainable transport interchange” seek to facilitate the use of walking and cycling. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 looks to improve air quality and support the reduction of traffic emissions and seeks to encourage cycling and walking.

Taking the above into account, it is found that Option 3 is the best performing under this sustainability topic as it provides a number of new jobs over a wider area, allowing more opportunity to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle and reduce atmospheric pollution. Option 2 performs well, and slightly better than Option 1, as it provides the opportunity to reduce the need to travel over a wider area. It should be noted, however, that all Options have the potential for a negative effect on air quality as a result of increased traffic, which could be as a result of the creation of new jobs. It is considered that there is suitable mitigation provided through LPS policies, proposed CHAAP Policies, and available at implementation level to make sure that none of the Options would have a significant negative effect on this topic.
## Climatic factors

### Table D.6 Sustainability topic: climatic factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank and significance</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>As detailed in Appendix B of this Report, total CO₂ emissions (including the domestic sector) fell by 13% between 2013 and 2016 (the latest year for which data are available), though most of this change occurred during 2013-14; a reduction in greenhouse gases will be primarily achieved through reducing emissions from buildings and transport. Build standards have already improved, however reliance on private transport remains high (Appendix B of this Report). The reliance on private transport has been considered at length under the sustainability topic of air, and therefore it is not proposed to revisit it under the climatic factors sustainability topic. All of the Options have some potential to support renewable or low carbon energy infrastructure, which would minimise per capita CO₂ emissions from the built environment, however small-scale sites provide fewer opportunities for incorporating renewable or low carbon energy infrastructure. Mitigation could be provided through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. LPS Policy SE 8 &quot;Renewable and Low Carbon Energy&quot; seeks to support such schemes, whilst LPS Policy SE 9 &quot;Energy Efficient Development&quot; looks to achieve high energy efficiency ratings. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 2 &quot;Energy infrastructure” requires new development to be net carbon zero. Taking the above into account, it is found that all of the Options perform equally as they have some potential to support renewable or low carbon energy infrastructure. As climate change is a global issue it is not possible to conclude on the significance of local actions and in turn the significance of effects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transport

Table D.7 Sustainability topic: transport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank and significance</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key consideration is to reduce the amount of traffic congestion in the Borough by reducing the need to travel through good access to jobs, services, facilities, and sustainable forms of transport. There are opportunities to travel on public transport, for example there are 22 Railway Stations across the Borough (including Crewe Railway Station, which is located in the scoping boundary). However, although the estimated miles driven by vehicles in Cheshire East has fallen in 2017, it is still higher than the totals for 2009 to 2013. Generally, locating housing where there is sustainable transport (and existing services and facilities) provides the opportunity to reduce the reliance on private vehicles. Therefore Options that focus development in areas that have good access to public transport, with opportunities for walking and cycling, and existing services and facilities, have a greater likelihood of a positive effect on congestion. The provision of employment land provides opportunities for residents to work close to where they live, reducing the need to travel and having a potential positive effect on congestion. Therefore Options that provide an employment land have a greater likelihood of a positive effect on congestion.

Looking at the Options, it is noted that they would all provide an HS2 Hub Station, which is highly likely to result in an increased amount of traffic in the area and would lead to a negative effect on congestion. It is also noted that there is an intention to intensify development in all Options, which could increase the amount of traffic in the area as well. Option 1 looks to focus development in the POA, with additional development in part of the SOA, and would include the creation of around 25,300 new jobs. This could reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the POA and part of the SOA, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on congestion. However, it is recognised that the creation of new jobs can also bring people into the area, with the potential for an increase in congestion. This Option also seeks to provide 1,550sq.m of retail floorspace and leisure facilities as well as pedestrian links to the town centre and the Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station. These provide opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the POA and part of the SOA, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on congestion.

Option 2 looks to focus development in the POA and SOA and would include the creation of around 26,150 new jobs. This could reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the POA and SOA, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on congestion. However, it is recognised that the creation of new jobs can also bring people into the area, with the potential for an increase in congestion. This Option also seeks to provide 6,400sq.m of retail floorspace and leisure facilities as well as pedestrian links to the town centre and the Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station. These provide opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in the POA and the SOA, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on congestion.

Option 3 looks to distribute development across all three opportunity areas and would include the creation of 35,300 new jobs. This could reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in all the opportunity areas, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on congestion. However, it is recognised that the creation of new jobs can also bring people into the area, with the potential for an increase in congestion. This Option also seeks to provide 7,450sq. m of retail floorspace and leisure facilities as well as pedestrian links to the town centre and the Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station. These provide opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle in all the opportunity areas, and is therefore likely to have a positive effect on congestion.

Mitigation could be provided through LPS, proposed CHAAP, and CNLPP Policies. LPS Policy IN 2 “Developer Contributions” looks to secure appropriate developer contributions to make sure that the necessary physical, social, public realm, economic and green infrastructure is in place to support sustainable development. LPS Policy CO 1 “Sustainable Travel and Transport” seeks to encourage a modal shift away from car travel to public transport, cycling and walking, with LPS Policy CO 2
"Enabling Business Growth Through Transport Infrastructure" seeking to minimise the need to travel. Policy Tran 7 "Crewe Railway Station" of the CNLP supports an extensive modernisation of Crewe Railway Station including improved access for pedestrians, cyclists and passenger facilities. CNLP Policy S.12.2 "Mill Street" notes that proposals at the Mill Street site will be expected to provide improved links to Crewe Railway Station and Crewe town centre. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 4 "Improving connections between the town centre and the railway station" seeks to improve connections between the Crewe Hub station and Crewe town centre, with its services and facilities, and physical access is to not be impeded, as well as provide high quality pedestrian and cycle networks. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 5 "Enabling sustainable transport interchange" seeks to facilitate the use of walking and cycling. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 looks to encourage cycling and walking.

Taking the above into account, it is found that Option 3 is the best performing under this sustainability topic as it provides a number of new jobs over a wider area, allowing more opportunity to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle and reduce congestion. Option 2 performs well, and slightly better than Option 1, as it provides the opportunity to reduce the need to travel over a wider area. It should be noted, however, that all Options have the potential for a negative effect on congestion as a result of increased traffic, which could be as a result of the creation of new jobs. It is considered that there is suitable mitigation provided through LPS Policies, proposed CHAAP Policies, and available at implementation level to make sure that none of the Options are likely to have a significant negative effect on this topic.
Cultural heritage and landscape

Table D.8 Sustainability topic: cultural heritage and landscape

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank and significance</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**

The Borough has an extensive historic environment, with many designated (and non-designated) heritage assets (as detailed in Appendix B of this Report). There are two Grade II Listed Buildings in the scoping boundary. These are the 1867 buildings at Crewe Railway Station, and the Delaney Building at Crewe and Alsager College. Development can lead to pressure on historic cores/Conservation Areas through increased traffic. Therefore Options that focus growth in such areas are likely to have a greater negative effect on the historic environment, compared to others that direct development elsewhere.

All landscapes in Cheshire East have an identified character, with varying degrees of importance and sensitivity; the Borough contains several historic land classifications and landscape character types (see Appendix B of this Report). The scoping boundary includes five historic land classifications (settlement, recreation, industry, communications and ornamental) and one landscape character type (LCT 7 Lower Wooded Farmland). The Borough also contains Local Landscape Designation Areas, none of which are located in the scoping boundary. Trees contribute to the identified landscape character of an area; the scoping boundary contains two areas where trees are subject to Tree Preservation Orders (western corner of the A534 Crewe Road and Gateway, and Quakers Coppice/land adjacent to University Way). As the majority of land in the scoping boundary is brownfield, Options that seek to provide green infrastructure are likely to have a positive effect.

Looking at the Options (and with reference to their relationship with the opportunity areas), Option 1 looks to focus development in the POA, with additional development in part of the SOA and is likely to have a negative effect on the historic environment due to the presence of Listed Buildings at the Railway Station and locally listed buildings. There is also potential for a likely negative effect on the landscape, if the trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders in the POA are not taken into account in any development proposals. Option 1 looks to provide buildings at a height range of between four and eight storeys, which, on the one hand could be an improvement on existing, depending on where it takes place (with a likely positive effect), but on the other, it may effect long distance views into and across Crewe from the surrounding area (with a likely negative effect).

Option 2 looks to focus development in the POA and SOA and is likely to have a negative effect on the historic environment due to the presence of Listed Buildings at the Railway Station and locally listed buildings. There is also potential for a likely negative effect on the landscape, if the trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders in the POA are not taken into account in any development proposals. Option 2 looks to provide buildings at a height range of between four and eight storeys, which, on the one hand could be an improvement on existing, depending on where it takes place (with a likely positive effect), but on the other, it may effect long distance views into and across Crewe from the surrounding area (with a likely negative effect, but less than Options 1 and 3).

