

**GLOUCESTER LOCAL DEVELOPMENT  
FRAMEWORK**

**SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE  
TALL BUILDINGS IN GLOUCESTER  
ISSUES AND OPTIONS DOCUMENT**

**NOVEMBER 2007**

## **CONTENTS**

|    |                                      |    |
|----|--------------------------------------|----|
| 1. | INTRODUCTION                         | 3  |
| 2. | BACKGROUND                           | 5  |
| 3. | THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL PROCESS | 6  |
| 4. | RELEVANT BASELINE INFORMATION        | 10 |
| 5. | OVERALL FINDINGS                     | 10 |
| 6. | COMMENTS AND SUGGESTED CHANGES       | 13 |
| 7. | CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS            | 14 |

## **APPENDICES**

|  |  |    |
|--|--|----|
|  | APPENDIX 1 – SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL MATRIX | 15 |
|--|--|----|

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 As part of the emerging Local Development Framework for Gloucester, we have prepared a 'Tall Buildings in Gloucester' issues and options consultation document.
- 1.2 The issues and options document sets out the key issues relating to the provision of tall buildings in Gloucester and suggests five alternative policy approaches towards dealing with them.
- 1.3 The aim of the issues and options document is to stimulate views on which option or combination of options should be taken forward as Council policy in respect of tall buildings. The preferred option or options will be incorporated into a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to be produced and consulted on in 2008 and thereafter, formally adopted as part of the Local Development Framework (the replacement to the Local Plan).
- 1.4 This document is a 'Sustainability Appraisal' that has been carried out on the issues and options document in order to determine how well each of the different options performs in 'sustainability' terms. In other words, to identify the extent to which they meet social, economic and environmental objectives.
- 1.5 The appraisal helps us to identify what level of impact the various options set out in the document are likely to have, whether the impacts will be significant, temporary or permanent and whether they are likely to have any impact beyond the boundaries of Gloucester.
- 1.6 The appraisal also helps us to identify how the document might be improved to make it more effective in sustainability terms. It helps us to identify and address any potential conflicts between different sustainability objectives.
- 1.7 This document is divided into a number of sections for ease of reference. Section 3 outlines in more detail the nature of the sustainability appraisal process that has been carried out, Section 4 describes relevant baseline data and background information and Section 5 describes the main findings of the appraisal.
- 1.8 Section 6 flags up any comments and suggested improvements that could be made to the draft SPD to improve its performance in sustainability terms.

- 1.9 Attached to the appraisal at Appendix 1 is a completed 'Sustainability Appraisal Matrix' setting out in detail the predicted impact of the issues and options document when set against a series of sustainability sub-objectives (the use of this matrix is explained in more detail in Section 3 below).
- 1.10 The sustainability appraisal has been carried out to assist people in making comments on the issues and options document itself. The deadline for comments on this document is the same as the deadline for submitting comments on the draft SPD i.e. 21<sup>st</sup> January 2008.
- 1.11 We would encourage you to submit your comments electronically using the public access section of the Council's website available at [www.gloucester.gov.uk](http://www.gloucester.gov.uk) or by sending an email to [pdc@gloucester.gov.uk](mailto:pdc@gloucester.gov.uk)
- 1.12 If you do not have access to a PC and wish to send your comments by post, please send them to the following address:
- Policy Design and Conservation  
Gloucester City Council  
Herbert Warehouse  
The Docks  
Gloucester  
GL1 2EQ
- 1.13 If you have any questions about this document or the SPD to which it relates please call 01452 396854 for assistance.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 The Council is in the process of preparing a Local Development Framework for Gloucester (LDF). This will replace the existing Local Plan. The LDF will consist of four main development plan documents including:
- Core Strategy
  - Development Control Policies
  - Central Area Action Plan; and
  - Site Allocations/Designations (Non-Central Area)
- 2.2 These documents will be accompanied by a Proposals Map showing graphically where each policy and proposal applies.
- 2.3 Supporting these main Development Plan Documents will be a number of topic-based Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) including 'Tall Buildings in Gloucester'.
- 2.4 The purpose of these supplementary planning documents is to support and provide additional information in relation to the main Development Plan Documents referred to above.
- 2.5 Supplementary Planning Documents do not have the same status as Development Plan Documents but they are nonetheless very important considerations when planning applications are being decided.

### 3. THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL PROCESS

#### What is 'Sustainability'?

- 3.1 There is no single definition of sustainability. A commonly used definition, which has been around since 1987 is:

***'Development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'.***

- 3.2 More recently, it has been accepted that sustainable development isn't just about protecting the environment, but that it also includes social and economic objectives.

- 3.3 In particular, the Government acknowledges sustainable development as having four main aims:

- Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone
- Effective protection of the environment
- Prudent use of natural resources; and
- Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment

#### So how will we appraise the 'sustainability' of our SPDs?

- 3.4 On July 28th 2005, the Council approved a Sustainability Appraisal 'Scoping Report' which sets out the broad approach that the Council will take in subjecting each of the documents produced under the Local Development Framework, to a Sustainability Appraisal. The Scoping Report, plus a non-technical summary, is available to download online at [www.gloucester.gov.uk](http://www.gloucester.gov.uk)
- 3.5 Hard copies may also be viewed and/or purchased from the City Council Offices.
- 3.6 The Scoping Report was subject to consultation with the Environment Agency, the Countryside Agency, English Nature, English Heritage and a number of other relevant organisations. It identifies the main national, regional and local policy influences on Gloucester as well as the current baseline state of the City in environmental, social and economic terms. From this assessment, the scoping report draws out the key issues facing Gloucester and translates these into a number of sustainable objectives.

