

Local Development Framework

Development Management Submission Document

(Post Pre-Submission Consultation):
Sustainability Appraisal – Non-technical Summary
(Evidence Base Document)



LDF

Contents

1 Introduction.....2

2 Sustainability Appraisal Methodology4

3 Sustainability Appraisal – Matrices and Summaries.....8

4 Consultation on the Development Management DPD and the SA Report 24

5 How the Plan has Incorporated SA Recommendations 245

6 Implementation and Monitoring 25

7 Conclusion and Next Steps 31

If you would like this information in large print, Braille or another language, please contact 01702 318111.

1 Introduction

Purpose of the Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD)

- 1.1 Rochford District Council is at the final stage of preparing the Development Management DPD, which will form part of the Council's Local Development Framework (LDF).
- 1.2 The Development Management DPD sits below the Core Strategy in the LDF. The Core Strategy sets out the broad policies to guide the future development of the District, addressing a range of issues including housing, employment, open spaces and community facilities. Broad locations for the allocation of new housing and employment development for example are identified within the Core Strategy.
- 1.3 In turn, the Development Management DPD will set out detailed planning policies for determining planning applications and aid the delivery of development. It will address a number of issues such as the design of housing, employment opportunities in the Green Belt, nature conservation, parking standards and town centre shopping frontages.
- 1.4 The initial stage of the Development Management DPD, called the Discussion and Consultation Document, was published for public consultation in March/April 2010. The purpose of this document was to set out a number of options for the specific issues it seeks to address, for example, it identified a preferred option and three alternative options for the density of new developments.
- 1.5 In January/February 2012 a second, informal, stage in the preparation of the document, called the Preferred Policy Options Document, was published for public consultation. This document built on the previous stage of the Development Management DPD, and set out the preferred policies to be taken to the submission stage.
- 1.6 The final stage of the Development Management DPD, called the Development Management Submission Document, has been prepared taking into account a plethora of evidence base documents (as detailed within the Submission Document). This document sets out detailed policies for determining planning applications to address specific issues such as the design and density of new developments.

Purpose of the Sustainability Appraisal

- 1.7 In accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Development Management DPD has been the subject of, and has been produced in conjunction with, a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). European and UK legislation require that the LDF is also subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), a process that considers the effects of development planning on the environment. Government guidance advises that these two processes should be carried out together and outlines a number of stages of SA work that need to be carried out as

the LDF is being prepared. Government guidance, as detailed further below, also states that SA work should not repeat that carried out at a higher level. As such, this SA incorporates the requirements of SEA and does not repeat the SA/SEA work undertaken on the Rochford District Core Strategy. This SA should be read in conjunction with the SA/SEA of the Rochford District Core Strategy, including addendums to such work.

- 1.8 The purpose of the SA is to ensure that wider sustainability issues, encompassing environmental, economic and social implications of options or policies proposed, are taken into consideration throughout the preparation of Development Plan Documents.
- 1.9 This document combines the initial Scoping Report for the SA which has informed the preparation of the full SA Report for each stage of the Development Management DPD. It has been produced in-house to ensure that the SA process is as integrated with the plan making process as possible.
- 1.10 The policies in the informal Preferred Policy Options Document (2012) are similar to those within the Submission Document (2013) and this SA combines the appraisal for both documents, but ultimately provides the draft assessment for the final proposed document.

Vision and Objectives

- 1.11 The SA for the Core Strategy (September 2009) recognises that the Core Strategy includes an overarching Vision and Objectives for the District.

Spatial Vision:

To make Rochford District a place which provides opportunities for the best possible quality of life for all who live, work and visit here.

Key Planning Objectives:

To support the vision, the Council has four main corporate objectives. These are:

- *Making a difference to our people*
- *Making a difference to our community*
- *Making a difference to our environment*
- *Making a difference to our local economy*

- 1.12 The Core Strategy is structured around a number of themes that have individual visions and objectives that all contribute to the overall vision for the District. The Core Strategy includes the following themes:

- Housing

- Character of Place
- The Green Belt
- Upper Roach Valley and Wallasea Island
- Environmental Issues
- Community Infrastructure, Leisure and Tourism
- Transport
- Economic Development
- Retail and Town Centres

1.13 The Development Management DPD seeks to deliver key aspects of the Core Strategy in relation to these themes:

- Housing, Character of Place and Residential Amenity
- The Green Belt and Countryside
- Environmental Issues
- Transport
- Economic Development
- Retail and Town Centres