Option 3 looks to distribute development across all three opportunity areas and is likely to have a greater negative effect on the historic environment due to the presence of Listed Buildings at both the Railway Station and Crewe and Alsager College, as well as locally listed buildings. There is also potential for a likely negative effect on the landscape, if the trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders in the POA and PeOA are not taken into account in any development proposals. Option 3 looks to provide buildings at a height range of between two and eight storeys, which, on the one hand could be an improvement on existing, depending on where it takes place (with a likely positive effect), but on the other, it may effect long distance views into and across Crewe from the surrounding area (with a likely negative effect). The boundary of Option 3 also includes a landscape character type of Lower Wooded Farmland, with the potential for a negative effect on landscape.
Mitigation could be provided through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. LPS Policy SE 7 "The Historic Environment" seeks to protect the historic environment. Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 2 "Safeguarding Crewe’s railway and built heritage" looks to respect, retain and enhance Crewe’s railway and built heritage. LPS Policy IN 2 "Developer Contributions" looks to secure appropriate developer contributions to make sure that the necessary physical, social, public realm, economic and green infrastructure is in place to support sustainable development. LPS Policy SE 4 "The Landscape" looks to conserve the landscape character and quality of the Borough, and for the historic, natural and man-made features to be enhanced and effectively managed. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 "Development strategy" seeks to provide green infrastructure and public realm improvements. Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 1 "Design and integration of development" seeks to raise design standards and looks for a significant improvement in the quality of design and public realm and the provision of green infrastructure. Proposed CHAAP IN 1 "New infrastructure" and IN 4 "Green infrastructure" also require the provision of green infrastructure.

Taking the above into account, it is found that it is difficult to differentiate between Options 1 and 2 under under this sustainability topic, as they both perform similarly. Option 3 does not perform as well because development could take place in, or close to, more Listed Buildings and protected trees than Options 1 and 2. It should be noted, however, that there is an element of uncertainty for all Options until the precise location of development is known. It is considered that there is suitable mitigation provided through LPS Policies, proposed CHAAP Policies, and available at implementation level to make sure that none of the Options would have a significant negative effect on this topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation could be provided through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. LPS Policy SE 7 &quot;The Historic Environment&quot; seeks to protect the historic environment. Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 2 &quot;Safeguarding Crewe’s railway and built heritage&quot; looks to respect, retain and enhance Crewe’s railway and built heritage. LPS Policy IN 2 &quot;Developer Contributions&quot; looks to secure appropriate developer contributions to make sure that the necessary physical, social, public realm, economic and green infrastructure is in place to support sustainable development. LPS Policy SE 4 &quot;The Landscape&quot; looks to conserve the landscape character and quality of the Borough, and for the historic, natural and man-made features to be enhanced and effectively managed. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 &quot;Development strategy&quot; seeks to provide green infrastructure and public realm improvements. Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 1 &quot;Design and integration of development&quot; seeks to raise design standards and looks for a significant improvement in the quality of design and public realm and the provision of green infrastructure. Proposed CHAAP IN 1 &quot;New infrastructure&quot; and IN 4 &quot;Green infrastructure&quot; also require the provision of green infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking the above into account, it is found that it is difficult to differentiate between Options 1 and 2 under under this sustainability topic, as they both perform similarly. Option 3 does not perform as well because development could take place in, or close to, more Listed Buildings and protected trees than Options 1 and 2. It should be noted, however, that there is an element of uncertainty for all Options until the precise location of development is known. It is considered that there is suitable mitigation provided through LPS Policies, proposed CHAAP Policies, and available at implementation level to make sure that none of the Options would have a significant negative effect on this topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table D.9 Sustainability topic: social inclusiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank and significance</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development in areas with lower access to public transport, services and facilities could result in higher social exclusion. Therefore Options that direct growth to areas with poor access to public transport, services and facilities have a greater likelihood of a negative effect on social inclusion, compared to those that direct development to other areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>There is a need to provide a mix of housing types and tenures (including affordable homes) in the Borough. Housing growth provides the opportunity for affordable housing to be provided; as detailed in Appendix B of this Report only about 12% of homes were operated by a private registered provider, with an increase in average (mean) house prices since 2013. Housing growth can also lead to funding being made available to provide new or upgraded infrastructure to enable communities to be more socially inclusive (for example, meeting places, opportunities to access training, public transport provision, footways and cycleways), however, if the critical mass is not reached there will be a resulting increase in pressure on existing services. The Borough contains Lower Super Output Areas that are some of the most deprived in England, reflected in the Index of Multiple Deprivation (2015). Two of the Lower Super Output Areas (E01018445 and E1018400), which contain part of the scoping boundary, are some of the most deprived in England.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need to provide a mix of housing types and tenures (including affordable homes) in the Borough. Housing growth provides the opportunity for affordable housing to be provided; as detailed in Appendix B of this Report only about 12% of homes were operated by a private registered provider, with an increase in average (mean) house prices since 2013. Housing growth can also lead to funding being made available to provide new or upgraded infrastructure to enable communities to be more socially inclusive (for example, meeting places, opportunities to access training, public transport provision, footways and cycleways), however, if the critical mass is not reached there will be a resulting increase in pressure on existing services. The Borough contains Lower Super Output Areas that are some of the most deprived in England, reflected in the Index of Multiple Deprivation (2015). Two of the Lower Super Output Areas (E01018445 and E1018400), which contain part of the scoping boundary, are some of the most deprived in England.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>All of the options provide an element of housing, which could include a mix of types and tenures. All Options are also in about one mile of Crewe Railway Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the options provide an element of housing, which could include a mix of types and tenures. All Options are also in about one mile of Crewe Railway Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at the Options (and with reference to their relationship with the opportunity areas), Option 1 looks to focus development in the POA, with additional development in part of the SOA, and would include around 1,500 new homes. If the critical mass for further infrastructure provision to enable communities to become more socially inclusive is reached then there is the likelihood of a positive effect on social inclusion in these areas. However, if the critical mass is not reached, and hence services and facilities will be under pressure, there is a likelihood of a negative effect on social inclusion. Option 1 does look to provide pedestrian links to the town centre and Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station, through the inclusion of the POA and part of the SOA, making these areas more accessible; this is likely to have a positive effect for this Option. This Option also looks to provide 1,550sq.m of retail floorspace and leisure facilities, with the opportunity to reduce the need to travel (and social exclusion) and a likely positive effect on social inclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 looks to focus development in the POA, with additional development in part of the SOA, and would include around 1,500 new homes. If the critical mass for further infrastructure provision to enable communities to become more socially inclusive is reached then there is the likelihood of a positive effect on social inclusion in these areas. However, if the critical mass is not reached, and hence services and facilities will be under pressure, there is a likelihood of a negative effect on social inclusion. Option 1 does look to provide pedestrian links to the town centre and Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station, through the inclusion of the POA and part of the SOA, making these areas more accessible; this is likely to have a positive effect for this Option. This Option also looks to provide 1,550sq.m of retail floorspace and leisure facilities, with the opportunity to reduce the need to travel (and social exclusion) and a likely positive effect on social inclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 looks to focus development in the POA and SOA and would include around 3,700 homes. If the critical mass for further infrastructure provision to enable communities to become more socially inclusive is reached then there is the likelihood of a positive effect on social inclusion in these areas. However, if the critical mass is not reached, and hence services and facilities will be under pressure, there is a likelihood of a negative effect on social inclusion. Option 2 also looks to provide pedestrian links to the town centre and Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station, through the inclusion of the POA and SOA, making these areas more accessible; this is likely to have a positive effect for this Option. This Option also looks to provide 6,400sq.m of retail floorspace and leisure facilities, with the opportunity to reduce the need to travel (and social exclusion) and a likely positive effect on social inclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 looks to focus development in the POA and SOA and would include around 3,700 homes. If the critical mass for further infrastructure provision to enable communities to become more socially inclusive is reached then there is the likelihood of a positive effect on social inclusion in these areas. However, if the critical mass is not reached, and hence services and facilities will be under pressure, there is a likelihood of a negative effect on social inclusion. Option 2 also looks to provide pedestrian links to the town centre and Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station, through the inclusion of the POA and SOA, making these areas more accessible; this is likely to have a positive effect for this Option. This Option also looks to provide 6,400sq.m of retail floorspace and leisure facilities, with the opportunity to reduce the need to travel (and social exclusion) and a likely positive effect on social inclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 looks to distribute development across all three opportunity areas, and would include around 6,550 new homes. Out of the three Options, Option 3 is considered to be the most likely to reach a critical mass to deliver infrastructure improvements to enable communities to become more socially inclusive, which is likely to have a positive effect on social inclusiveness in all of the opportunity areas. However, if the critical mass is not reached, and hence services and facilities will be under pressure, there is a likelihood of a negative effect on social inclusiveness. Option 3 seeks to provide pedestrian links to the town centre and Crewe Commercial Hub, along with improved pedestrian connectivity to and from the Railway Station, making these areas more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mitigation could be provided through LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. LPS Policy IN 1 "Infrastructure" seeks to make sure that new and improved social and community facilities, utilities and other infrastructure is provided in a timely manner to meet the needs of new development as they arise. LPS Policy IN 2 "Developer Contributions" looks to secure appropriate developer contributions to make sure that the necessary physical, social, public realm, economic and green infrastructure is in place to support sustainable development. LPS Policy CO 1 "Sustainable Travel and Transport" seeks to encourage a modal shift away from car travel to public transport, cycling and walking, with LPS Policy CO 2 "Enabling Business Growth Through Transport Infrastructure" seeking to minimise the need to travel. LPS Policy SE 1 "Design" seeks to encourage a sense of place with new development, managing design quality and designing in safety. LPS Policy SC 3 "Health and Well-Being", requires development to be designed to create safe environments, education and skills training should be improved, and existing community infrastructure should be protected, with the provision of a network of community facilities and opportunities to access services. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 3 "Social infrastructure – local employment and skills based training" looks to maximise the provision of local employment opportunities, providing the chance for members of the community to access jobs. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 "Transport and infrastructure" seeks to encourage cycling and walking.