3.7 Key sustainability issues identified for Gloucester include:

Economic Issues

- The highest unemployment rate in the County
- Pronounced unemployment among black and minority ethnic communities
- Lower than County average household income
- Growth in the service sector and a decline in manufacturing
- High levels of in-commuting
- Limited early hours/evening economy
- Overall shortage of employment land
- Older, less attractive employment areas
- Lack of overnight tourist visitors
- Poor retail provision compared to the size of Gloucester's shopper population

Social Issues

- An acute housing 'need'
- Poorer than average health of residents
- 'Pockets' of acute deprivation in some parts of the City
- Growth in the number of households in particular single person households
- Gloucester has the second highest crime rate in the South West
- Educational achievement is the lowest in the County
- Poor literacy and numeracy skills
- A significant percentage of homes classified as 'unfit'
- High levels of homelessness
- Highest teenage pregnancy rate in the South West

Environmental Issues

- Many of the un-built parts of the City are of significant landscape and/or nature conservation importance
- A large proportion of the City falls within the River Severn floodplain
- Gloucester has an important built and cultural heritage
- Certain areas of the City suffer from traffic congestion
- Previously developed land may be subject to contamination
- The City has a shortfall of public open space compared to the national recommended standard
- Lower than average rates of recycling

3.8 Based on these identified key issues, we have identified nine 'headline' sustainable objectives, which we will expect all LDF policies and proposals to be consistent with as far as possible. Where there are potential conflicts, these will be highlighted through the appraisal process.

3.9 Our nine headline objectives also take into account the objectives of the Regional Sustainable Development Framework for the South West (2001).

3.10 They include:

1. Protecting the City's most vulnerable assets
2. Delivering sustainable economic growth
3. Minimising consumption of natural resources and the production of waste
4. Ensuring everyone has access to the essential services they require and that local needs are met
5. Improving standards of health and education
6. Making Gloucester a great place to live and work
7. Reducing the need to travel
8. Improving environmental quality (air, water, land)
9. Reducing contributions to climate change

3.11 Under each of these headline objectives we have identified a number of sub-objectives i.e. more detailed questions that will be asked of potential policies and proposals during the sustainability appraisal process.

3.12 For example, under headline objective 1, which is to protect the City's most vulnerable assets, a policy or proposal would be assessed in terms of whether it would minimise the risk of flooding, help to conserve and/or enhance natural habitats, conserve and/or enhance species biodiversity, maintain and/or enhance cultural and historic assets and so on.

3.13 Under headline objective 5, which is to improve standards of health and education, a policy or proposal would be assessed in terms of how well it would contribute towards improve health and enhancing people's ability to engage in healthy activities as well as whether it would improve access to health care facilities or improve access to opportunities for learning, training, skills and knowledge.



- 3.14 Clearly some objectives will be more relevant to certain policies and proposals than others. Thus for example a policy relating to the provision of affordable housing is unlikely to have much a direct impact in terms of nature conservation (unless it relates to a particular site with nature conservation value). Such a policy would however be directly related to the sustainable objective of ensuring that everyone has access to safe and affordable housing.
- 3.15 It is also important to remember that there may be less obvious linkages between policies and sustainability objectives. A good example is the link between design and reducing crime levels, which is not immediately obvious, however evidence suggests that it is possible through the use of good design to reduce the opportunity to commit crime e.g. by providing overlooking, good lighting and reducing the number of 'escape routes' available.
- 3.16 We have identified these less obvious linkages wherever possible.
- 3.17 The headline objectives and sub-objectives set out in the Scoping Report have been incorporated into a 'Sustainability Matrix' which is a table of criteria that has been applied to the SPD in order to determine how well each of the five proposed options performs in sustainability terms.
- 3.18 The completed sustainability matrix is set out at Appendix 1 of this document. The matrix looks at the likelihood of any impact, the likely timescale, whether the effect will be temporary or permanent, significant and/or cumulative and whether the impact will be localised, citywide or even cross-boundary. The impact of each option has been scored on the following basis:
- |    |                             |
|----|-----------------------------|
| ++ | Significant positive effect |
| +  | Moderate positive effect    |
| 0  | Neutral effect              |
| -- | Significant negative effect |
| -  | Moderate negative effect    |
| ?  | Uncertain effect            |
- 3.19 Commentary on the main findings of the appraisal is set out in Sections 5, 6 and 7 below. Before that however it is worth briefly outlining some relevant baseline information to place the sustainability appraisal in context. We do this in Section 4.0 below.

#### **4. RELEVANT BASELINE INFORMATION**

- 4.1 There have been a number of tall developments in modern times that have had a negative impact on the character of Gloucester. These include Clapham Court, The Shire Hall, Gloscat Tower and the Great Western Hospital tower.
- 4.2 The influence of the Cathedral and other historic structures on the local distinctiveness of Gloucester cannot be underestimated and it is considered important that modern developments respect the views to, and scale of these buildings.

#### **5. OVERALL FINDINGS**

- 5.1 The issues and options consultation paper puts forward five possible options for how the Council can deal with the issue of the provision of tall buildings in new development. The five options are:
- Do-nothing (Business as Usual)
  - Continuation of the 1983 Local Plan approach
  - An 'Area Based' Approach
  - A 'View Corridor' Based Approach
  - Prohibitive Approach
- 5.2 Set out below is a brief summary of each option and a description of how well they perform when assessed using the Council's sustainability appraisal matrix. The full results for each option are set out in the five matrices attached at Appendix 1.

##### Option 1 – Do Nothing or 'Business As Usual'

- 5.3 Option 1 is the 'do nothing' or 'business as usual' scenario. This essentially involves having no policy in place to guide the provision of tall buildings in Gloucester.
- 5.4 Any proposal that would come forward as part of a planning application would be considered on its individual merits.
- 5.5 Whilst this approach would perhaps offer developers a greater degree of flexibility it may lead to pressure for inappropriate forms of development that would be difficult to resist without an agreed policy framework in place.
- 5.6 Application of the sustainability matrix shows that this option would perform relatively poorly. In particular there is a danger that the pressure for tall buildings in inappropriate locations may have a negative impact on the historic and cultural assets of the City including in particular, views of the Cathedral Tower.