Summary of Compliance with the SEA Directive/Regulations

- 1.14 The SEA Regulations set out certain requirements for reporting the SEA process, and specify that if an integrated appraisal is undertaken (i.e. SEA is subsumed within the SA process, as for the SA of the Rochford LDF), then the sections of the SA Report that meet the requirements set out for reporting the SEA process must be clearly signposted. The requirements for reporting the SEA process are set out in Appendix 1 and within each relevant section of this SA Report, as appropriate. This SA Report should also be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.
- 1.15 This SA report has been produced in-house to ensure that the SA process is as integrated with the plan making process as possible. To ensure the preparation of a robust and compliant report, this SA has sought reference from the Discussion and Consultation Document of the Allocations SA document which has undertaken a compliance review by independent consultants, Enfusion.

Habitats Regulations Assessment

- 1.16 A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) must be undertaken to assess the impacts of land-use plans on sites of European importance, in accordance with the European Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC), as set out in the UK amended Habitats Regulations (2007).

The Core Strategy, which sets out the broad policies for the future development of the District, has been subject to a HRA.

- 1.17 A HRA for the Discussion and Consultation Document was prepared December 2011 and recommended that:
- 1.18 “In addition, strengthen the wording in the existing policy would also help to avoid any likely significant effects. It is recommended PolicyDM2 should be amended to include more specific reference of European sites in the policy, for example: “Proposals for residential development must optimise the capacity of the site in a manner that is compatible with the use, intensity, scale and character of the surrounding natural and built environment area, including any European sites, and the size of the site.” This amendment is considered to be minor, and should be applied to the submission draft prior to its submission for Examination.”
- 1.19 The HRA concluded that:
- “Although the assessment found that DM2 in the Development Management DPD had the potential for likely significant in-combination effect on European sites through increased disturbance; the assessment also considered that the mitigation provided by the Local Development Framework i.e. Core Strategy through the provision for new open space and alternative recreational opportunities would be sufficient to avoid likely significant effects as a result of increased disturbance.
- 1.20 The assessment suggests making amendments to the text in order to mitigate the potential likely significant effects outlined above.”
- 1.21 The final policies within the Development Management DPD: Submission Document, in general, do not differ greatly from those proposed in the Discussion and Consultation Document.

2 Sustainability Appraisal Methodology

- 2.1 The SA Report has been produced alongside the Development Management Submission Document, and as such has been undertaken in accordance with the advice set out in the guidance on the preparation of SAs for Development Plan Documents published in 2005¹. This guidance has since been superseded (in September 2009) by the CLG Plan Making Manual², which continues to refers to guidance on undertaking Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) published in

¹ ‘Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents’ (November 2005) available from: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/planningandbuilding/sustainabilityappraisal>

² ‘CLG Plan Making Manual’ available at: <http://www.pas.gov.uk/pas/core/page.do?pageId=109798>

2005³. This SA Report will combine the SEA guidance with the advice within the Plan Making Manual.

- 2.2 An overarching LDF Scoping Report generic to all LDF Development Plan Documents has already been prepared. This was produced during the preparation of the Core Strategy Submission Document and as such the overarching SA of the Council's LDF is the Core Strategy Submission SA Report. This was in accordance with government guidance which stated that the SA must be proportionate to the plan in question and it should not repeat the appraisal of higher level policy.
- 2.3 The Council's Core Strategy was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination (to be undertaken by the independent Inspector on behalf of the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government) on 14 January 2010. The final SA Report for the Core Strategy Submission Document with an integrated Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was produced in 2009. However, following the Forest Heath case (Save Historic Newmarket v. Forest Heath District Council) in March 2011 which provided an additional interpretation on undertaking SEA, the Council requested that the Inspector delay the issuing of a decision on the soundness of the Core Strategy to enable a review of the Core Strategy Submission SA to be undertaken. The Inspector accepted this request, and an addendum to the submitted Core Strategy SA was produced, and consulted upon in June/July 2011. The addendum appraised in further detail the preferred general locations for housing and employment development and the reasonable alternatives. The addendum should be read in conjunction with the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.
- 2.4 The Core Strategy was found sound, subject to changes and the Inspector's Report stated that the SA/SEA work undertaken, including the addendum, was adequate. The Core Strategy was adopted on 13 December 2011.
- 2.5 The SEA Baseline Information Profile for the District, which contains a wealth of environmental, economic and social information, is produced by Essex County Council and updated on a regular basis. This will therefore enable a consistent methodology and approach to all LDF documents, and a wide ranging set of information has been included to ensure the full appraisal of individual documents. The 2009-2010 SEA Baseline Information Profile (which is available in Appendix 8) has been used in the appraisals. The evidence base supporting the development of the Core Strategy has also been drawn upon, as appropriate.
- 2.6 The stages of the SA process are outlined in Table 1 below.

