**Appendix F: Appraisal of strategic employment growth options**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Description** | **Symbol** |
| **Significant Positive Effect** | The option contributes significantly to the achievement of the objective. | **++** |
| **Minor Positive Effect** | The option contributes to the achievement of the objective but not significantly. | **+** |
| **Neutral** | The option does not have any effect on the achievement of the objective | **0** |
| **Minor Negative Effect** | The option detracts from the achievement of the objective but not significantly. | **-** |
| **Significant Negative Effect** | The option detracts significantly from the achievement of the objective. | **--** |
| **No Relationship** | There is no clear relationship between the option and the achievement of the objective or the relationship is negligible. | **~** |
| **Uncertain** | The option has an uncertain relationship to the objective or the relationship is dependent on the way in which the aspect is managed. In addition, insufficient information may be available to enable an appraisal to be made. | **?** |

NB: where more than one symbol/colour is presented in a box it indicates that the appraisal has identified both positive and negative effects. Where a box is coloured but also contains a ‘?’, this indicates uncertainty over whether the effect could be a minor or significant effect although a professional judgement is expressed in the colour used. A conclusion of uncertainty arises where there is insufficient evidence for expert judgement to conclude an effect.

### Options appraised

* **Option 1 - Adopting one of the labour demand/labour supply scenarios** set out in the Ashfield Economy and Employment Background Paper which gives a requirement of:
* Offices floorspace requirements range from 4,995 to 16,588 sq m.
* Industrial land ranges from 12.17 to 23.91 ha.
* **Option 2 – Adopting the past take up rates set out in the Ashfield Economy and Employment Background Paper predicting an annual figure of past losses at 100%** of the rate that has been identified for the period from 2011/12 to 2022/23 which gives a requirement of:
* Offices floorspace requirements 2,170 sq m.
* Industrial land requirements 91.87 ha.
* **Option 3 - Preferred Option – Reflects Past Take Up Rates for the period 2023 to 2040 with amended figures for the predicted past losses at 50%** of the annual rate that has been identified for the period from 2011/12 to 2022/23:
* Offices floorspace requirements 1,433 sq m.
* Industrial land requirements 80.62 ha.

| **SA Objective** | **Option 1 - Adopting one of the labour demand/labour supply scenarios** | **Option 2 – Adopting the past take up rates and past losses of 100%** | **Option 3 -** **Adopting past take up rates and amended figures for the past losses (50%)**  **Preferred Option** | **Commentary** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **1. Housing**   To ensure that the housing stock meets the housing needs of Ashfield. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **Likely Significant Effects**  All options are considered to indirectly support housing needs by providing employment land within the District to meet evidenced need. However, all options are considered to have not have a direct effect on achievement of this objective.  Overall, neutral effects are assessed for each employment growth option.  **Mitigation**   * None identified.   **Assumptions**   * None identified.   **Uncertainties**   * None identified. |
| 1. **2. Health**   To improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities. | **+/-** | **+/-** | **+/-** | **Likely Significant Effects**  The construction of employment sites has the potential to have a localised and short-term negative effect on the health and wellbeing of residents, particularly those who are in close proximity to development sites and/or along transport routes. Effects may include, for example, respiratory problems associated with construction traffic and dust. These issues will be more pertinent for those with pre-existing health issues or for areas of greater deprivation. Effects would be expected to be greater for higher levels of development associated with option 2 and 3. However, for all options, these effects are expected to be temporary and not significant.  Once premises are occupied, there may be further adverse effects on health arising from, in particular, emissions to air associated with the movement of workers to/from sites and operational traffic (including HGVs) and noise. Whilst the creation of local employment opportunities associated with all options could reduce out-commuting from the District and associated emissions to air, there is also the potential that not fulfilling jobs growth forecasts could result in higher levels of out-commuting.  The extent to which new employment development promotes healthy lifestyles through, for example, walking and cycling will be dependent on its accessibility which is at present uncertain. Should future development be focused within or adjoining Sutton/Kirkby and Hucknall, then opportunities would be physically accessible to a relatively large labour pool which may promote walking and cycling (and, potentially, reduce emissions to air associated with car use). However, the opportunities for active transport are likely to be much less should development come forward close to key junctions along the M1. However, all options would support the provision of jobs in the district. Unemployment is known to have a negative effect on mental wellbeing.    Overall, all options have been assessed as having a mix of minor positive and negatives effect on this objective. For option 2 and 3, which identify greater levels of employment land, the negative effects may be greater.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should ensure that development is not located in close proximity to unsuitable neighbouring uses. * Local Plan policies should support employment development in locations that can be accessed by sustainable transport modes.   **Assumptions**   * None identified.   **Uncertainties**   * The type and location of additional employment land required under this option is unknown at this stage. |