- 5.7 On a related note, in the event that harm may be caused to the historic and cultural assets of Gloucester, this is likely to have a negative impact on the attraction of the City as a tourist destination.
- 5.8 There is also likely to be an overall deterioration in the quality of where people live under this option.
- 5.9 There is one positive impact associated with Option 1, which is that it could be seen to be contributing towards the objective of making the most efficient use of land, by adopting a more flexible approach towards the provision of tall buildings in new development.

#### Option 2 – Continuation of the 1983 Local Plan Approach

- 5.10 Option 2 is to continue the approach to tall buildings set out in the adopted 1983 Gloucester Local Plan. The plan identifies three zones of height restriction within which building heights would be controlled to varying degrees.
- 5.11 Within the inner area and along a number of defined ‘view corridors’ building heights will be restricted to heights as existing. Outside the inner area, north to Estcourt Road, east to Horton Road and south to Barton Street, Parkend Road and the old Docks Loop Railway line, no new building should exceed 23 metres. South of this area and to the east of the canal, extending south to Cole Avenue, higher buildings will be acceptable, subject to design and local environmental considerations.
- 5.12 Option 2 scores relatively well when assessed against the sustainability matrix. In seeking to protect important views by controlling building heights in certain areas and view corridors, this Option would help to maintain and enhance the City’s cultural and historic assets, it would help maintain and improve Gloucester’s attraction as a tourist attraction and would help to improve the overall quality of where people live.
- 5.13 Option 2 scores slightly less well than Option 4 as it considers fewer view corridors and thereby arguably offers less protection against inappropriate high-rise development.
- 5.14 There is one negative impact associated with Option 2, which is that in restricting the development of tall buildings in some parts of the City, it could be seen as discouraging the most efficient use of previously developed land. This of course must be balanced against the positive impacts of this option.

### Option 3 – An ‘Area Based’ Approach

- 5.15 Option 3 is a proposed ‘area based’ approach. Under this option, the Council would define a number of ‘character areas’ within which development proposals would be limited to a height that does not exceed that of the surrounding buildings in order to preserve the historic character of each area.
- 5.16 The consultation paper proposes four character areas:
- Cathedral Precincts
  - City Centre and Gate Streets
  - Historic Docks and Quays
  - Spa Area
- 5.17 This option would be similar to the 1983 Local Plan approach (Option 2) but would involve the designation of these new character areas.
- 5.18 Option 3 scores well in sustainability terms when assessed against the sustainability matrix although not as well as Option 1 (see above) and Option 4 (see below). This is because the character areas that would be safeguarded under Option 3 are less extensive than the areas and view corridors identified under Options 1 and 2.
- 5.19 Therefore, although positive scores have been awarded in terms of the maintenance and enhancement of the historic and cultural environment, promotion of Gloucester as a tourist attraction and improving the quality of where people live, the scores are not as high as Option 4, which would arguably offer a greater level of protection against inappropriate high-rise development.
- 5.20 A further option would be to combine Options 3 and 4 to provide a strengthened approach towards the provision of tall buildings.
- 5.21 Like Option 2, Option 3 has a single negative impact in relation to the efficient use of land.

### Option 4 – A ‘View Corridor’ Based Approach

- 5.22 Option 4 is to adopt a ‘view corridor’ based approach based around the protection of local and strategic views of the Cathedral Tower. This would be similar to the 1983 Local Plan approach (Option 2), which also identifies a number of important view corridors although a number of new corridors would be defined including local and more strategic views.
- 5.23 These view corridors would be safeguarded from inappropriate development and proposals to replace existing tall buildings within the view corridors will be favourably considered.

- 5.24 Option 4 scores well when assessed using the Sustainability Matrix. The designation of a broad range of designated local and strategic views that would be safeguarded from tall development, will have a strong, positive impact in terms of enhancing the historic and cultural assets of Gloucester, promoting the City as a tourist destination and improving the overall quality of where people live.
- 5.25 The sole negative impact that has been identified relates to the efficient use of land.

#### Option 5 – Prohibitive Approach

- 5.26 Option 5 is to impose a complete ‘ban’ on tall buildings over a certain height. Such an approach has been introduced in other historic cities including Bath.
- 5.27 Under this option no building over a specified height, for example 6-storeys, would be permitted anywhere in the City.
- 5.28 Option 5 in seeking to impose a ban on buildings of a certain size, will help to maintain Gloucester’s historic assets including views of the Cathedral, it will help to improve the attraction of Gloucester to tourists and will help to improve the overall quality of where people live.
- 5.29 It would however have a particularly negative impact in terms of the objective of making the most efficient use of land by not allowing for any tall buildings over a specified height.
- 5.30 There is also the possibility that the policy will discourage the use of previously developed land although this is difficult to quantify.

## **6. COMMENTS AND SUGGESTED CHANGES**

- 6.1 Option 1 can be seen to have a potentially negative impact when assessed using the sustainability matrix. Option 5 has a positive impact overall but would not be in the interests of making the most efficient use of land.
- 6.2 Options 2, 3 and 4 all score positively with Option 4 scoring particularly well.
- 6.3 In terms of suggested changes, the only suggested change is that it would be possible to adopt a combination of Option 3 (area-based approach) and Option 4 (view-corridor based approach) in order to provide a strengthened, yet flexible approach towards the provision of tall buildings in new development.
- 6.4 This scenario would effectively represent an expansion of the 1983 Local Plan approach (Option 2) and would score well in sustainability terms.

## **7. CONCLUSION & NEXT STEPS**

- 7.1 This appraisal has helped to identify how well each of the proposed options set out in the tall buildings consultation paper performs in sustainability terms. Options 2, 3 and 4 all score well with Option 4 performing particularly well. A combination of Options 3 and 4 would score even better yet would still offer a good degree of flexibility for developers and landowners.
- 7.2 All comments we receive on the Tall Buildings Issues and Options consultation paper and this accompanying sustainability appraisal will be taken into account and will be incorporated where appropriate into a draft Supplementary Planning Document to be published and subjected to further consultation in 2008.
- 7.3 The document will then be adopted as part of the Local Development Framework at a later date.