Mitigation could also be provided through LPS Policy SC 4 "Residential Mix" which looks to provide a mix of housing tenures, types and sizes, with LPS Policy SC 5 "Affordable Homes" seeking the provision of affordable homes as part of residential developments. LPS Policy SC 7 "Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople" seeks to meet the accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 "Development strategy" looks to provide a range of housing types and sizes.

Taking the above into account, Option 3 is the best performing under this sustainability topic as it is the most likely to provide the critical mass to enable the provision of infrastructure, and also provides the opportunity to reduce the need to travel. It is difficult to differentiate between Options 1 and 2 as they both perform similarly, and relatively well, providing opportunities to reduce the need to travel. It should be noted, however, that there is an element of uncertainty for all Options until the precise location of development is known and whether a critical mass would be reached for the provision of services and infrastructure.
### Economic development

**Table D.10 Sustainability topic: economic development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank and significance</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commentary

As detailed in Appendix B of this Report, the Borough has a high jobs density, with above average skills levels and a relatively high proportion of residents in employment and people employed in high-skill occupations. However, a relatively high proportion of people in the Borough travel over 20km to work (Appendix B of this Report). Therefore Options that provide employment opportunities are likely to have a positive effect on economic development. Housing growth could support business growth, especially in town and larger village centres, through increased footfall and allowing businesses to base themselves close to employees. All of the Options provide an element of housing growth and are therefore likely to have a positive effect on economic development.

A more pleasant local environment that includes, for example green and open space and areas of landscape value, has the ability to attract more businesses. All landscapes in Cheshire East have an identified character, with varying degrees of importance and sensitivity; the Borough contains several historic land classifications and landscape character types (see Appendix B of this Report). The scoping boundary includes five historic land classifications (settlement, recreation, industry, communications and ornamental) and one landscape character type (LCT 7 Lower Wooded Farmland). The Borough also contains Local Landscape Designation Areas, none of which are located in the scoping boundary. Trees contribute to the identified landscape character of an area; the scoping boundary contains two areas where trees are subject to Tree Preservation Orders (western corner of the A534 Crewe Road and Gateway, and Quakers Coppice/land adjacent to University Way). As the majority of land in the scoping boundary is brownfield, Options that seek to provide green infrastructure are likely to have a positive effect with regards to creating a pleasing environment for business growth. The Borough also has an important tourism offer and historic environment, which provides significant opportunities for the economy (Appendix B of this Report). There are two Grade II Listed Buildings in the scoping boundary. These are the 1867 buildings at Crewe Railway Station, and the Delaney Building at Crewe and Alsager College. Therefore Options that focus growth in such areas are likely to have a greater positive effect on economic development, compared to those that direct development to other areas.

All of the Options provide new jobs and the Crewe Commercial Hub, along with a HS2 Hub Station and any associated economic benefits, with a likely positive effect on economic development.

Looking at the Options, Option 1 looks to focus development in the POA, with additional development in part of the SOA; these areas contain Listed Buildings at the Railway Station, locally listed buildings, and trees with Tree Preservation Orders, all of which contribute to creating a pleasing environment for business growth. If these elements are lost or their value reduced through development, then this Option is likely to have a negative effect on economic development.

Option 2 looks to focus development in the POA and SOA; these areas contain Listed Buildings at the Railway Station, locally listed buildings, and trees with Tree Preservation Orders, all of which contribute to creating a pleasing environment for business growth. If these elements are lost or their value reduced through development, then this Option is likely to have a negative effect on economic development.

Option 3 looks to distribute development across all three opportunity areas; these areas contain Listed Buildings at both the Railway Station and Crewe and Alsager College, locally listed buildings, and trees with Tree Preservation Orders in the POA and PeOA, and a landscape character type of Lower Wooded Farmland, all of which contribute to creating a pleasing environment for business growth. If these elements are lost or their value reduced through development, then this Option is likely to have a negative effect on economic development.
Mitigation could be provided through LPS, proposed CHAAP and CNLPP Policies. LPS Policy EG 1 "Economic Prosperity" looks to support employment development in the Borough, LPS Policy EG 4 "Tourism" seeks to protect and enhance the unique features of the Borough that attract visitors. In terms of town centres, LPS Policy EG 5 "Promoting a Town Centre Approach to Retail and Commerce" seeks to promote the vitality and viability of town and other centres. Policy S9 "Nantwich Road, Crewe" of the CNLP supports development of a scale appropriate to the character and function of the Nantwich Road Shopping Area. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 "Development strategy" seeks to protect the role and function of Crewe town centre and allows limited convenience provision that services the needs of travellers and businesses. Proposed CHAAP Policy IN 3 "Social infrastructure – local employment and skills based training" looks to maximise the provision of local employment opportunities, providing the chance for members of the community to access jobs.

Mitigation can also be provided through Policies that seek to protect the historic environment including LPS Policy SE 7 "The Historic Environment", and proposed CHAAP Policy DH 2 "Safeguarding Crewe's railway and built heritage" looks to respect, retain and enhance Crewe's railway and built heritage. LPS Policy SE 4 "The Landscape" looks to conserve the landscape character and quality of the Borough, and for the historic, natural and man-made features to be enhanced and effectively managed. Proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 "Development strategy" looks to provide green infrastructure and public realm improvements. Proposed CHAAP Policy DH 1 "Design and integration of development" seeks to raise design standards and looks for a significant improvement in the quality of design and public realm and the provision of green infrastructure. Proposed CHAAP IN 1 "New infrastructure" and IN 4 "Green infrastructure" also require the provision of green infrastructure.

Taking the above into account it is found that Option 2 is the best performing under this sustainability topic, as, although it delivers fewer job opportunities than Option 3, it provides a better environment for business growth. Option 3 does not perform as well because development could take place in, or close to, more Listed Buildings and protected trees than Options 1 and 2, which would not provide for a pleasing environment for business growth. It should be noted, however, that there is an element of uncertainty for all Options until the precise location of development is known. It is considered that there is suitable mitigation provided through LPS Policies, proposed CHAAP Policies, and available at implementation level to make sure that none of the Options would have a significant negative effect on this topic.

Summary findings and conclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and human health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and soil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climatic factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural heritage and landscape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social inclusiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D.18 The appraisal found no significant differences between the Options in relation to climatic factors.

D.19 Option 1 looks to focus development in the POA, with additional development in part of the SOA, therefore any effects are limited to a relatively smaller area. This option could have a negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna, water and soil, and cultural heritage and landscape through the instigation of development, the potential for loss of amenity greenspace and the effect on the historic environment for example; however, mitigation is available though LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. Option 1 was found to have potential positive effects against sustainability topics relating to population and human health, air quality, transport, social inclusiveness and economic development as there may be potential for a critical mass to be reached in terms of infrastructure provision, opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle and the visual improvement of the existing area for example.

D.20 Option 2 looks to focus development in the POA and SOA, therefore any effects are spread over a slightly larger area than Option 1. This Option could have a negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna, water and soil, and cultural heritage and landscape through the instigation of development, the potential for loss of amenity greenspace and the effects on a watercourse and the historic environment for example; however, mitigation is available though LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. Option 2 was found to have potential positive effects against sustainability topics relating to population and human health, air quality, transport, social inclusiveness and economic development as there may be potential for a critical mass to be reached in terms of infrastructure provision, opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle and the visual improvement of the existing area, for example.

D.21 Option 3 looks to distribute development across all three opportunity areas, therefore any effects are spread over a relatively larger area. This Option could have a negative effect on biodiversity, flora and fauna, water and soil, and cultural heritage and landscape through the instigation of development, the potential for loss of amenity greenspace, effects on a watercourse and the historic environment, and potential for effects on a LWS and SBI for example; however, mitigation is available though LPS and proposed CHAAP Policies. Option 3 was found to have potential positive effects against sustainability topics relating to population and human health, air quality, transport, social inclusiveness and economic development as there is a greater likelihood of a critical mass being reached in terms of infrastructure provision (compared to the other Options), opportunities to reduce the need to travel by private vehicle and the visual improvement of the existing area, for example.

D.22 In conclusion, the appraisal found that there is little difference between the Options; there is a variance as to the amount of growth each Option would accommodate and the area of land covered. However, none of the Options are likely to have a significant negative effect. Although Option 3 was the best performing under four of the sustainability topics, Option 2 performs well across all of the topics. Mitigation provided through Local Plan Policies and available at the project level should make sure that there are no major negative effects. Ultimately the nature and significance of effects against the majority of topics will be dependent on the precise location of development.
Appendix E: Alternatives for policy themes

E.1 This Appendix seeks to demonstrate that the approach taken to the appraisal of policy alternatives is justified, reasonable and proportionate. Most of the Draft CHAAP policies are derived from or are related to policies in the LPS; these LPS policies have already been subject to SA through the development of the LPS. Each of the policy themes covered by the Draft CHAAP is discussed below; for the majority of policy themes there is little to be gained from a formal alternatives appraisal and it would not be a proportionate approach to take. For the minority of themes further discussion is needed before it can be concluded that a formal alternatives appraisal is not required.

E.2 The information in this Appendix is supplemented by the detailed appraisal findings in Chapter 4 of this Report. As part of the appraisal presented in Chapter 4, the proposed policies are appraised against the baseline, that is, the 'do nothing option'.

General development policies

E.3 To make sure that all development is brought forward in a way that contributes to delivery of the overall vision for the area and remains consistent with the strategic approach of the LPS, there is a need for guidance relating to a number of matters that are universal to development across the Crewe Hub and that also require a series of more specific policy tests than set out in the LPS.

E.4 Achieving the right balance between maximising growth opportunities and delivering development that is sustainable is a particular challenge and the Council seeks to moderate this through a development strategy that enforces specific thresholds and requirements.