| **3.Historic Environment**  To conserve and enhance Ashfield’s historic environment, heritage assets and their settings. | **-/?** | **--/?** | **--/?** | **Likely Significant Effects**  The District includes a number of designated historic sites and assets. This includes six Conservation Areas, 80 Listed Buildings, nine Scheduled Monuments and two Registered Historic Parks and Gardens. The District also has a number of non-designated historic assets of local importance. Additionally, part of the north west of the District forms part of the setting of the Grade 1 listed Hardwick Hall and Old Hall which are prominent in the landscape.  Adverse effects on these heritage assets may be felt during construction and also in the longer term once development has been completed. Effects may be direct (where development involves the loss of, or alteration to, assets) or indirect (where elements which contribute to the significance of assets are harmed). However, the likelihood of these effects occurring and their magnitude will be dependent on the type, location and design of new development which is currently uncertain.  The levels of employment growth to be accommodated in all options is likely to have an adverse effect on local landscape and townscape character, although the magnitude of effects would be likely to be reduced through the application of the site selection methodology which seeks to protect historic assets and consideration at the detailed planning application stage. The level of effects associated with the options will largely depend upon the selection of individual sites. However, as a basic principle, the magnitude of effect is likely to be increased commensurate with the higher scale of growth under Option 2 and 3 compared to the substantially lower growth in Option 1.  Furthermore, the higher employment figures are likely to require some development in locations along the junctions of the M1 in Ashfield as the M1 is where logistics demand in Nottinghamshire is identified as being best located in the 2022 Logistics Study. It is noted that Jct 27 is in proximity to Grade II\* Annesley Hall Registered Park and Garden. These options could potentially have a significant effect on the historic environment, but it is uncertain.  Overall, all employment growth options are considered to have a minor negative effect on this objective. However, the magnitude is uncertain. The uncertainty is greater for Option 2 and 3.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should ensure that historic environment is conserved and enhanced in accordance with the NPPF. * Local Plan policies should promote high standards of architecture and urban design.   **Assumptions**   * Logistics demand is required along the M1.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact location of new development is unknown at this stage. * The form and function of any development will have the potential to enhance or detract from designated heritage and cultural assets and/or their settings. |
| **4.Community Safety**  To improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. | **0** | **0** | **0** | **Likely Significant Effects**  The scale of growth under each employment growth option is not (of itself) considered to influence the ability to improve community safety, reduce crime and the fear of crime. The ability to do so depends on the inclusion of design features such as natural surveillance, appropriate lighting and shared spaces. These factors can only be determined through detailed design at the masterplanning/planning application stage and therefore the employment growth options are not considered to have an effect on this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should ensure that new development designs out crime, where possible.   **Assumptions**   * None identified.   **Uncertainties**   * None identified. |
| **5.Social Inclusion Deprivation**  To improve social inclusion and to close the gap between the most deprived areas and the rest of Ashfield. | **+** | **+** | **+** | **Likely Significant Effects**  Ashfield, ranked at 63rd out of 326 local authority areas, performs poorly in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD 2019). There are significant pockets of deprivation within Ashfield, particularly in the main urban centres of Kirkby of Sutton.  The provision of employment opportunities in the right locations, and with the ability to provide a range of jobs, can help to address deprivation. However, the extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market), their location/accessibility and the recruitment policies of prospective employers. It is therefore important that employment developments are accessible by a range of sustainable transport modes to reduce the need for the private car, so all households can access these developments.  Overall, the options are considered to have minor positive effects on achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should support regeneration opportunities, where possible. * New development should be located close to existing or planned residential development, services and facilities.   **Assumptions**   * None identified.   **Uncertainties**   * The location of development is unknown. |