**Tall Buildings in Gloucester, Issues and Options Document – Sustainability Matrix**

**Option 1 – Do-Nothing or ‘Business as Usual Scenario’**

| SA Objectives   | Impact<br>++<br>+<br>0<br>--<br>-<br>? | Likely Timing of Impact (Short, Med, Long Term) | Temporary or Permanent Impact? | Geographic Scale | Likelihood of Impact | Significance of Impact | Commentary (any cumulative, secondary, synergistic impacts?) & Recommendations for Improvement/Mitigation  |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|
| <b>1. To protect the City's most vulnerable assets</b>  |  |   |                                |                  |                      |                        |  |
| 1.a. Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property?                                      | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -  |
| 1.b. Will it conserve and enhance natural/semi-natural habitats?  | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -  |
| 1.c. Will it conserve and enhance species diversity and in particular, avoid harm to protected species? | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -  |
| 1.d. Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?              | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -  |
| 1.e. Will it maintain and enhance cultural and historical assets?                                       | -                                      | MT  | Permanent                      | Trans-boundary   | High                 | High                   | Having no policy in place under the 'do-nothing scenario' may lead to pressure for tall development in inappropriate locations with a consequent negative effect on the historic and cultural assets of the City e.g. views of the Cathedral Tower. For this reason, a negative impact has been predicted. |

|   |   |    |           |                |          |          |  |
|---|---|----|-----------|----------------|----------|----------|--|
| 1.f. Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover?   | 0 | -  | -         | -              | -        | -        | -  |
| <b>2. To Deliver Sustainable Economic Growth</b>  |   |    |           |                |          |          |  |
| 2.a. Will it create new and lasting full time jobs particularly for those most in need of employment? | 0 | -  | -         | -              | -        | -        | -  |
| 2.b. Will it encourage both indigenous and inward investment?   | 0 | -  | -         | -              | -        | -        | -  |
| 2.c. Will it help to support and encourage the growth of small businesses?                            | 0 | -  | -         | -              | -        | -        | -  |
| 2.d. Will it help to improve the attraction of Gloucester as a tourist destination?                   | - | MT | Permanent | Trans-boundary | Moderate | Moderate | Having no policy in place under the 'do-nothing scenario' may lead to pressure for tall development in inappropriate locations with a consequent negative effect on the historic and cultural assets of the City e.g. views of the Cathedral Tower. For this reason, a negative impact has been predicted as assets such as the Cathedral act as vitally important tourist attractions for the City. |



| 3. To minimise consumption of natural resources and production of waste  |   |    |           |          |          |          |   |
|--|---|----|-----------|----------|----------|----------|---|
| 3.a. Will it encourage the most efficient use of land and buildings?   | + | MT | Permanent | Citywide | Moderate | Moderate | The do-nothing scenario is likely to lead to pressure for taller developments in Gloucester which would provide the opportunity to make the most efficient use of relatively small parcels of land. This could however lead to the loss of important views with other negative impacts in sustainability terms. |
| 3.b. Will it encourage development on previously developed land?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 3.c. Will it minimise the demand for raw materials and/or encourage the use of raw materials from sustainable sources? | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 3.d. Will it increase waste recovery and recycling?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 3.e. Will it help to reduce the amount of waste that is generated?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 3.f. Will it positively encourage renewable forms of energy?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 3.g. Will it reduce water consumption?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |

| <b>4. To ensure everyone has access to the essential services they require and that local needs are met</b> |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4.a Will it help everyone access essential basic services easily, safely and affordably?                    | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.d. Will it provide additional leisure facilities, green spaces and improve access to existing facilities? | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.e. Will it help to ensure that everyone has access to safe and affordable housing?                        | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.f. Will it reduce homelessness?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>5. To improve standards of health and education</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5.a. Will it improve health and people's ability to engage in healthy activities?                           | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.b. Will it improve access to health care facilities?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.d. Will it improve access to learning, training, skills and knowledge?                                    | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.e. Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people and adults?                                  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| <b>6. To make Gloucester a great place to live and work</b>  |   |    |           |          |      |      |   |
|--|---|----|-----------|----------|------|------|---|
| 6.a. Will it help to reduce crime and the fear of crime?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -    | -    | -   |
| 6.b. Will it encourage community engagement in community activities?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -    | -    | -   |
| 6.c. Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -    | -    | -   |
| 6.d. Will it improve community cohesion?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -    | -    | -   |
| 6.e. Will it help to maintain and/or enhance the vitality and viability of a designated centre?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -    | -    | -   |
| 6.f. Will it increase access to and participation in, cultural activities?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -    | -    | -   |
| 6.g. Will it reduce poverty and income inequality?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -    | -    | -   |
| 6.h. Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -    | -    | -   |
| 6.i. Will it improve the quality of where people live?   | - | LT | Permanent | Citywide | High | High | The do-nothing scenario is likely to lead to pressure for tall buildings in inappropriate locations. If permitted, this could have a negative impact on the quality of the built environment enjoyed by local residents and visitors including the loss of important views. |
| <b>7. To reduce the need to travel</b>   |   |    |           |          |      |      |   |
| 7.a. Will it reduce the need/desire to travel by car?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -    | -    | -   |
| 7.b. Will it help ensure that alternatives to the car are available for essential journeys, especially to residents in areas of low car ownership? | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -    | -    | -   |

|  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7.c. Will it help to achieve a reduction in road accident casualties?      | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.d. Will it increase the proportion of freight carried by rail and water? | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.e. Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?    | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>8. To improve environmental quality (air, water, land)</b>              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8.a. Will it help to reduce any sources of pollution?                      | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.b. Will it help to reduce levels of noise?                               | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.c. Will it maintain and enhance water quality?                           | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.e. Will it maintain and enhance air quality?                             | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.f. Will it maintain and enhance land/soil quality?                       | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.g. Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>9. To reduce contributions to climate change</b>                        |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9.a. Will it reduce contributions to climate change?                       | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9.b. Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?                       | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