E.5 The matters addressed in Section 1 of Chapter 12 cover a range of issues related to establishing an overarching framework in which to achieve sustainable development across the Crewe Hub. Section 1 of Chapter 12 proposes an approach to defining the boundary in which CHAAP policy will apply, acceptable limits in terms of quantum and type of development, ensuring that all development supports and makes best use of locating close to the HS2 Hub Station and to make sure that all development contributes to improved connectivity across the Crewe Hub.

E.6 There are five proposed policies under the general development policies theme:

- GD 1 “Crewe Hub Area Action Plan boundary”
- GD 2 “Development strategy”
- GD 3 “Supporting the Crewe Hub Station and maximising opportunities”
- GD 4 “Improving connections between the town centre and the railway station”
- GD 5 “Enabling sustainable transport interchange”

E.7 The proposed policy approach covers the relationship between the Policies of the AAP and the Policies and proposals of the Cheshire East Local Plan, the overall development strategy including the provision of housing and jobs (further information regarding this can be found in the 'Developing the Crewe Hub Area Action Plan Boundary and Development Options' paper). support for the delivery and successful operation of a HS2 Hub Station as
well as maximisation of opportunities to enhance connections to Crewe town centre, and the improvement of movement to and around the Railway Station through transport interchange. The approach also covers additional retail development outside of Crewe town centre.

E.8 Of the proposed Policies, the majority of them are derived from or relate to Policies contained in the LPS, and therefore formal alternatives appraisal was not warranted. In relation to GD 1 “Crewe Area Action Plan boundary” and GD 2 “Development strategy”, it was considered best practise to formally appraise the alternative options for the boundary of the CHAAP area, as well as the amount of housing and employment proposed. The formal alternatives appraisal of options for the overall development strategy and CHAAP boundary can be found in Appendix D of this Report.

General design and heritage policies

E.9 Section 2 of Chapter 12 presents policies relevant to design and heritage matters specific to the Crewe Hub; matters that are primarily focused on ensuring the visual aesthetic of new development integrates with the existing fabric of the town.

E.10 The policies here address specific problems arising from the need to provide development at higher densities, and buildings at taller heights, than previously seen in Crewe. To achieve an attractive and unique series of well related developments across the Crewe Hub, this unique challenge must be met positively and alongside the policies set out here; further more detailed design codes may be used to supplement the approach.

E.11 Heritage also plays a key role in achieving this aim and policies in this Chapter seek to make sure that characterful buildings and interesting features of the local environment are used to best effect in creating a place that is unique and speaks to the history of Crewe.

E.12 There are two proposed policies under the general design and heritage policies theme:

- DH 1 “Design and integration of development”
- DH 2 “Safeguarding Crewe’s railway and built heritage”

E.13 The proposed policy approach covers design principles and the protection of Crewe’s heritage.

E.14 Of the proposed Policies, all of them are derived from or relate to Policies contained in the LPS, and therefore formal alternatives appraisal was not warranted.

General infrastructure policies

E.15 Section 3 of Chapter 12 covers matters related to the provision of a range of infrastructure necessary to underpin the overall success of the Crewe Hub. It covers several themes including digital, water and energy infrastructure, social infrastructure related to skills and training opportunities, green infrastructure and the key highways and transport infrastructure that will connect the new opportunities within the Crewe Hub to each other, to communities across Crewe and beyond.
E.16 Whilst some of the themes here are covered in detail by policies in the LPS, the approach here is sensitive to the conditions of the Crewe Hub recognising that a more bespoke approach is necessary to achieved coherent development at a scale of increased density than is normal for Cheshire East. Therefore the policies in this Chapter should be read alongside all other relevant policies set out in other parts of the development plan.

E.17 There are five proposed policies under the general infrastructure policies theme:

- IN 1 “New infrastructure”
- IN 2 “Energy infrastructure – net zero emissions”
- IN 3 “Social infrastructure – local employment and skills based training”
- IN 4 “Green infrastructure”
- IN 5 “Transport and highways infrastructure”

E.18 The proposed policy approach covers the provision of a range of infrastructure types and infrastructure costs.

E.19 Of the proposed Policies, all of them are derived from or relate to Policies contained in the LPS, and therefore formal alternatives appraisal was not warranted.

General transport and highways policies

E.20 Connectivity and movement is essential to the successful future operation of the Crewe Hub. A crucial element of the approach to increased density of development around a future HS2 Station must make sure parking and public transport is well managed in a way that responds positively to specific local circumstances. Section 4 of Chapter 12 therefore includes policies on car parking, bus routes and taxis that are complementary to the various transport infrastructure requirements set out in the previous section and to the approach set out in the LPS.

E.21 There are five proposed policies under the general transport and highways policies theme:

- TH 1 “Accessible car parks”
- TH 2 “Well managed car parks”
- TH 3 “Bus priority”
- TH 4 “Taxi and PHV areas”
- TH 5 “Car parking standards”

E.22 The proposed policy approach covers the provision of car parks, car parking standards, the introduction of bus priority measures and taxi ranks.

E.23 Of the proposed Policies, four of them are derived from or relate to Policies contained in the LPS, and therefore formal alternatives appraisal was not warranted.

E.24 It is difficult to envisage an alternative direction that might be taken to proposed policy TH 2 "Well managed car parks". The policy aims to provide a quantum of chargeable car parking that is reflective of anticipated rail passenger growth forecasts and proposed land uses, and which does not discourage the use of public/sustainable transport; there is little reason to suggest that the approach taken to this policy is not appropriate.
E.25  Formal alternatives appraisal was not warranted.
Appendix F: Development areas

Introduction

F.1 The Development Areas that are considered potentially suitable for allocation through the plan (development area options) have been appraised for completeness.

F.2 The aim of the appendix is to:

- explain how the list of development area options was arrived at
- explain the development area options appraisal methodology
- present the outcomes of the development area options appraisal

Identifying development area options

F.3 The Draft CHAAP proposes six ‘Development Areas’ and a set of policy principles that will be developed within them. These areas were established to take account of the emerging land use requirements that may be necessary in order to deliver the vision, aims and objectives of the CHAAP.

F.4 Previously, ten potential opportunity areas were identified in the Crewe Station Hub Area Action Plan Development Strategy (“CSHAAP”) of January 2019. This document set out a broad set of development principles that could be progressed within each of the areas and identified each on a base map; no firm boundaries for any area were established and no policy intentions were attached to them.

F.5 The CSHAAP included three boundary options and Opportunity Areas were proposed across the widest area under consideration. Following consultation on this paper, and additional evidence, the opportunity areas were renamed ‘Development Areas’ and reconfigured with new defined boundaries and a set of policy principles that could underpin development in the future. It is these development area options that we consider to be reasonable alternatives and they have therefore been subject to SA.

F.6 The Draft CHAAP identifies a preferred overall boundary and quantum of growth to be taken forward in the submission version of the CHAAP, later in 2019. The preferred option carried forward was Option 2: Mixed Use Led. This boundary choice has determined the geography within which each Development Area could be established.

F.7 The six Development Areas identified within the preferred boundary are:

- DA 1 Mill Street
- DA 2 Gresty Road
- DA 3 Macon Way
- DA 4 Weston Road
- DA 5 Crewe Commercial Hub
- DA 6 Nantwich Road Corridor

F.8 The extent of the Development Areas was also informed by:

- physical boundaries created by the road and rail network
Clearly, each of the proposed Development Areas could be further subdivided, however, each is proposed due to their overall coherence in relation to their physical boundaries and operational character both now and in the future, even where such land uses may be varied from one to another within an area. Further information is set out in the 'Establishing the Development Areas' paper.

**Developing the appraisal methodology**

Given the limited development area specific data availability it was not possible to only discuss (qualitative analysis) the merits of each development area under the SA framework. It would only have been possible to carry out a full qualitative analysis if time/resources were available to generate data/understanding for all development areas through discussion with landowners.

As such, work was undertaken to develop a methodology similar to the site options appraisal in the emerging SADPD, that could also be used to appraise development areas, whilst also reflecting the SA framework as best as possible. The methodology essentially employed GiS data-sets, site visits, and measuring (‘quantitative analysis’) how each development area relates to various constraint and opportunity features, as well as the use of qualitative analysis and planning judgement, where appropriate. The outcome was the completion of a proforma for each development area, incorporated into the 'Establishing the Development Areas' paper.

The site options appraisal methodology (traffic light rationale) that has been used to appraise the development areas is presented in Table F.1.

The aim of categorising the performance of the development areas is to aid differentiation, that is, to highlight instances of development areas performing relatively well/poorly. The intention is not to create a ‘significant effect’. Whilst Regulations require that the SA process identifies and evaluates significant effects of the draft plan and reasonable alternatives, there is no assumption that significant effects must be identified and evaluated for all development areas considered. See Chapter 3 of this Report for a discussion of how reasonable alternatives have been considered through the CHAAP/SA process.