| **6. Biodiversity & Green Infrastructure**  To conserve, enhance and increase biodiversity levels and Green & Blue Infrastructure | **-/?** | **-/?** | **-/?** | **Likely Significant Effects**  There are no internationally designated conservation sites within the District although there is a possible potential SPA (ppSPA) for Sherwood Forest, which is recognised as being important for breeding woodlark and Nightjar, in the south and east of the District. There are nine SSSIs across Ashfield and several tracts of ancient woodland. There are also a number of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) across the District and four Local Nature Reserves (LNR).  It is assumed that employment development would not directly affect these designated sites although the construction and operation of employment uses could have indirect negative effects on these assets due to, for example, emissions to air and noise. However, this would be dependent on the exact location and type of future development and the proximity of the development to the designated sites, which is currently unknown.  The limited availability of brownfield sites in Ashfield will result in the development of greenfield sites. Development on these sites is considered likely to affect biodiversity through potential loss of habitat. However, arable fields and new grass leys can have limited value for biodiversity. Consequently, the magnitude of any direct negative effects will be dependent on the existing biodiversity value of the sites developed. This is uncertain at this stage.  Overall, all options are considered to have minor negative effects with some uncertainty. Commensurate with the scale of growth, the likelihood of adverse effects on biodiversity may be increased under the higher growth options (Option 2 and Option 3 - the preferred option).  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should include policies that seek to conserve and enhance the District’s biodiversity assets, green and blue infrastructure. * The opportunities for biodiversity linkages through the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping should be considered.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that greenfield land will be required to accommodate growth and greenfield land generally has higher ecological value than previously developed land. * It is assumed that new development would not be located on land designated for nature conservation.   **Uncertainties**   * The location of employment development is unknown at this stage. |
| **7.Landscape**  To protect enhance and manage the character and appearance of Ashfield’s landscape /townscape, maintaining and strengthening local distinctiveness and sense of place. | **+/-/?** | **+/-/?** | **+/-/?** | **Likely Significant Effects**  There are no landscape designations within the District but there are a range of features of natural, historic and cultural importance that contribute to the District’s landscape and townscapes. The Greater Nottingham Landscape Character Assessment (2009) identifies that the District comprises character areas of Magnesium Limestone Ridge, Nottinghamshire Coalfields and Sherwood which form distinct landscapes.  Employment development is likely to result in adverse effects on landscape character. Effects may be felt during construction and once development is complete, although the likelihood of adverse effects occurring, and their magnitude, will be dependent on the scale, density and location of new development in the context of the landscape sensitivity of the receiving environment. The general principle may be applied that the greater the amount of employment development the greater the effect on the landscape. However, this effect is dependent on the specific approach to meeting the identified need through policies and proposals within the Local Plan.  There will be a need to direct a proportion of employment development (under all growth options) towards greenfield sites. However, the lower growth option provides greater potential for a higher proportion of growth to be delivered on previously developed land although there is a limited supply of brownfield sites within the District.  Around 41% of land within the District is designated as Green Belt (which lies within the southern part of the District). Higher growth options (Option 2 and Option 3 - the preferred option) increase the likelihood that there will be a requirement to release Green Belt land to accommodate the development. However, the release of Green Belt land may occur under all of the options for employment growth.  However, there may also be potential for new development to enhance the quality of the built environment and to improve townscapes, particularly where brownfield sites are redeveloped (although as noted previously, there are only a limited number of brownfield sites that have not already been brought forward for development).  Overall, all options have been assessed as having a mixed positive and negative effect on this objective, although the magnitude of effect will be dependent in part on the location and design of new development. The increased scale of development proposed by under Option 2 and 3 would be likely to place greater pressure on greenfield sites relative to Option 1.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should contain policies on high quality design. * Local Plan policies and proposals should seek to conserve and enhance the character and quality of the District’s landscape.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that the landscape sensitivity of greenfield sites would be greater than brownfield land.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact location of future development, the quality of the receiving landscapes and the proximity of sensitive receptors is unknown at this stage. |