## Option 2 - Continuation of the 1983 Local Plan Approach

| SA Objectives   | Impact<br>++<br>+<br>0<br>--<br>-<br>? | Likely Timing of Impact (Short, Med, Long Term) | Temporary or Permanent Impact? | Geographic Scale | Likelihood of Impact | Significance of Impact | Commentary (any cumulative, secondary, synergistic impacts?) & Recommendations for Improvement/Mitigation  |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|
| <b>1. To protect the City's most vulnerable assets</b>  |  |   |                                |                  |                      |                        |  |
| 1.a. Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property?                                      | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -  |
| 1.b. Will it conserve and enhance natural/semi-natural habitats?  | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -  |
| 1.c. Will it conserve and enhance species diversity and in particular, avoid harm to protected species? | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -  |
| 1.d. Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?              | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -  |
| 1.e. Will it maintain and enhance cultural and historical assets?                                       | +                                      | MT  | Permanent                      | Citywide         | High                 | High                   | Option 2 will help to minimise the impact of inappropriate tall development on important views of the Cathedral Tower and the historic character of the City more generally. The defined view corridors are however less extensive than those identified under Option 4. |
| 1.f. Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover?   | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -  |

| <b>2. To Deliver Sustainable Economic Growth</b>  |   |    |           |                |          |          |   |
|---|---|----|-----------|----------------|----------|----------|---|
| 2.a. Will it create new and lasting full time jobs particularly for those most in need of employment? | 0 | -  | -         | -              | -        | -        | -   |
| 2.b. Will it encourage both indigenous and inward investment?   | 0 | -  | -         | -              | -        | -        | -   |
| 2.c. Will it help to support and encourage the growth of small businesses?                            | 0 | -  | -         | -              | -        | -        | -   |
| 2.d. Will it help to improve the attraction of Gloucester as a tourist destination?                   | + | MT | Permanent | Trans-boundary | Moderate | Moderate | Option 2 in seeking to control building heights in certain locations will help to safeguard key views including those of the Cathedral Tower. This will help to maintain Gloucester's attraction as a tourist location. The defined view corridors are however less extensive than those identified under Option 4. |

| 3. To minimise consumption of natural resources and production of waste  |   |    |           |          |          |     |  |
|--|---|----|-----------|----------|----------|-----|--|
| 3.a. Will it encourage the most efficient use of land and buildings?   | - | MT | Permanent | Citywide | Moderate | Low | Option 2 in seeking to control the heights of tall buildings in certain locations could arguably be seen to be discouraging the most efficient use of land. This of course must be balanced against the positive impacts of controlling inappropriate tall development. Notably Option 2 does not preclude the provision of tall buildings rather it seeks to guide them to the most appropriate locations. Option 5 however does seek to preclude tall buildings and therefore scores a double negative in this regard. |
| 3.b. Will it encourage development on previously developed land?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -   | -  |
| 3.c. Will it minimise the demand for raw materials and/or encourage the use of raw materials from sustainable sources? | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -   | -  |
| 3.d. Will it increase waste recovery and recycling?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -   | -  |
| 3.e. Will it help to reduce the amount of waste that is generated?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -   | -  |
| 3.f. Will it positively encourage renewable forms of energy?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -   | -  |
| 3.g. Will it reduce water consumption?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -   | -  |

| <b>4. To ensure everyone has access to the essential services they require and that local needs are met</b> |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4.a Will it help everyone access essential basic services easily, safely and affordably?                    | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.d. Will it provide additional leisure facilities, green spaces and improve access to existing facilities? | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.e. Will it help to ensure that everyone has access to safe and affordable housing?                        | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.f. Will it reduce homelessness?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>5. To improve standards of health and education</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5.a. Will it improve health and people's ability to engage in healthy activities?                           | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.b. Will it improve access to health care facilities?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.d. Will it improve access to learning, training, skills and knowledge?                                    | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.e. Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people and adults?                                  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |



| <b>6. To make Gloucester a great place to live and work</b>                                     |   |    |           |          |          |          |  |
|---|---|----|-----------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| 6.a. Will it help to reduce crime and the fear of crime?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -  |
| 6.b. Will it encourage community engagement in community activities?                            | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -  |
| 6.c. Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions?                             | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -  |
| 6.d. Will it improve community cohesion?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -  |
| 6.e. Will it help to maintain and/or enhance the vitality and viability of a designated centre? | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -  |
| 6.f. Will it increase access to and participation in, cultural activities?                      | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -  |
| 6.g. Will it reduce poverty and income inequality?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -  |
| 6.h. Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -  |
| 6.i. Will it improve the quality of where people live?  | + | LT | Permanent | Citywide | Moderate | Moderate | In seeking to control the heights of buildings in key locations in order to safeguard important views, Option 2 will have a positive impact on the quality of the built environment. The impact will be citywide rather than trans-boundary as the view corridors identified under Option 2 are local views only and do not extend beyond the City's boundaries. Option 4 identifies more strategic views across the City's boundaries and therefore has a trans-boundary positive impact. |

|  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>7. To reduce the need to travel</b>   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7.a. Will it reduce the need/desire to travel by car?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.b. Will it help ensure that alternatives to the car are available for essential journeys, especially to residents in areas of low car ownership? | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.c. Will it help to achieve a reduction in road accident casualties?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.d. Will it increase the proportion of freight carried by rail and water?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.e. Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>8. To improve environmental quality (air, water, land)</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8.a. Will it help to reduce any sources of pollution?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.b. Will it help to reduce levels of noise?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.c. Will it maintain and enhance water quality?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.e. Will it maintain and enhance air quality?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.f. Will it maintain and enhance land/soil quality?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.g. Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>9. To reduce contributions to climate change</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9.a. Will it reduce contributions to climate change?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9.b. Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