A separate Accessibility Assessment has been carried out for each of the development areas. This can be found in Appendix G of this Report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Detailed criteria</th>
<th>Basis of traffic light choice</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Economically viable?</td>
<td>What charging zone in the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule does the site fall into? Is there anything site specific that could impact on the site's viability?</td>
<td>Broad site viability. Marginal viability/potentially viable. Not viable and unlikely to become viable.</td>
<td>NPPF ¶67 - considering deliverable and developable sites. ¶16, ¶35 - plan deliverability. NPPG - Viability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Landscape impact?</td>
<td>What would the likely impact on the local landscape, including views from and onto the site, and degree of visual prominence? The strength of the outer boundary is also a factor. Are there any sensitive receptors - footpaths, bridleways, landscape designations etc.?</td>
<td>No impact or development could improve the landscape. There will be an impact, but potential to be mitigated through sensitive layout and design. There will be significant landscape impact that will be difficult to mitigate.</td>
<td>NPPF ¶170 - protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. LPS Policy SE 4 Landscape. SA theme: • Cultural heritage and landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Settlement character and urban form impact?</td>
<td>What is the relationship to the existing character and form of the settlement? *Substantially - more than 50% of one side of the development.</td>
<td>Site is wholly in the settlement (infill) or is substantially* enclosed by the settlement on 3 sides. Site is immediately adjacent to the settlement and substantially* enclosed by development on 2 sides. Site is on the edge of the settlement, only adjoining development on 1 side or not adjoining a settlement.</td>
<td>SA themes: • Cultural heritage and landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strategic Green Gap?</td>
<td>Does the site fall in a Strategic Green Gap, as defined in Figure 8.3 Strategic Green Gap in the Local Plan Strategy?</td>
<td>No. In part. Yes (all or most of the site).</td>
<td>LPS Policy PG 5 Strategic Green Gap. SA theme: • Cultural heritage and landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Compatible with neighbouring uses?</td>
<td>Site on the edge of an established residential area and is proposed for residential use. Site on the edge of an established industrial area and is proposed for employment use. Site on the edge of a mixed use area where no known amenity issues exist that would preclude development. Site on the edge of a mixed use area and/or major transport infrastructure where some form of mitigation will be required to minimise any impact. Site on the edge of uses that are not considered compatible e.g. residential on the edge of an industrial area, especially where there are known amenity issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Highways access?</td>
<td>Existing access into the site. Access can be created in the site. No apparent means of access would be difficult to achieve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Highways impact</td>
<td>Are there any known highways issues that could impact the site (e.g. narrow roads, busy junctions, or significant road network)? Relevant Highway Studies/models can be referenced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Detailed criteria</td>
<td>Basis of traffic light choice</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LPS Policies IN 1 Infrastructure, CO 1 Sustainable Travel and Transport, CO 2 Enabling Business Growth through Transport Infrastructure, CO 4 Travel Plans and Transport Assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA theme: • Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Heritage assets impact?</td>
<td>Will there be any impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets* and their setting(s)?</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>NPPF ¶185 - positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A list of designated and non-designated assets is given on p141 of the LPS.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LPS Policy SE 7 The Historic Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA theme: • Cultural heritage and landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LPS Policy SE 13 Flood Risk and Water Management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NPPG - Flood risk and coastal change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA theme: • Water and soil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Development areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Detailed criteria</th>
<th>Basis of traffic light choice</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Ecology impact?</td>
<td>Are there any Habitats Regulations Assessment (&quot;HRA&quot;) implications? Are there any known/likely ecological issues in, adjoining or close to the site (e.g. old trees, hedgerows, ponds, watercourses, buildings to be demolished/converted, areas of scrub/woodland, grassland with a diversity of plants or designated sites)? LPS Policy SE 3 has a list of national/international and local/regional designations. N.B. The SADPD HRA will be published alongside the Site Selection Methodology.</td>
<td>Unlikely to result in any significant adverse impacts.</td>
<td>NPPF ¶170 - protect and enhance sites of biodiversity value; minimise impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity. NPPF ¶174 to 177 - Protecting biodiversity and geodiversity. LPS Policy SE 3 Biodiversity and Geodiversity. NPPG - Natural environment. SA theme: • Biodiversity, flora and fauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tree Preservation Orders (&quot;TPO&quot;) on/immediately adjacent?</td>
<td>Are there any TPO's on or immediately adjacent to the site?</td>
<td>Likely significant effects but avoidance/mitigation measures are possible.</td>
<td>NPPF ¶170 - recognise the benefits of trees and woodland. NPPF ¶127 – planning policies should promote developments with a high standard of amenity. LPS Policy SE 5 Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland. NPPG - TPOs and trees in Conservation Areas. SA theme: • Cultural heritage and landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. In an Air Quality Management Area (&quot;AQMA&quot;)?</td>
<td>Is the site in an AQMA?</td>
<td>Likely significant effects where avoidance/mitigation would be difficult to achieve.</td>
<td>NPPF ¶181 - take into account AQMAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Detailed criteria</td>
<td>Basis of traffic light choice</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13. In/adjacent to an area of mineral interest? | Is the site in or adjacent to an area where there is a known mineral interest?[^3] | - No. (yellow) Part of the site is in an AQMA.  
- Yes. (red) The entire site is in an AQMA.  
- Yes. (red) In a Mineral Safeguarding Area (including the 250m Buffer Zone) or an Area of Search.  
- Yes. (red) Is an allocated minerals site or a known site for potential allocation, or is in a Preferred Area. |  
- LPS Policy SE 12 Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability.  
- NPPG - Air quality.  
- SA theme: • Air |
| 14. Accessibility? | How accessible is the site to open space, local amenities and transport facilities?  
N.B. The Accessibility Assessment of the SADPD Sustainability Appraisal will be published alongside the Site Selection Methodology.  
N.B. The commentary here is as important as the balancing of the traffic lights. | - Majority of the criteria are green (11 and over). (green)  
- A mix of red/amber/green. (yellow)  
- Majority of the criteria are red (11 and over). (red) |  
- NPPF ¶8 – sustainable development includes accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities’ health, social and cultural well-being.  
- NPPF ¶104 – minimise the number and length of journeys needed for employment, shopping and other leisure activities.  
- LPS Policies SD 1 Sustainable Development in CE and SD 2 Sustainable Development Principles. |
### Development areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Detailed criteria</th>
<th>Basis of traffic light choice</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Public transport frequency?</td>
<td>Are there any rail or bus services? Are any considered to be commutable? A commutable service is considered to be that which can be used by someone that is working between 9am and 5pm, Monday to Friday.</td>
<td>Commutable service.</td>
<td>NPPF ¶108 – in assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, it should be ensured that appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be taken up. LPS Policies CO 1 Sustainable Travel and Transport, CO 2 Enabling Business Growth through Transport Infrastructure, CO 4 Travel Plans and Transport Assessments. SA themes: • Transport • Social inclusiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Brownfield/greenfield?</td>
<td>Is the land brownfield, greenfield or a mix of both?</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>NPPF ¶117 to 119 - making effective use of land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A mix of brown and greenfield land.</td>
<td>LPS Policy SE 2 Efficient Use of Land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield.</td>
<td>SA theme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Detailed criteria</td>
<td>Basis of traffic light choice</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Agricultural land?</td>
<td>Does the site protect the best and most versatile agricultural land?</td>
<td>Grade 4, and 5; other; 'settlement'.</td>
<td>NPPF ¶170 - take account of the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                               | N.B. Currently there is insufficient evidence to differentiate between Grade 3a and 3b in some settlements. For those settlements that it has been possible to differentiate between Grade 3a and 3b, Magic has been used: (5) | Grade 1, 2, and 3a (where known). | SA theme:  
  • Water and soil |
### Development areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Detailed criteria</th>
<th>Basis of traffic light choice</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed use, including an element of employment.</td>
<td>SA theme: Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Distance to existing employment areas?</td>
<td>How close are existing employment areas to the site? Existing employment areas include allocated employment sites in the LPS, relevant allocations in the former District Local Plans, existing employment areas identified in the Employment Land Review (2012), and town centres. The distance thresholds have been carried forward from the LPS Sustainability (Integrated) Appraisal Addendum: Proposed Changes.</td>
<td>Within 500m of an existing employment area.</td>
<td>NPPF ¶104 – minimise the number and length of journeys needed for employment, shopping and other leisure activities. LPS Policy EG 6 Existing and Allocated Employment Sites. SA theme: Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 500m and 1,000m from an existing employment area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over 1,000m from an existing employment area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. http://cheshireeast-consult.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/cs/library#ref
Appraisal findings

F.15  Table F.2 presents appraisal findings in relation to the development areas that have been a focus of plan-making in terms of the 20 appraisal criteria (Table F.1), with performance categorised on a ‘RAG’ scale.\(^{(92)}\) None of the development areas are located in the Green Belt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA 1</td>
<td>Mill Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA 2</td>
<td>Gresty Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA 3</td>
<td>Macon Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA 4</td>
<td>Weston Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA 5</td>
<td>Commercial Hub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA 6</td>
<td>Nantwich Road Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(92)}\) Red/amber/green
Reasons for progression or non-progression of development area options in plan-making

Table F.3 sets out the development areas considered and detailed in Table F.2 (above), with an outline of the reasons for their progression (as in this case there are no reasonable alternatives). It should be noted that whilst the SA findings are considered by the Council in the progression of development areas and form part of the evidence supporting the CHAAP, the SA findings are not the sole basis for a decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Reasons for progression or non-progression of the option in plan-making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA 1</td>
<td>Mill Street</td>
<td>This development area has been progressed as DA 1 because of its strong physical boundaries and the opportunity to physically integrate the site and land uses through future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA 2</td>
<td>Gresty Road</td>
<td>This development area has been progressed as DA 2 because of its strong physical boundaries and the opportunity to physically integrate the site and land uses through future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA 3</td>
<td>Macon Way</td>
<td>This development area has been progressed as DA 3 because of its strong physical boundaries and the opportunity to physically integrate the site and land uses through future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA 4</td>
<td>Weston Road</td>
<td>This development area has been progressed as DA 4 because of its strong physical boundaries and its core function in a small area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA 5</td>
<td>Commercial Hub</td>
<td>This development area has been progressed as DA 5 because of its strong physical boundaries, its coherent future land use and the opportunity to physically integrate the site and land uses through future development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA 6</td>
<td>Nantwich Road Corridor</td>
<td>This development area has been progressed as DA 6 because of its core function in a small area and strong north/south boundaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Accessibility assessments

G.1 The Accessibility Assessments are based on the criteria and distances in the accompanying Table 9.1 to LPS Policy SD 2 "Sustainable Development Principles". The accessibility of the development areas, other than where stated, is based on conditions prior to development. Any on-site provision of services/facilities, or alterations to service/facility provision resulting from the development have not been taken into account. Buffers (500m, 800m, 1,000m, 1,500m, 2,000m, and 3,000m) around the development areas have been used to carry out the assessments.