| **8.Natural Resources**  To minimise the loss of natural resources including soils, greenfield land and the best quality agricultural land. | **+/-/?** | **+/--/?** | **+/--/?** | **Likely significant effects**  The higher growth options for employment land development (Option 2 and Option 3) would require a greater release of greenfield land with a smaller proportion of growth likely to make use of brownfield land. It is also likely that the ability to avoid the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1 to 3) would be lessened with the higher growth options.  Council monitoring shows that between 2001 and 2020 around 72% of employment land development (c. 86ha) took place on greenfield sites. It is recognised that many of the brownfield sites have been redeveloped already within the District. However, there may still be opportunities to bring brownfield land forward and remediate contaminated land.  Overall, the lower growth option (Option 1) has been assessed as having mixed minor positive and negative effects. The higher growth options (Option 2 and Option 3) have been assessed as having mixed minor positive and significant negative effects. However, the magnitude of the effects is dependent on the location of development.  **Mitigation**   * Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. * Local Plan policies should prioritise the reuse of brownfield land before greenfield land.   **Assumptions**   * None identified.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact location of development is unknown at this stage. |
| **9.Air & noise pollution**  To reduce air pollution and the proportion of the local population subject to noise pollution. | **-/?** | **-/?** | **-/?** | **Likely significant effects**  There is the potential for the construction and occupation of new employment development to have negative effects on air quality due to, for example, emissions generated from plant and HGV movements during construction and increased vehicle movements once construction is complete.  Although there are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) currently in the District, increased car use and HGV movements linked to employment development could exacerbate congestion and lead to greater occurrences of poor air quality. Similarly, noise associated with construction would have adverse effects on the amenity of adjacent occupiers, although this would be temporary. In the long-term, and during occupation of new employment development, greater road congestion would also increase levels of noise in some specific areas.  Some development locations may also be more susceptible to noise pollution. For example, development close to the M1 (which may be attractive to logistics developments) is likely to increase noise pollution linked to the motorway. However, until the location of new development has been determined, the likelihood of adverse effects occurring, and their magnitude, is uncertain.  The extent to which new employment development affects car use and related emissions will be dependent on its accessibility which is at present uncertain. Should future development be focused on locations accessible to the main urban areas of Sutton/Kirkby and Hucknall, in particular, then opportunities may be available to promote walking and cycling and public transport use, reducing emissions to air associated with travel by car.  Overall, all employment growth options are considered to have minor negative effects. Although the magnitude of effects may increase with the higher growth options. However, until the location of new development has been determined, the likelihood of adverse effects occurring, and their magnitude is uncertain.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should seek to reduce congestion. * Careful consideration should be given to the distribution/location of new employment development to ensure accessibility by transport modes other than the car. * Developments that may involve noise polluting employment and commercial activities should be located away from sensitive receptors, such as residential development.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that proposals to ensure no sale of new diesel/petrol engine vehicles after 2035, which will lead to an increased proportion of e-vehicles over time, may benefit air quality over the long-term.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact location of future development is uncertain at this time. |
| **10.Water Quality**  To conserve and improve water quality and quantity. | **-** | **-** | **-** | **Likely significant effects**  The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) indicated water resources in the East Midlands are significantly constrained with little opportunity to develop new water resource schemes.  Any increase in employment land provision will increase demand for water resources. The shortfall identified in the Watercycle Study (of water supply) is also identified in the more recent Severn Trent Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP, 2019) within the Nottinghamshire Water Resource Zone, but the WRMP19 proposes a range of demand and supply measures to ensure sufficient water resources can be maintained to 2025 (and in outline up to 2030). The draft Water Resource Management Plan 2024 (2022) sets out what is planned between 2025 and 2085 to address water pressures. Ashfield sits in an area under serious water stress as identified by the Environment Agency (Water stressed areas – final classification 2021). All options for employment growth will increase demand for water resources, and such changes will need to be addressed through the preparation of the next WRMP.  