### Option 3 – An ‘Area Based’ Approach

| SA Objectives   | Impact<br>++<br>+<br>0<br>--<br>-<br>? | Likely Timing of Impact (Short, Med, Long Term) | Temporary or Permanent Impact? | Geographic Scale | Likelihood of Impact | Significance of Impact | Commentary (any cumulative, secondary, synergistic impacts?) & Recommendations for Improvement/Mitigation   |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---|
| <b>1. To protect the City's most vulnerable assets</b>  |  |   |                                |                  |                      |                        |   |
| 1.a. Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property?                                      | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -   |
| 1.b. Will it conserve and enhance natural/semi-natural habitats?  | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -   |
| 1.c. Will it conserve and enhance species diversity and in particular, avoid harm to protected species? | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -   |
| 1.d. Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?              | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -   |
| 1.e. Will it maintain and enhance cultural and historical assets?                                       | +                                      | MT  | Permanent                      | Citywide         | High                 | High                   | Option 3 will help to minimise the impact of inappropriate tall development in a number of defined character areas. These areas are focused around the City Centre and the impact of tall buildings across the rest of the City will be less well controlled. |
| 1.f. Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover?   | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -   |

| <b>2. To Deliver Sustainable Economic Growth</b>  |   |    |           |                |          |          |   |
|---|---|----|-----------|----------------|----------|----------|---|
| 2.a. Will it create new and lasting full time jobs particularly for those most in need of employment? | 0 | -  | -         | -              | -        | -        | -   |
| 2.b. Will it encourage both indigenous and inward investment?   | 0 | -  | -         | -              | -        | -        | -   |
| 2.c. Will it help to support and encourage the growth of small businesses?                            | 0 | -  | -         | -              | -        | -        | -   |
| 2.d. Will it help to improve the attraction of Gloucester as a tourist destination?                   | + | MT | Permanent | Trans-boundary | Moderate | Moderate | Option 3 in seeking to control building heights in certain designated character areas will help to safeguard key views including those of the Cathedral Tower by restricting building heights to those already existing within each area. This will help to maintain Gloucester's attraction as a tourist location. The defined character areas are however less extensive than the areas identified under Option 1 and the view corridors identified under Option 4. |

| 3. To minimise consumption of natural resources and production of waste  |   |    |           |          |          |     |  |
|--|---|----|-----------|----------|----------|-----|--|
| 3.a. Will it encourage the most efficient use of land and buildings?   | - | MT | Permanent | Citywide | Moderate | Low | <p>Option 3 in seeking to control the heights of tall buildings in certain locations could be seen to be discouraging the most efficient use of land. This of course must be balanced against the positive impacts of controlling inappropriate tall development.</p> <p>Notably Option 3 does not preclude the provision of tall buildings rather it seeks to control them in certain defined character areas. Option 5 however does seek to preclude tall buildings and therefore scores a double negative in this regard.</p> |
| 3.b. Will it encourage development on previously developed land?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -   | -  |
| 3.c. Will it minimise the demand for raw materials and/or encourage the use of raw materials from sustainable sources? | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -   | -  |
| 3.d. Will it increase waste recovery and recycling?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -   | -  |
| 3.e. Will it help to reduce the amount of waste that is generated?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -   | -  |
| 3.f. Will it positively encourage renewable forms of energy?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -   | -  |
| 3.g. Will it reduce water consumption?   | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -   | -  |

| <b>4. To ensure everyone has access to the essential services they require and that local needs are met</b> |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4.a Will it help everyone access essential basic services easily, safely and affordably?                    | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.d. Will it provide additional leisure facilities, green spaces and improve access to existing facilities? | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.e. Will it help to ensure that everyone has access to safe and affordable housing?                        | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.f. Will it reduce homelessness?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>5. To improve standards of health and education</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5.a. Will it improve health and people's ability to engage in healthy activities?                           | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.b. Will it improve access to health care facilities?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.d. Will it improve access to learning, training, skills and knowledge?                                    | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.e. Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people and adults?                                  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| <b>6. To make Gloucester a great place to live and work</b>                                     |   |    |           |          |          |          |   |
|---|---|----|-----------|----------|----------|----------|---|
| 6.a. Will it help to reduce crime and the fear of crime?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.b. Will it encourage community engagement in community activities?                            | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.c. Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions?                             | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.d. Will it improve community cohesion?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.e. Will it help to maintain and/or enhance the vitality and viability of a designated centre? | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.f. Will it increase access to and participation in, cultural activities?                      | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.g. Will it reduce poverty and income inequality?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.h. Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.i. Will it improve the quality of where people live?  | + | LT | Permanent | Citywide | Moderate | Moderate | In seeking to control the heights of buildings within defined character areas Option 3 will have a positive impact on the quality of the built environment through the protection of key views. |

|  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>7. To reduce the need to travel</b>   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7.a. Will it reduce the need/desire to travel by car?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.b. Will it help ensure that alternatives to the car are available for essential journeys, especially to residents in areas of low car ownership? | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.c. Will it help to achieve a reduction in road accident casualties?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.d. Will it increase the proportion of freight carried by rail and water?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.e. Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>8. To improve environmental quality (air, water, land)</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8.a. Will it help to reduce any sources of pollution?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.b. Will it help to reduce levels of noise?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.c. Will it maintain and enhance water quality?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.e. Will it maintain and enhance air quality?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.f. Will it maintain and enhance land/soil quality?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.g. Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>9. To reduce contributions to climate change</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9.a. Will it reduce contributions to climate change?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9.b. Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |



### Option 4 – ‘View Corridor’ Based Approach

| SA Objectives   | Impact<br>++<br>+<br>0<br>--<br>-<br>? | Likely Timing of Impact (Short, Med, Long Term) | Temporary or Permanent Impact? | Geographic Scale | Likelihood of Impact | Significance of Impact | Commentary (any cumulative, secondary, synergistic impacts?) & Recommendations for Improvement/Mitigation |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---|
| <b>1. To protect the City's most vulnerable assets</b>  |  |   |                                |                  |                      |                        |   |
| 1.a. Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property?                                      | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -   |
| 1.b. Will it conserve and enhance natural/semi-natural habitats?  | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -   |
| 1.c. Will it conserve and enhance species diversity and in particular, avoid harm to protected species? | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -   |
| 1.d. Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?              | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -   |

|   |    |    |           |                |      |      |   |
|---|----|----|-----------|----------------|------|------|---|
| 1.e. Will it maintain and enhance cultural and historical assets?                                     | ++ | MT | Permanent | Trans-boundary | High | High | <p>Option 4 will help to minimise the impact of inappropriate tall development by controlling development within a number of local and strategic view corridors.</p> <p>The positive impact of this option will therefore be trans-boundary as a number of the wider strategic view corridors identified straddle the City Council's administrative boundary.</p> <p>The number of corridors defined will mean a greater degree of protection and this option has therefore scored a double positive.</p> |
| 1.f. Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover?   | 0  | -  | -         | -              | -    | -    | -   |
| <b>2. To Deliver Sustainable Economic Growth</b>  |    |    |           |                |      |      |   |
| 2.a. Will it create new and lasting full time jobs particularly for those most in need of employment? | 0  | -  | -         | -              | -    | -    | -   |
| 2.b. Will it encourage both indigenous and inward investment?   | 0  | -  | -         | -              | -    | -    | -   |
| 2.c. Will it help to support and encourage the growth of small businesses?                            | 0  | -  | -         | -              | -    | -    | -   |

|  |           |           |                  |                       |             |                 |   |
|--|-----------|-----------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------|---|
| <p>2.d. Will it help to improve the attraction of Gloucester as a tourist destination?</p> | <p>++</p> | <p>MT</p> | <p>Permanent</p> | <p>Trans-boundary</p> | <p>High</p> | <p>Moderate</p> | <p>Option 4 in seeking to control building heights within a large number of local and strategic view corridors will help to safeguard key views including those of the Cathedral.</p> <p>This will help to maintain Gloucester's attraction as a tourist location thereby having positive trans-boundary impacts.</p> <p>This option has been scored double positive essentially because it covers a wider area than options 2 and 3.</p> |
|--|-----------|-----------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------|---|

| 3. To minimise consumption of natural resources and production of waste  |    |    |           |          |          |          |  |
|--|----|----|-----------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| 3.a. Will it encourage the most efficient use of land and buildings?   | -- | MT | Permanent | Citywide | Moderate | Moderate | <p>Option 4 like options 2 and 3 can be seen to be discouraging the most efficient use of land by controlling building heights within a number of local and strategic view corridors.</p> <p>This of course must be balanced against the positive impacts of controlling inappropriate tall development.</p> <p>Notably Option 4 does not preclude the provision of tall buildings rather it seeks to control them. Option 5 however does seek to preclude tall buildings and therefore scores a double negative in this regard.</p> |
| 3.b. Will it encourage development on previously developed land?   | 0  | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -  |
| 3.c. Will it minimise the demand for raw materials and/or encourage the use of raw materials from sustainable sources? | 0  | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -  |
| 3.d. Will it increase waste recovery and recycling?  | 0  | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -  |
| 3.e. Will it help to reduce the amount of waste that is generated?   | 0  | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -  |
| 3.f. Will it positively encourage renewable forms of energy?   | 0  | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -  |

|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.g. Will it reduce water consumption?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>4. To ensure everyone has access to the essential services they require and that local needs are met</b> |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4.a Will it help everyone access essential basic services easily, safely and affordably?                    | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.d. Will it provide additional leisure facilities, green spaces and improve access to existing facilities? | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.e. Will it help to ensure that everyone has access to safe and affordable housing?                        | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.f. Will it reduce homelessness?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>5. To improve standards of health and education</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5.a. Will it improve health and people's ability to engage in healthy activities?                           | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.b. Will it improve access to health care facilities?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.d. Will it improve access to learning, training, skills and knowledge?                                    | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.e. Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people and adults?                                  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| <b>6. To make Gloucester a great place to live and work</b>                                     |    |    |           |                |      |          |  |
|---|----|----|-----------|----------------|------|----------|--|
| 6.a. Will it help to reduce crime and the fear of crime?  | 0  | -  | -         | -              | -    | -        | -  |
| 6.b. Will it encourage community engagement in community activities?                            | 0  | -  | -         | -              | -    | -        | -  |
| 6.c. Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions?                             | 0  | -  | -         | -              | -    | -        | -  |
| 6.d. Will it improve community cohesion?  | 0  | -  | -         | -              | -    | -        | -  |
| 6.e. Will it help to maintain and/or enhance the vitality and viability of a designated centre? | 0  | -  | -         | -              | -    | -        | -  |
| 6.f. Will it increase access to and participation in, cultural activities?                      | 0  | -  | -         | -              | -    | -        | -  |
| 6.g. Will it reduce poverty and income inequality?  | 0  | -  | -         | -              | -    | -        | -  |
| 6.h. Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?  | 0  | -  | -         | -              | -    | -        | -  |
| 6.i. Will it improve the quality of where people live?  | ++ | LT | Permanent | Trans-boundary | High | Moderate | In seeking to control the heights of buildings within defined view corridors, Option 4 will have a very positive impact on the quality of the built environment through the protection of key local and strategic views. |

|  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <b>7. To reduce the need to travel</b>   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7.a. Will it reduce the need/desire to travel by car?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.b. Will it help ensure that alternatives to the car are available for essential journeys, especially to residents in areas of low car ownership? | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.c. Will it help to achieve a reduction in road accident casualties?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.d. Will it increase the proportion of freight carried by rail and water?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.e. Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>8. To improve environmental quality (air, water, land)</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8.a. Will it help to reduce any sources of pollution?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.b. Will it help to reduce levels of noise?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.c. Will it maintain and enhance water quality?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.e. Will it maintain and enhance air quality?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.f. Will it maintain and enhance land/soil quality?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.g. Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>9. To reduce contributions to climate change</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9.a. Will it reduce contributions to climate change?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9.b. Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