G.2 The development area options are:

- DA 1 Mill Street
- DA 2 Gresty Road
- DA 3 Macon Way
- DA 4 Weston Road
- DA 5 Commercial Hub
- DA 6 Nantwich Road Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>DA 1</th>
<th>DA 2</th>
<th>DA 3</th>
<th>DA 4</th>
<th>DA 5</th>
<th>DA 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop</td>
<td>500m</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Right of Way</td>
<td>500m</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Station</td>
<td>2km where geographically possible</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenity Open Space</td>
<td>500m</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Playground</td>
<td>500m</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports</td>
<td>500m</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Park and Village Green</td>
<td>1km</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Amenities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience Store</td>
<td>500m</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>1km</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Box</td>
<td>500m</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>1km</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank or Cash Machine</td>
<td>1km</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>1km</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>1km</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School</td>
<td>1km</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Centre</td>
<td>1km</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Facilities</td>
<td>1km</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Meeting Place/Community Centre</td>
<td>1km</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public House</td>
<td>1km</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare Facility (nursery or creche)</td>
<td>1km</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets minimum standard</td>
<td>Fails to meet minimum standard (less than 60% failure for amenities with a specified maximum distance of 500m and 50% failure for amenities with a maximum distance of 1,000m or 2,000m).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails to meet minimum standard</td>
<td>Significant failure to meet minimum standard (greater than 60% failure for amenities with a specified maximum distance of 500m and 50% failure for amenities with a maximum distance of 1,000m or 2,000m).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: Equality Impact Assessment

Equality Impact Assessment is a requirement for all strategies, plans, functions, policies, procedures and services, under the Equalities Act 2010. We are required to publish assessments so that we can demonstrate how we have considered the impact of the proposals.

Section 1: Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Environment and Neighbourhood Services</th>
<th>Lead officer responsible for assessment</th>
<th>Neighbourhood Planning Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Other members of the team undertaking assessment</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>Version</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of document</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a new/existing/revision of an existing document</td>
<td>New</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title and subject of impact assessment (include a brief description of the aims, outcomes, operational issues as appropriate and how it fits in with the wider aims of the organisation)</td>
<td>Crewe Hub Area Action Plan: Development Strategy and Further Options (&quot;CHAAP&quot;)&lt;br&gt;The Local Plan sets planning policies and allocates sites for development. The first part of the Local Plan (the Local Plan Strategy (&quot;LPS&quot;)) contains strategic planning policies and site allocations. It was adopted in July 2017 and its policies are now used by the council to determine planning applications. The significant change instigated by the arrival of HS2 is anticipated by the LPS. However, the LPS is a 'pre-HS2' plan and could not address the implications of HS2 in any detail because of the time when it was prepared. To manage change anticipated by HS2, the CHAAP is being prepared for a focused area around Crewe Railway Station and its vicinity. The CHAAP will be a bespoke planning document that will set out a planning framework for the development of the Hub Station and its environs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who are the main stakeholders?</td>
<td>Cheshire East residents, developers operating in Cheshire East, employers and employees in Cheshire East, and infrastructure providers in Cheshire East.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 2: Initial screening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is affected?</th>
<th>Cheshire East residents, developers operating in Cheshire East, employers and employees in Cheshire East, and infrastructure providers in Cheshire East.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who is intended to benefit and how?</td>
<td>Stakeholders in, and working in Cheshire East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could there be a different impact or outcome for some groups?</td>
<td>No. The CHAAP seeks to achieve improvements that will benefit all sections of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it include making decisions based on individual characteristics, needs or circumstances?</td>
<td>Yes. The CHAAP seeks to address all sections of the community which relate to the CHAAP boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are relations between different groups or communities likely to be affected?</td>
<td>No. The CHAAP seeks to achieve improvements that will benefit all sections of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any specific targeted action to promote equality? Is there a history of unequal outcomes (do you have enough evidence to prove otherwise)?</td>
<td>An SA Objective under the social inclusiveness sustainability topic requires the needs of all sections of the community to be considered in order to achieve high levels of equality, diversity and social inclusion. The CHAAP seeks to achieve improvements that will benefit all sections of the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Is there an actual or potential negative impact on these specific characteristics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N √</th>
<th>Carers</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N √</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N √</td>
<td>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N √</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion &amp; belief</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N √</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N √</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic status</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N √</td>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N √</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What evidence do you have to support your findings (quantitative and qualitative)?

A comprehensive evidence base has been produced for the LPS and is being produced for the CHAAP.
## Equality Impact Assessment

The CHAAP seeks to achieve improvements that will benefit all sections of the community. The CHAAP promotes accessibility of services, facilities, and jobs. Development would incorporate a mix of types and sizes of homes. The CHAAP will be the subject of public consultations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Consultation/involvement carried out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender reassignment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage &amp; civil partnership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy &amp; maternity</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion &amp; belief</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carers</td>
<td>The CHAAP seeks to achieve improvements that will benefit all sections of the community. The CHAAP promotes accessibility of services, facilities, and jobs. The CHAAP will be the subject of public consultations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic status</td>
<td>The CHAAP seeks to achieve improvements that will benefit all sections of the community. The CHAAP promotes accessibility of services, facilities, and jobs. Development would incorporate a mix of types and sizes of homes. The CHAAP will be the subject of public consultations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix I: Health Impact Assessment

### Table I.1 Health Impact Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues - will the CHAAP:</th>
<th>Impact (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Description of impact and effects on any particular socioeconomic or equalities group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land use and layout</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Provide a diverse mix of land uses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The CHAAP seeks to provide a diverse mix of land uses. This could include residential, employment, leisure, retail, health, education and green infrastructure uses. It seeks to meet the needs of all socioeconomic and equalities groups. In particular, it is considered that mixed use developments and the provision of a range of employment options can facilitate social cohesion. However, it is acknowledged that during the development of sites there may be stress and disturbance caused by construction activity. This impact can be lessened through the use of planning conditions to determine the hours and days that construction can take place. A diverse mix of land uses may also bring about disturbance from noisy activities and uses; however LPS Policy SE 12 “Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability” seeks to mitigate any impacts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve the availability, affordability and quality of housing</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The CHAAP seeks to provide an element of residential development, which should be of a range of housing types and sizes (proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 &quot;Development strategy&quot;); LPS Policy SC 5 &quot;Affordable homes&quot; requires the provision of affordable homes. This seeks to meet the needs of all relevant socioeconomic and equalities groups, with positive effects, particularly for low income households, where the availability of affordable homes is improved. However, it is acknowledged that during the development of sites there may be stress and disturbance caused by construction activity. This impact can be lessened through the use of planning conditions to determine the hours and days that construction can take place. Issues with regards to unhealthy living environments (daylight and ventilation) could be addressed through better quality housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve water management and reduce flood risk</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The CHAAP looks to manage flooding and minimise surface water runoff quality (proposed CHAAP Policy IN 4 &quot;Green infrastructure&quot;); the LPS includes a policy to integrate measures for sustainable water management in developments and reduce flood risk (LPS Policy SE 13 &quot;Flood Risk and Water Management&quot;). This is considered to have a positive effect for all socioeconomic and equalities groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues - will the CHAAP:</td>
<td>Impact (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Description of impact and effects on any particular socioeconomic or equalities group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the resilience of the area to climate change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The CHAAP looks to provide net-zero carbon development (proposed CHAAP Policy IN 2 “Energy infrastructure – net zero emissions”); the LPS seeks to support the development of renewable and low carbon energy schemes, and energy efficient development through policies (LPS Policies SE 8 “Renewable and Low Carbon Energy” and SE 9 “Energy Efficient Development”). This is considered to have a positive effect for all socioeconomic and equalities groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce crime and fear of crime</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>An Objective of the CHAAP is to create a safe, high quality journey experience. The LPS provides policies to make sure that all development is designed to create safe environments (LPS Policy SC 3 “Health and Well-being”) and discourage crime and anti-social behaviour (LPS Policy SD 2 “Sustainable Development Principles”). This is considered to have a positive effect for all socioeconomic and equalities groups, in particular those with mental illness associated with a fear of crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance neighbourhood attractiveness, layout and design</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The CHAAP, in conjunction with the LPS, provides policy to make sure that development proposals make a positive contribution to their surroundings (proposed CHAAP Policy DH 1 “Design and integration of development” and LPS Policy SE 1 “Design”). This is considered to have a positive effect for all socioeconomic and equalities groups. An attractive neighbourhood may encourage social interaction and have a positive effect on social cohesion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote active travel (such as walking and cycling) and general levels of physical activity (for example creation of walking and cycling routes)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The CHAAP, in conjunction with the LPS, encourages sustainable transport; this includes accessibility by walking and cycling to services and facilities. In particular proposed CHAAP Policies GD 5 &quot;Enabling sustainable transport interchange&quot;, and IN 5 “Transport and highways infrastructure” seek to facilitate the use of walking and cycling. LPS Policy CO 1 “Sustainable Travel and Transport” requires improvements to pedestrian and cyclist facilities. This is considered to have a long term minor positive effect on population and human health; in particular promoting active travel is thought to contribute greatly to those with poor mental wellbeing, and could help those that are currently physically inactive or at a risk of cardiovascular disease and obesity. Active travel can also help to reduce noise and air pollution from traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit traffic speeds and traffic noise, reduce traffic flows and make the street environment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The CHAAP, in conjunction with the LPS, provides policy to make sure that the street environment is safer and more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists. This includes a review of speed limits, where appropriate, and the encouragement to use sustainable transport (proposed CHAAP Policy GD 5 &quot;Enabling sustainable transport interchange&quot;), which in turn can reduce traffic flows and traffic noise (LPS Policy...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Description of impact and effects on any particular socioeconomic or equalities group</td>
<td>Impact (Yes/No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO1</td>
<td>Sustainable Travel and Transport</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is considered to have a positive effect for all socioeconomic and equalities groups. A safer and more pleasant environment could help those that are currently physically inactive or at risk of cardiovascular disease and obesity, facilitate social cohesion, and reduce road and traffic injuries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is considered to have a positive effect for all socioeconomic and equalities groups. A safer and more pleasant environment could help those that are currently physically inactive or at risk of cardiovascular disease and obesity, facilitate social cohesion, and reduce road and traffic injuries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO1 Sustainable Travel and Transport</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is considered to have a positive effect for all socioeconomic and equalities groups. A safer and more pleasant environment could help those that are currently physically inactive or at risk of cardiovascular disease and obesity, facilitate social cohesion, and reduce road and traffic injuries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO1 Sustainable Travel and Transport</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is considered to have a positive effect for all socioeconomic and equalities groups. A safer and more pleasant environment could help those that are currently physically inactive or at risk of cardiovascular disease and obesity, facilitate social cohesion, and reduce road and traffic injuries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO1 Sustainable Travel and Transport</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is considered to have a positive effect for all socioeconomic and equalities groups. A safer and more pleasant environment could help those that are currently physically inactive or at risk of cardiovascular disease and obesity, facilitate social cohesion, and reduce road and traffic injuries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issues - will the CHAAP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Description of impact and effects on any particular socioeconomic or equalities group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>proposals designed specifically for elderly people to be accessible by public transport and in reasonable walking distance of shops, medical services and open space. The preservation and enhancement of community facilities is considered to facilitate social cohesion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The CHAAP looks to improve employment opportunities through the delivery of the Commercial Hub and proposed CHAAP Policy IN 3 &quot;Social infrastructure – local employment and skills based training&quot; looks to maximise the provision of local employment opportunities, providing the chance for members of the community to access jobs. The LPS also seeks to improve employment opportunities through the allocation of sites to meet the employment needs of the Borough. This seeks to meet the needs of all socioeconomic and equalities groups, with positive effects particularly for unemployed people. The provision of a range of employment options can also facilitate social cohesion, and improve feelings of wellbeing of those who suffer from mental illness and poor self-esteem associated with unemployment and poverty. However, it is acknowledged that during the development of sites there may be stress and disturbance caused by construction activity. This impact can be lessened through the use of planning conditions to determine the hours and days that construction can take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>An Objective of the CHAAP is to support skills and jobs. The LPS looks to create and safeguard opportunities to improve education and skills training and encourage life-long learning (LPS Policy SC 3 &quot;Health and Well-Being&quot;). The LPS also provides policy to seek the provision of social and community infrastructure, which can include skills training, to meet the needs of new development (LPS Policy IN 1 &quot;Infrastructure&quot;). This seeks to meet the needs of all socioeconomic and equalities groups, with positive effects particularly for unemployed people, and those who suffer from mental illness and poor self-esteem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The CHAAP in conjunction with the LPS, does not seek to improve access to food outlets in particular, however, the LPS does look to reduce the need to travel by guiding development (which could include food outlets) to accessible locations or to locations that can be made accessible (LPS Policy CO 1 &quot;Sustainable Travel and Transport&quot;). This seeks to meet the needs of all socioeconomic and equalities groups, and could help to facilitate social cohesion. However, if access is improved to fast food outlets, this may lead to an increase in obesity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The CHAAP does not specifically reference local food production, however it is considered that this is adequately covered in other Local Plan policies. The LPS provides policy to promote the role of communal growing spaces including allotments, garden plots in developments, and small scale agriculture and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Open space and green infrastructure

| Provide open spaces (for example children's play, flexible amenity areas) and green infrastructure (for example green corridors, tree planting) | Yes | The CHAAP seeks to provide green infrastructure (proposed CHAAP Policies GD 2 "Development strategy", DH 1 "Design and integration of development", IN 1 "New infrastructure" and IN 4 "Green infrastructure"). The LPS provides policy to support the provision of green infrastructure (including children play space) and to strengthen the contribution that sport and playing fields, open space and recreation facilities make to the green infrastructure network (LPS Policy SE 6 "Green Infrastructure"). This seeks to meet the needs of all socioeconomic and equalities groups, with positive effects particularly for children aged 5 to 12 in relation to the provision of children's play. There are also mental health benefits from access to nature, green space and water, with the potential for an increase in social cohesion, and positive impact on obesity and cardiovascular disease through an increase in physical activity. |

| Preserve and enhance existing green infrastructure | Yes | The CHAAP seeks to provide green infrastructure (proposed CHAAP Policies GD 2 "Development strategy", DH 1 "Design and integration of development", IN 1 "New infrastructure" and IN 4 "Green infrastructure"). The LPS provides policy to safeguard, retain and enhance green infrastructure assets (LPS Policy SE 6 "Green Infrastructure"). This seeks to meet the needs of all socioeconomic and equalities groups; in particular there are mental health benefits from access to nature, and green space. |

### Affordable and specialised housing

<p>| Provide a variety of affordable housing (different tenures and so on) | Yes | The CHAAP seeks to provide an element of residential development, which should be of a range of housing types and sizes (proposed CHAAP Policy GD 2 &quot;Development strategy&quot;); LPS Policy SC 5 &quot;Affordable homes&quot; requires the provision of affordable homes. This looks to meet the needs of all socioeconomic and equalities groups, with positive effects particularly for low income households where the availability of affordable homes is improved. However, it is acknowledged that during the development of sites there may be stress and disturbance caused by construction activity. This impact can be lessened through the use of planning conditions to determine the hours and days that construction can take place. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues - will the CHAAP:</th>
<th>Impact (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Description of impact and effects on any particular socioeconomic or equalities group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide for the specialised needs of the elderly</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The CHAAP does not specifically reference provision for the elderly, however, it is considered that this is adequately covered in other Local Plan policies. The LPS supports development proposals designed specifically for the elderly where there is a proven need, the proposed development is located in a settlement, accessible by public transport and in reasonable walking distance of community facilities (LPS Policy SC 4 &quot;Residential Mix&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy, air quality and noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce energy usage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The CHAAP looks to incorporate renewable or low carbon technology into new development (proposed CHAAP Policy GD 7 &quot;Design of development&quot;); the LPS seeks to support the development of renewable and low carbon energy schemes, and energy efficient development through policies (LPS Policies SE 8 &quot;Renewable and Low Carbon Energy&quot; and SE 9 &quot;Energy Efficient Development&quot;). This is considered to have a positive effect for all socioeconomic and equalities groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help the development of practices and/or technologies that are low carbon or carbon neutral</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The CHAAP looks to provide net-zero carbon development (proposed CHAAP Policy IN 2 &quot;Energy infrastructure – net zero emissions&quot;); the LPS seeks to support the development of renewable and low carbon energy schemes, and energy efficient development through policies (LPS Policies SE 8 &quot;Renewable and Low Carbon Energy&quot; and SE 9 &quot;Energy Efficient Development&quot;). This is considered to have a positive effect for all socioeconomic and equalities groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance land, air and water quality</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The CHAAP does not specifically reference land or water quality, however it is considered that this is adequately covered in other Local Plan policies. The CHAAP looks to support the improvement of air quality (proposed CHAAP Policy IN 5 &quot;Transport and highways infrastructure&quot;). The LPS seeks to make sure that development does not result in a cumulative or harmful impact on land, residents, air and water quality (LPS Policy SE 12 &quot;Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability&quot;). This could help to reduce health risks from the toxicity of contaminated land, with the potential to improve air quality leading to a reduction in instances of lung and heart disease. This may also help to make sure that noise sensitive development, which could lead to harm or is detrimental to amenity, is not close to existing sources that generate noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance pollution prevention and control</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The CHAP does not specifically reference the remediation of land, however, it is considered that this is adequately covered in other Local Plan policies. The LPS seeks to make sure that development does not result in a cumulative or harmful impact on land, residents, air and water quality (LPS Policy SE 12 &quot;Pollution, Land Contamination and Land Instability&quot;). This could help to reduce health risks from the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Health Impact Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues - will the CHAAP:</th>
<th>Impact (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Description of impact and effects on any particular socioeconomic or equalities group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Toxicity of contaminated land, with the potential to improve air quality leading to a reduction in instances of lung and heart disease. This may also help to make sure that noise sensitive development, which could lead to harm or is detrimental to amenity, is not close to existing sources that generate noise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I.1 This assessment is based on the CEC Health Impact Assessment Checklist for Planning Applications. The policies referred to in this assessment are considered to be the main ones in relation to the issues looked at and it is assumed that the Local Plan is read as a whole; it is acknowledged that the list is not exhaustive and that issues may be covered to some extent in other CHAAP or LPS policies.

I.2 In conclusion it is found that the CHAAP, read alongside the LPS, seeks to meet the needs of all socioeconomic and equalities groups through policy. It has a positive impact particularly for older persons, unemployed people, children aged 5 to 12, low income households, families with children, and people with restricted mobility, with any negative impacts mitigated through Policy or the use of planning conditions.
### Appendix J: Rural Proofing Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Proofing Criteria</th>
<th>Negative impact?</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the plan affect the availability of services?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The CHAAP seeks to work with infrastructure providers to make sure that infrastructure to support the community is provided; this will include local health and social care facilities, leisure facilities, recreation and greenspace, education, transport, superfast broadband, mobile and other ICT connectivity, water, waste and energy. However, as the CHAAP is an area specific Development Plan Document, focused around Crewe Railway Station and its vicinity, it is unlikely to affect the availability of services in rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the cost of delivery be higher in rural areas where clients are more widely dispersed or economies of scale are harder to achieve?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The cost of delivery is unlikely to be higher in rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the plan affect travel needs or the cost of travel?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The CHAAP seeks to give priority to walking, cycling, and public transport, providing a genuine choice of modes. It also seeks to develop improved transport and infrastructure networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the plan be suitable communicated and delivered to those in a rural area?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The CHAAP will be advertised on the Council's website and will be able to view in Crewe Library and online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan impact on infrastructure (for example broadband, ICT, main roads, utilities)?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The CHAAP seeks to work with infrastructure providers to make sure that infrastructure to support the community is provided; this will include local health and social care facilities, leisure facilities, recreation and greenspace, education, transport, superfast broadband, mobile and other ICT connectivity, water, waste and energy. However, as the CHAAP is an area specific Development Plan Document, focused around Crewe Railway Station and its vicinity, it is unlikely to have an impact in rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the plan impact on rural businesses, and rural based industries and the self-employed?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The CHAAP is an area specific Development Plan Document, focused around Crewe Railway Station and its vicinity and is unlikely to have an impact in rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the plan affect those on low wages or in part-time or seasonal employment?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The CHAAP is unlikely to affect these forms of business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the plan to be targeted at the disadvantaged?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The CHAAP seeks to create sustainable communities, where all members are able to contribute and where all the infrastructure needed to support the community is provided, including the disadvantaged.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rural Proofing Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Proofing Criteria</th>
<th>Negative impact?</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the plan depend on new buildings or development sites?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The CHAAP depends on a level of new sustainable development focused around Crewe Railway Station and its vicinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the plan likely to impact on the quality and character of the natural and built rural landscape?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The CHAAP is an area specific Development Plan Document, focused around Crewe Railway Station and its vicinity and is unlikely to have an impact on the quality and character of the natural and built rural landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the plan impact on people wishing to reach and use the countryside as a place for recreation and enjoyment?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The CHAAP is an area specific Development Plan Document, focused around Crewe Railway Station and its vicinity and is unlikely to have an impact on people wishing to reach and use the countryside as a place for recreation and enjoyment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J.1 This assessment is based on the Countryside Agency: Rural Proofing Checklist.
Appendix K: Sustainability Appraisal consultation responses

Crewe Station Hub AAP Interim Sustainability Appraisal (January 2019)

Table K.1 CSHAAP Interim SA Report consultation responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation point</th>
<th>Summary of issue</th>
<th>Council’s response</th>
<th>Proposed change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¶1.1</td>
<td>Historic England is the Government’s statutory adviser on all matters relating to the historic environment in England. We are a non-departmental public body established under the National Heritage Act 1983 and sponsored by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. We champion and protect England’s historic places, providing expert advice to local planning authorities, developers, owners and communities to help ensure our historic environment is properly understood, enjoyed and cared for. In view of our comments on the AAP, we do not have any comments to make at this stage on the Interim SA.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>No change proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶1.12</td>
<td>Why not re-brand Crewe as a Health &amp; Wellbeing business/family Spa Town supported by the vast green geothermal waters under Crewe. Its ticks all the boxes for sustainability.</td>
<td>Noted. This is primarily a matter for the plan-making process.</td>
<td>No change proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶4.11</td>
<td>It is critical that the areas within and adjacent to the new station have zones (internal &amp; external) which have plants of various types so that the station environment is welcoming for travellers arriving/departing and waiting for trains. This requirement also extends to improving the sites of biodiversity in the older station and the areas surrounding the stations e.g. retail outlets/town centre etc. In addition, it’s important that the environment leading to/from the station also have appropriate tree/shrub planting to enhance the biodiversity of the development. These must be incorporated in the HS2 development plans at the outset.</td>
<td>Noted. This is primarily a matter for the plan-making process.</td>
<td>No change proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¶4.15</td>
<td>The current retail environment is clearly difficult with many shops (even the larger ones) closing on the high streets which are having a serious impact on town/city centres. I think a key requirement alongside the station development is the provision</td>
<td>Noted. This is primarily a matter for the plan-making process.</td>
<td>No change proposed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of realistic retail opportunities within the station for commuters and a seamless link to the city centre where larger shops will be available - to facilitate this pedestrianised walkways and even moving walkways from the station must be installed. Linked to this, it is critical that the rates/rentals of the station outlets (and city centre) are constrained/reduced in order to stimulate growth plus the introduction of appropriate pedestrianisation and affordable car parks.

It is also critical that there are adequate facilities put in place to serve the disabled community i.e. the provision of lifts and trained staff. It is also important that adequate facilities such as disabled person toilets and rooms for feeding/changing babies are all put in place in the new station.

It is also critical that there are adequate facilities put in place to serve the disabled community i.e. the provision of lifts and trained staff. It is also important that adequate facilities such as disabled person toilets and rooms for feeding/changing babies are all put in place in the new station.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation point</th>
<th>Summary of issue</th>
<th>Council’s response</th>
<th>Proposed change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¶4.16</td>
<td>The Crewe station development plans must consider a number of options related to an expansion of the local population and hence increased passenger numbers.</td>
<td>Noted. This is primarily a matter for the plan-making process.</td>
<td>No change proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation point</td>
<td>Proposed change</td>
<td>Council’s response</td>
<td>Summary of issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of a modern tram system has another possible advantage and this relates to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of a modern tram system has another possible advantage and this relates to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking issue that patients experience at Leighton Hospital. This is a major problem and again needs resolving. Thinking here if a tram line is put in place that serves the hospital, patients from the Crewe area wouldn’t need to drive to the hospital - this would be a cost-effective option for the patients and significantly better for the environment.</td>
<td>No change proposed. Noted. This is primarily a matter for the plan-making process.</td>
<td>It is also critical that the new station has seamless links with the existing rail network station - these link local communities and again offer them simple access need to be installed at the time of the HS2 station construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The HS2 team need to consider opportunities to improve links to major road/motorway links e.g. M6, M56, this would allow HS2 passengers to use Crewe as a hub for access to places like Stoke, Nantwich, Leek, Ashbourne, Middlewich etc.</td>
<td>No change proposed. Noted. This is primarily a matter for the plan-making process.</td>
<td>Local opportunities/ enhancements regarding local employment are critical but HS2 offers a wider opportunity relating to people working at other cities linked by the HS2 network - this extends to Manchester Airport as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Crewe is relatively central within the HS2 network, would this allow Crewe to</td>
<td>No change proposed. Noted. It is considered that the SA has assessed the impacts of the different boundary options, which can be found in Appendix D of the CHAAP Interim SA. This appraisal has influenced the development of a preferred boundary option, with the option being consulted on.</td>
<td>We do not agree that generic policies in the Local Plan are sufficient to mitigate for negative impacts on biodiversity as a result of delivering CSHAAP. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) should assess the impacts of the different boundary options and the results of this should influence the preferred option. Once a preferred option is selected, the findings of the SA and proposed mitigation should be incorporated into policy wording.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** ¶4.60 **

Local opportunities/ enhancements regarding local employment are critical but HS2 offers a wider opportunity relating to people working at other cities linked by the HS2 network - this extends to Manchester Airport as well.

** ¶4.70 **

As Crewe is relatively central within the HS2 network, would this allow Crewe to build a state of the art conference centre (or other centres) that would serve most of England? This would offer numerous possibilities for building new hotels/restaurants and offer enhancements for retailers etc.

** ¶4.11, Table D.2 **

We do not agree that generic policies in the Local Plan are sufficient to mitigate for negative impacts on biodiversity as a result of delivering CSHAAP. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) should assess the impacts of the different boundary options and the results of this should influence the preferred option. Once a preferred option is selected, the findings of the SA and proposed mitigation should be incorporated into policy wording.
### Sustainability Appraisal consultation responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation point</th>
<th>Summary of issue</th>
<th>Council’s response</th>
<th>Proposed change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>through consultation on the CHAAP: Development Strategy and Further Options document. The Local Plan Strategy, Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (once adopted) and the CHAAP (once adopted) form part of the Development Plan for the Borough, and as such should be read as a whole. Through collection of the baseline data it has been shown that the scoping boundary (and as a result the preferred option boundary) is of limited biodiversity value.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>