The Watercycle Study for Greater Nottingham and Ashfield (2010) notes that there are no capacity constraints at Ashfield’s Wastewater Treatment Works.  The supporting evidence for the Environment Agency Humber Basin River Basin Management Plan (2015) identifies that further improvement to water quality in rivers and stream is also required. Depending on the type and location of new employment development, the proximity to waterbodies and the prevailing quality of the waterbody, there is potential for adverse effects on water quality associated with construction and operational activities (through, for example, accidental discharges or uncontrolled surface water runoff). However, it is assumed that the design of development will include sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDs) to ensure that all subsequent rainfall will infiltrate surfaces rather than exacerbate any downstream flood risks (which also have temporary effects on water quality).  All of the options for employment growth are considered to have minor negative effects on the achievement of this objective. However, higher growth may provide additional demand for water resources.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should support water efficiency measures, the implementation of SuDs, and wastewater treatment capacity enhancements where necessary.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that the Council will continue to liaise with Severn Trent regarding the planned level of growth.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact location of developments and the potential impact on waterbodies is uncertain at this stage. |
| **11.Waste**  To minimise waste and increase the re-use and recycling of waste materials. | **-** | **-/?** | **-/?** | **Likely significant effects**  The construction of new employment development will require raw materials and the generation of waste.  Depending on the nature of the employment use, raw materials may also be required during the operational phase, although the volume and type of resources required would be dependent on the type and scale of use.  Commercial development will generate construction waste, although it is anticipated that a proportion of this waste would be reused/recycled. Once premises are occupied, there would also be an increase in commercial waste arisings although again, it is anticipated that a proportion of this waste would be reused or recycled  Commensurate with the level of growth, it is expected that the development under Option 1 would lead to the lower use of raw materials during construction and the use of materials and generation of waste during occupancy than the higher options. The potential for significant negative effects is therefore greater under Option 2 and Option 3. Therefore, there is some uncertainty about the magnitude.  Overall, all employment growth options have been assessed as having minor negative effects on this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should support the use of recycled and secondary materials in the construction of new development.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Joint Waste Local Plan will make sufficient waste infrastructure provision available.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact scale of waste is unknown at this stage. |
| **12. Climate Change and Flood Risk**  To adapt to climate change by reducing and manage the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to people, property and the environment. | **0/?** | **0/?** | **0/?** | **Likely significant effects**  The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2023) identifies that the District has a relatively low risk of flooding from watercourses. Flood risk is mainly away from the urban areas. However, it is recognised that additional water in the River Leen could cause flood issues for Nottingham to the south.  It is considered that any adverse effects from employment development associated with all growth option levels will be mitigated through the implementation of NPPF compliant Local Plan policies related to flood risk and sustainable drainage. New development proposals which may be at risk or pose a risk of flooding elsewhere would be subject to the strict tests to ensure suitability. The selection of sites in the Local Plan, through the application of the site selection methodology, would also seek to avoid areas of high flood risk. Most employment developments would fall under the ‘less vulnerable’ category of development.  Overall, all options are considered to have neutral effects on the achievement of this objective. However, the effects are uncertain at this stage and depend on the location of new development.  **Mitigation**   * Site selection processes should help to avoid areas of highest flood risk (Flood Zones 2 and 3). * Local Plan policies should ensure that new development avoids increasing all forms of flooding. * Local Plan policies should support achievement of greenfield runoff rates in new development.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that, where appropriate, development proposals would be accompanied by a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and that suitable flood alleviation measures would be incorporated into the design of new development where necessary to minimise flood risk.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact location of development to meet the employment land identified. |
| **13.Climate Change and Energy Efficiency**  To adapt to climate change by minimise energy usage and to develop Ashfield’s renewable energy resource, reducing dependency on non-renewable sources. | **+/-** | **+/-** | **+/-** | **Likely significant effects**  Minor negative effects are anticipated to arise from employment growth generating an increase in greenhouse gases both during construction (e.g. due to emissions from HGV movements and plant and associated with embodied carbon in construction materials) and once development is complete (e.g. due to increased traffic generation and energy use in new buildings). The scale of these effects will be most significant for the higher growth options.  The provision of new development provides the opportunity for more energy efficient commercial buildings (with more efficient boilers, insulation, and possible low carbon energy generation) which could mean that carbon generation per square metre of floorspace would be lower than at present. This could help mitigate some of the effects. Indeed, higher levels of development could support opportunities for the provision of combined heat and power networks and provide greater flexibility for passive solar gain through effective layout and design.  Overall, all options have been assessed as having positive and negative effects on achievement of this objective.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should support the integration of energy efficient measures into the design of new buildings and through energy efficient layouts.   **Assumptions**   * It is assumed that over the plan period there will be a decarbonisation of the electricity generation mix with renewable energy sources displacing fossil fuels.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact magnitude of effects will be dependent on the design and location of development at the individual site level (which is currently uncertain). |
| **14.Travel and Accessibility**  To improve travel choice and accessibility, reduce the need for travel by car and shorten the length and duration of journeys. | **+/-** | **+/-/?** | **+/-/?** | **Likely significant effects**  The provision of employment proposed under all options could be expected to increase levels of traffic during both the construction of premises and once development is complete. This may result in congestion with associated negative effects including driver delay and an increase in road traffic accidents. The highest growth figure under Option 2 may lead to significant effects in this regard.  The extent to which new employment development affects car use will be dependent on its accessibility which is at present uncertain. Locations within and on the edge of the main urban areas of Kirkby, Sutton and Hucknall may support opportunities for walking and cycling and integrated public transport services. However, development close to junctions 27 and 28 could additionally increase flows to and on the M1.  It is recognised that the District has modest workforce containment with strong links to Nottingham. Employment growth could support greater containment in this regard if jobs are filled locally.  Option 2 and 3 propose a substantially higher level of growth than Option 1 and, as such, the potential for adverse effects on the road network associated with increased traffic volumes may be increased. However, the delivery of higher growth options would provide a higher number of local employment opportunities which could help to reduce out-commuting (although higher growth options reflect regional demand). There is greater uncertainty in relation to the location of development and the ability to support sustainable transport to and from employment locations at the higher growth rates.  Overall, minor positive and negative effects are assessed for the options. However, there is uncertainty for higher growth options as to the extent of these effects.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should support walking and cycling and seek contributions to public transport provision where possible. * The development of green travel plans should be supported where possible. * Local Plan policies should support the implementation of measures in the Nottinghamshire Local Transport Plan 3.   **Assumptions**   * None identified.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact location of development is unknown at this stage. |
| **15.Employment**  To create high quality employment opportunities including opportunities for increased learn and skills to meet the needs of the District. | **++/-/?** | **++/?** | **++** | **Likely significant effects**  The Nottingham Core HMA and Nottingham Outer HMA Employment Land Needs Study 2021 (ELNS) sets out that the primary business clusters in the District are located in the centres of Sutton in Ashfield, Kirkby-in-Ashfield and Hucknall to the south of the District. Hucknall is identified as being within the Core HMA area due to the close function links with the City of Nottingham. The ELNS states that Ashfield has larger percentage of smaller enterprises than average for the regional.  The construction of new employment space under all options would support the construction sector and has the potential to create spend in the local supply chain. This may also support construction skills development. However, effects in this regard will be temporary and the extent to which the jobs that may be created benefit the District’s residents will depend on the number of jobs created and the approach of firms to filling positions.  All options would encourage investment in businesses and infrastructure which would lead to a more diversified economy, maximising viability of the economy in the District and reducing out-commuting. In the 2021 Census, 58.4% of the District’s population (aged 16 and over) was economically active, in line with the East Midlands regional average (57.5%) and national average (58.6%). Unemployment rates (2.7%) were slightly higher than the regional (2.4%) but lower than the national average (2.9%). The provision of local employment opportunities may help to tackle unemployment, particularly in the more deprived parts of the District, whilst it may help to drive investment in skills. However, the extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market), their location/accessibility and the recruitment policies of prospective employers. Jobs growth would, in-turn, increase the amount of money spent in the local economy and there may also be supply chain benefits associated with new or expanded businesses.  