## Option 5 – Prohibitive Approach

| SA Objectives   | Impact<br>++<br>+<br>0<br>--<br>-<br>? | Likely Timing of Impact (Short, Med, Long Term) | Temporary or Permanent Impact? | Geographic Scale | Likelihood of Impact | Significance of Impact | Commentary (any cumulative, secondary, synergistic impacts?) & Recommendations for Improvement/Mitigation   |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---|
| <b>1. To protect the City's most vulnerable assets</b>  |  |   |                                |                  |                      |                        |   |
| 1.a. Will it minimise the risk of flooding to people and property?                                      | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -   |
| 1.b. Will it conserve and enhance natural/semi-natural habitats?  | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -   |
| 1.c. Will it conserve and enhance species diversity and in particular, avoid harm to protected species? | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -   |
| 1.d. Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?              | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -   |
| 1.e. Will it maintain and enhance cultural and historical assets?                                       | +                                      | MT  | Permanent                      | Citywide         | High                 | High                   | Option 5 will help to minimise the impact of overly tall development on the character of the City by not allowing it to happen in any circumstance. |
| 1.f. Will it maintain and enhance woodland cover?   | 0                                      | -   | -                              | -                | -                    | -                      | -   |



| <b>2. To Deliver Sustainable Economic Growth</b>  |   |    |           |                |          |          |   |
|---|---|----|-----------|----------------|----------|----------|---|
| 2.a. Will it create new and lasting full time jobs particularly for those most in need of employment? | 0 | -  | -         | -              | -        | -        | -   |
| 2.b. Will it encourage both indigenous and inward investment?   | 0 | -  | -         | -              | -        | -        | -   |
| 2.c. Will it help to support and encourage the growth of small businesses?                            | 0 | -  | -         | -              | -        | -        | -   |
| 2.d. Will it help to improve the attraction of Gloucester as a tourist destination?                   | + | MT | Permanent | Trans-boundary | Moderate | Moderate | Option 5 would help to ensure that overly tall development does not take place and therefore would have a positive impact in terms of protecting and improving the attraction of Gloucester as a tourist destination. |

| <b>3. To minimise consumption of natural resources and production of waste</b>   |    |    |           |          |      |          |  |
|--|----|----|-----------|----------|------|----------|--|
| 3.a. Will it encourage the most efficient use of land and buildings?   | -- | MT | Permanent | Citywide | High | Moderate | Option 5 in seeking to restrict all tall buildings can be seen to be discouraging developers to make the most efficient use of land. This of course must be balanced against the positive impacts of controlling inappropriate tall development. |
| 3.b. Will it encourage development on previously developed land?   | 0  | -  | -         | -        | -    | -        | Possible negative impact although difficult to quantify.   |
| 3.c. Will it minimise the demand for raw materials and/or encourage the use of raw materials from sustainable sources? | 0  | -  | -         | -        | -    | -        | Potential positive impact although difficult to quantify.  |
| 3.d. Will it increase waste recovery and recycling?  | 0  | -  | -         | -        | -    | -        | -  |
| 3.e. Will it help to reduce the amount of waste that is generated?   | 0  | -  | -         | -        | -    | -        | -  |
| 3.f. Will it positively encourage renewable forms of energy?   | 0  | -  | -         | -        | -    | -        | -  |
| 3.g. Will it reduce water consumption?   | 0  | -  | -         | -        | -    | -        | -  |

| <b>4. To ensure everyone has access to the essential services they require and that local needs are met</b> |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4.a Will it help everyone access essential basic services easily, safely and affordably?                    | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.d. Will it provide additional leisure facilities, green spaces and improve access to existing facilities? | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.e. Will it help to ensure that everyone has access to safe and affordable housing?                        | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4.f. Will it reduce homelessness?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>5. To improve standards of health and education</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5.a. Will it improve health and people's ability to engage in healthy activities?                           | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.b. Will it improve access to health care facilities?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.d. Will it improve access to learning, training, skills and knowledge?                                    | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 5.e. Will it improve qualifications and skills of young people and adults?                                  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| <b>6. To make Gloucester a great place to live and work</b>                                     |   |    |           |          |          |          |   |
|---|---|----|-----------|----------|----------|----------|---|
| 6.a. Will it help to reduce crime and the fear of crime?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.b. Will it encourage community engagement in community activities?                            | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.c. Will it increase the ability of people to influence decisions?                             | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.d. Will it improve community cohesion?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.e. Will it help to maintain and/or enhance the vitality and viability of a designated centre? | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.f. Will it increase access to and participation in, cultural activities?                      | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.g. Will it reduce poverty and income inequality?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.h. Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?  | 0 | -  | -         | -        | -        | -        | -   |
| 6.i. Will it improve the quality of where people live?  | + | LT | Permanent | Citywide | Moderate | Moderate | <p>In seeking to restrict overly tall buildings, Option 5 will have a positive impact on the quality of the built environment through the protection of key views and the historic environment of the City more generally.</p> <p>This must of course be balanced against the fact that well designed, tall development can act as a positive landmark and add to the quality of the built environment.</p> |

| <b>7. To reduce the need to travel</b>   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7.a. Will it reduce the need/desire to travel by car?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.b. Will it help ensure that alternatives to the car are available for essential journeys, especially to residents in areas of low car ownership? | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.c. Will it help to achieve a reduction in road accident casualties?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.d. Will it increase the proportion of freight carried by rail and water?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 7.e. Will it help to reduce traffic congestion and improve road safety?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>8. To improve environmental quality (air, water, land)</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8.a. Will it help to reduce any sources of pollution?  | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.b. Will it help to reduce levels of noise?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.c. Will it maintain and enhance water quality?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.e. Will it maintain and enhance air quality?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.f. Will it maintain and enhance land/soil quality?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 8.g. Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| <b>9. To reduce contributions to climate change</b>  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9.a. Will it reduce contributions to climate change?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9.b. Will it reduce vulnerability to climate change?   | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |