

## Explanatory note of how overall SA RAG rating has been included in site assessment

When assessing the sites, the Council relied on the individual RAG ratings for each of the SA assessment criteria to inform the assessment of each site, as well as the suggested mitigations. These were taken from Table 6.1 and Appendices C1 and C2 of the 2022 Sustainability Appraisal (SD/4) at the time of plan preparation. Table 6.1 remains the same in EXAM 21 and the assessment of the relevant sites have transferred from Appendices C1 and C2 (SD/4c and SD/4d) to Appendix B (EXAM 21B) for accuracy.

The overall RAG rating was not the determinative factor as to whether a site has been proposed for allocation in the submission Local Plan. Having reviewed each instance where there has been an inconsistency in the overall RAG rating the Council is satisfied that in each instance the outcome would have been the same.

Therefore, the Council is proposing to use Table 6.1 (EXAM 21) and Appendix B (EXAM 21B) throughout the course of the Examination.

## Policy SL06 – Beaumont Park (Site 464) – Explanatory note on appraisal of the policy and site in the Sustainability Appraisal

Policy SL06 was assessed in SA Appendix D. Detailed appraisal of Local Plan policies (September 2022) (SD/4e), and this is accurately reflected in Tables 1.1 and 7.1 of the main SA Report (SD/4). The policy text from the submission Plan is quoted on pp. 10-12 of SD/4e.

Appraisal of site 464 (Policy SL06) was incorrectly excluded from SA Appendix B: Detailed appraisal of Local Plan sites (September 2022) (SD/4b) and were instead included in SA Appendix C1. Detailed appraisal of sites not in the Local Plan to site 641 September 2022 (SD/4c). The appraisal of the site is correct, despite being in the wrong appendix. This has been corrected in EXAM 21B. Site 464 appraisal identifies 4 red constraints which are:

- Distance to allotments
- Distance to water body
- Previously developed land
- Distance to train station

The mitigations for this site have been addressed in Document SD/18. This document does indicate an overall RAG rating of Amber which is incorrect. This is an oversight and should be Red as per EXAM 21B’s findings, which will be updated as part of Main Modifications. However, as outlined above, this has not had an overall implication to the assessment or decision around the site allocation.

In SD/4, Beaumont Park (site 464) was incorrectly included in Table 6.2 as a site removed between the pre-submission and submission Local Plan. This is explained in EXAM 20 and is corrected in Table 6.2 in EXAM 21. The site, Beaumont Park (site

464), is incorrectly excluded from Table 6.4 (Reasons for including seemingly unsustainable sites in the Local Plan) in SD/4 but this has been rectified in Table 6.4 in EXAM 21, where it has been included.