Option 1 would meet the baseline projected requirements in line with housing need/regeneration and would therefore meet the minimum projected levels of employment land for Ashfield but would not account for past take rates. Therefore, there may be minor negative effects as past take up is not accounted for in the figure which may hinder employment growth (especially in the longer term) and taking into account regional evidence of demand. Option 2 would provide a significant uplift on Option 1 and Option 2 based on evidence of completions/losses taking from years 2000-20 with around 65ha more land than Option 1 and 10ha more than Option 3. Option 3 would consider the effects of more recent employment losses data, which reflects that losses accounted for in the ELNS reflect textile factories/collieries being used for residential purposes and that there are no further colliery sites that could be developed. There is some uncertainty with regards to the identification of the higher figure for employment land under Option 2 as it would potentially lead to an overprovision of employment land. All options reflect that the need for office space is not significant within the District.  The ELNS acknowledges from evidence from agent/developers that there is a strong demand for strategic logistics along the M1 corridor. The Study acknowledges that Ashfield past take up rate to some degree reflect an element of strategic logistics. The option of the higher rates set out in either Option 2 or Option 3 would contribute towards meeting the wider logistic demand requirement.  Overall, all options are assessed as having positive effects on this objective. Options 2 and 3 are assessed as having significant positive effects on achievement of this objective, given that past take up rates are included in the figures identified. However, there is some uncertainty with regards to Option 2, which could provide an oversupply of employment land based on previous trends that are not reflected in more recent employment land loss data. Option 1 is assessed as having a mix of significant positive and minor negative effects, reflecting that the figure would not account for past rates and may potentially limit the ability to meet employment demand within the plan period, especially in the longer term. However, there is some uncertainty over the extent of such negative effects depending on take up of employment land within the plan period.  **Mitigation**   * None identified.   **Assumptions**   * None identified.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact location of new development is unknown at this stage. * The extent to which job creation is locally significant will depend on the type of jobs created (in the context of the local labour market) and the recruitment policies of prospective employers. |
| 1. **16. Economy**   To Improve the efficiency, competitiveness and adaptability of the local economy. | **++/-/?** | **++/?** | **++** | **Likely significant effects**  The likely effects against this objective are largely similar to those identified for SA Objective 15. All options would support the competitiveness of the District by providing land required to support investment in new and expanded employment development and meet evidenced need within the ELNS.  All options are assessed as having significant positive effects. As with SA Objective 15 Option 1 may limit economic performance as the past trends are not accounted for and this does not take into regional demand. A mix of significant positive and minor negative effects are assessed, with some uncertainty. Option 2 and 3 are assessed as having significant positive effects, although there is some uncertainty with regards to Option 2.  **Mitigation**   * None identified.   **Assumptions**   * None identified.   **Uncertainties**   * None identified. |
| 1. **17. Town Centres**   Increase the vitality and viability of Ashfield’s town centres. | **0/-/?** | **0/-/?** | **0/-/?** | **Likely significant effects**  The provision of employment land is not considered likely to significantly affect the vitality and vibrancy of town centres. Office growth may take place within or on the edge of town centres which could help to support vitality and vibrancy and support increased footfall at town centre facilities and services. However, even though offices are main town centre uses, it is recognised that office development often comes forward in locations outside of town centres with business parks often primary locations for their development (especially through allocations in a Local Plan). The ELNS also recognises that there is a more limited requirement for new office space in the District with the focus primarily on industrial land.  Overall, all options are considered to have a mix of neutral and minor positive effects on this objective. However, there is some uncertainty with regards to any minor positive effects, dependent on whether offices are located in town centre and well-connected edge of centre locations that could encourage the use of town centre facilities and services and support their vibrancy.  **Mitigation**   * Local Plan policies should help support regeneration and investment in town centres.   **Assumptions**   * None identified.   **Uncertainties**   * The exact location is unknown at this stage. |