³ 'A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (2005)' available from: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/practicalguides/ea.pdf>

Table 1 – Stages of the SA Process

Stage	Task
Stage A	SA Scoping Process
Stage B	Developing and refining options and assessing effects.
Stage C	Preparing the SA Report.
Stage D	Consulting on the Plan and the SA Report.
Stage E	Monitoring and implementing the Plan.

- 2.7 A number of plans, policies and programmes relevant to the production of the LDF generally have been identified and reviewed in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report. This is available to view in Appendix 6 of this report. To account for changes since the Core Strategy Submission SA Report in September 2009, a list of new or updated key plans and programmes is also available in Appendix 6a.
- 2.8 The 2009-2010 SEA Baseline Information Profile has been used as part of the appraisal process, where appropriate. This document is available in Appendix 8 of this report. The previous SEA Baseline Information Profile documents can be found on the Council's website at **www.rochford.gov.uk**.
- 2.9 The baseline conditions for the District, described in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report, are set out within Appendix 7.
- 2.10 The Core Strategy Submission SA Report identifies the sustainability characteristics for the District, and these are detailed within Appendix 7. The key sustainability issues for the District are also identified in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report. It is considered that this list is of relevance to the Development Management DPD. These issues were used in developing the objectives and policies of the document, as detailed within Task A5. The key sustainability issues for the District are set out in Table 2 below.

Table 2 – Key sustainability Issues/ opportunities identified for Rochford District

The provision of quality and affordable housing to meet housing needs in the Districts settlements.
Improving services and connectivity to the sparsely populated eastern part of the district.
Taking account of environmental and physical constraints when accommodating new housing.
The protection of the District's biodiversity and landscape qualities; including opportunities for green infrastructure networks.
High levels of car ownership and limited public transport in many areas.

Table 2 – Key sustainability Issues/ opportunities identified for Rochford District

High levels of out-commuting to other districts and difficulties in competing with economies in neighbouring areas.
Opportunity to stimulate the local economy, including the rural economy, whilst recognising difficulties in competing with economies in neighbouring areas.
Opportunities to incorporate good practice sustainable design into new development, and minimise the carbon footprint of the District.

- 2.11 The SA Framework was refined during the preparation of the Core Strategy SA Scoping Report. The final SA Framework used to appraise the development of the Core Strategy DPD is set out in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report, and can be found in Appendix 7.
- 2.12 The SA Framework used in the appraisal of the Development Management Submission Document was adapted from that of the Core Strategy Submission Document to reflect the differing perspectives and scales of the Development Plan Document, where appropriate.

Table 3 – SA Objectives

SA Objective Headings	
1. Balanced Communities	8. Landscape & Townscape
2. Healthy & Safe Communities	9. Climate Change & Energy
3. Housing	10. Water
4. Economy & Employment	11. Land & Soil
5. Accessibility	12. Air Quality
6. Biodiversity	13. Sustainable Design & Construction
7. Cultural Heritage	

- 2.13 Each option included within the Discussion and Consultation Document on this document and those included in the Submission Document and further alternatives, have been appraised against the SA Framework, where appropriate. A broad assessment of whether effects are likely to be cumulative, short, medium and long-term, temporary or permanent has been included, where possible, in relation to the SA objectives are detailed within the main Sustainability Appraisal.

3 Sustainability Appraisal – Matrices and Summaries

- 3.1 The following section provides a summary of the detailed assessment of the proposed policies and the alternative options against the SA objectives. Matrices in Appendices 3 of the document set out the detailed assessment themselves of the proposed

policies and the alternative options against the SA objectives and accompanying decision-aiding questions.

- 3.2 Each of the alternative options and the proposed policies have been given an impact category according to the table below.

Table 4 – Categories of Sustainability Effects

Colour	Impact
++	Major Positive
+	Positive
+/-	Positive/Negative
0	No Impact
?	Uncertain
-	Negative
--	Major Negative

- 3.3 A scoring summary of the proposed policies and the reasonable alternative options considered is set out in the table below.

Rochford District Council – Development Management Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical summary)

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Housing, Character of Place and Residential Amenity													
Policy DM1	++	+	+	0	+/0	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	+
Policy DM2	+	?	+	?	+	0/?	0	+	0	0	+	0	0
Policy DM3	+	+/?	+	0	+	0/+	+	+	0	?	+	?	+
Policy DM4	+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy DM5	0	+	+	0	+	?/+	0	?/+	0	0	0	0	0
Policy DM6	?	?/+	0	?/+	0	?/+	?/+	+	0	0	0	0	0
Policy DM7	+	+	+/-	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+
Policy DM8	+	?/+	?/+	?	?	0	+	+	0	0	?/+	0	+
Policy DM9	?	?	+	?/+	?	0	+	?/+	0	0	?	0	?/+
The Green Belt and Countryside													
Policy DM10	+	?/+	?/+	?/+	?/+	0	0	+	0	0	0	?/+	0

Rochford District Council – Development Management Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical summary)

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Policy DM11	?/+	?/+	0	++	?	0	0	?	0	0	?/+	0	?
Policy DM12	+	?	0	++	+/-	?	?	?/+	0	0	?	0	0
Policy DM13	+	?	0	+	?/+	?	?/+	?/+	0	0	?/+	0	0
Policy DM14	+/-	?/+	0	+	+/-	+	+	+	0	0	?	0	?/+
Policy DM15	+	+	0	+/0	+/-	?/+	?	+	0	0	+	?	0
Policy DM16	+	+	0	?/+	+	?/+	?	?/+	0	0	?/+	?	?
Policy DM17	0	?/+	?	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+
Policy DM18	+	?/+	+	+	+	0	0	?/+	0	0	+/-	0	?
Policy DM19	+	0	+	?/+	?/+	0	0	?	0	0	+/-	0	?
Policy DM20	0	?	?	0	0	0	0	?/0	0	0	?	0	?/+
Policy DM21	+	0	+	0	0	0	?	?/+	0	0	?	0	+
Policy DM22	0	0	0	0	0	?	?	?/+	0	0	?	0	0

Rochford District Council – Development Management Submission Document Sustainability Appraisal (Non-technical summary)

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Policy DM23	?/+	+	+	?/+	?/+	0	+	+	0	0	0/?	0	+
Environmental Issues													
Policy DM24	+	0	+/-	0	?/+	?	+	?	0	0	0	0	0
Policy DM25	0	?/+	0	0	?/+	++	0	+	0	0	?	0	0
Policy DM26	0	?/+	?/+	0	?/+	+	?/+	+	0	0	0	0	?/+
Policy DM27	0	?/+	0	?	0	++	0	?	0	?	?	0	0
Policy DM28	0	+	?	?	0	?	0	+	+	+	+	0	0
Policy DM29	0	?/+	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	0	++	0
Transport													
Policy DM30	+	+	+	-/+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0
Policy DM31	+	+	0	0	+	?	?	?/+	?/+	0	0	?/+	0
Economic Development													

Policy/Option	SA Objective												
	Balanced Communities	Healthy & Safe Communities	Housing	Economy & Employment	Accessibility	Biodiversity	Cultural Heritage	Landscape & Townscape	Climate Change & Energy	Water	Land & Soil	Air Quality	Sustainable Design & Construction
Policy DM32	+	+/?	0	+	+	0	0	0	?	0	?	0	0
Policy DM33	+	0	0	-/+	+	0	0	?/+	0	0	0	?	?/+
Retail and Town Centres													
Policy DM34	+	+	0	++	+	0	?	?	0	0	?	+	?
Policy DM35	+	0	+	+	+	0	?	?	0	0	+	0	?
Policy DM36	+	+	+	?/+	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	?
Policy DM37	0	+	0	?/+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	?/+
Policy DM38	0	?	0	?/+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	?/+

- 3.4 The tables below summarise the options / reasonable alternatives considered for the Development Management DPD, with an outline of the reasons for rejection / selection of these in the Submission Document. It should be noted that whilst the SA findings are considered by the Council in its selection of options and form part of the evidence supporting the Development Management DPD, the SA findings are not the sole basis for a decision; planning and feasibility factors play a key role in the decision-making process.

Design of New Developments (DM1)

One preferred option and one alternative option were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The previous SA found that the criteria based approach within the preferred option would have a greater positive impact on a range of sustainability objectives than the alternative option, in particular the option to remove some of the specified criteria.

In terms of additional criteria, it was recommended that the preferred option should also include reference to the retention of trees. A minor amendment to the wording of the text within the preferred option was suggested, and the purpose of Concept Statements should be expanded upon in the preamble.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward.

Density of New Developments (DM2)

A preferred option and three alternative options were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on a range of sustainability objectives than the three alternative options as found in the previous SA. It was, however, recommended that minor changes to the text within the preferred option are made and that the varying density across the District is illustrated in the accompanying text.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward in the development of the Submission Document.

Infilling and Residential Intensification (DM3)

One preferred option and one alternative option were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

Infilling and Residential Intensification (DM3)

The criteria based approach within the preferred option was found to have a greater positive impact on a range of sustainability objectives than the alternative option. However, it was advised that the first sentence of the preferred option is reworded and that an additional criterion about tandem relationships is included.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward.

Habitable Floorspace for New Developments (DM4)

A preferred option and three alternative options were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The previous SA found that the preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on some of the sustainability objectives than the alternative option. However, it was suggested that the text within the preferred option is amended and reference is made to the Lifetime Homes Standard.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Light Pollution (DM5)

A preferred option but no specific separate alternatives were considered for this issue within the Discussion and Consultation Document. No distinct, realistic alternatives were identified.

The preferred option would have a positive impact on some of the sustainability objectives. However, it is recommended that reference is made to the acceptability of the design/appearance/scale (i.e. the height) of proposed lighting and the impact on the character and appearance of an area.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, should therefore be taken forward.

Telecommunications (DM6)

A preferred option but no specific separate alternatives were considered for this issue within the Discussion and Consultation Document. No distinct, realistic alternatives were identified.

The preferred option would have a positive impact on sustainability objectives.

Local List (DM7)

A preferred option and two alternative options were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The previous SA found that the preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on some of the sustainability objectives than the alternative option. However, it was suggested that the text within the preferred option is amended and minor changes are made to the supporting text.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Demolition within Conservation Area (DM8)

One preferred option and one alternative option were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

No amendments were proposed in the Discussion and Consultation SA.

The policy performs well against sustainability objectives.

Development outside, but close to the boundary of, Conservation Areas (DM9)

One preferred option and one alternative option were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The previous SA found that the preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on some of the sustainability objectives than the alternative option. However, it was recommended that the text within the preferred option is amended and changes are made to the heading and supporting text.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward in the development of the Submission Document.

Redevelopment of Previously Developed Land in the Green Belt (DM10)

This policy was introduced at the Submission stage; and was found to have a positive impact on sustainability objectives.

Existing Businesses in the Green Belt (DM11)

A preferred option and two alternative options were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The previous SA found that the preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on some of the sustainability objectives than the alternative option. However, it was suggested that the text within the preferred option is amended to remove the 25% allowance and addition wordings to be added to the supporting text.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward in

the development of the Submission Document.

Rural Diversification (DM12)

One preferred option and two alternative options were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The previous SA found that the preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on some of the sustainability objectives than the alternative option. However, it was suggested that the text within the preferred option is amended and a minor change to be made to a term in the policy.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Conversion of Existing Agricultural or Rural Buildings in the Green Belt (DM13)

A preferred option and one alternative option were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The previous SA found that the preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on some of the sustainability objectives than the alternative option. However, it was suggested that the text within the preferred option should be further explained and set out in the preferred option that it does not support the conversion of existing agricultural buildings for residential use. In addition, reference should be made to locally listed buildings in the supporting text with clarification on the definition of 'original building'.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward in the development of the Submission Document.

Green Tourism (DM14)

One preferred option and two alternative options were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on a range of sustainability objectives than the alternative option. However, it is recommended that the historic environment and agricultural land are included within the preferred option.

Policy DM14 was subject to amendments following pre-submission consultation. These sought to improve the effectiveness of the policy, rather than its aims. The changes are not considered likely to have a significant effect on any of the SA objectives.

Equestrian Facilities (DM15)

One preferred option and one alternative option were considered within Discussion and Consultation Document.

The previous SA found that the preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on some of the sustainability objectives than the alternative option. However, it was recommended that the second criterion and the text within the preferred option are amended.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Policy DM15 was subject to amendments following pre-submission consultation. These sought to improve the effectiveness of the policy, and explain the justification for the standards set, rather than relating to the aims of the policy. The changes are not considered likely to have a significant effect on any of the SA objectives.

Playing Pitches and Other Leisure and Recreational Activities (DM16)

One preferred option and one alternative option were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The previous SA found that the preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on some of the sustainability objectives than the alternative option. It was, however, recommended that minor changes to the text within the preferred option are made and that historic environment and agricultural land are included within the preferred option.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt (DM17)

One preferred option and two alternative options were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The previous SA found that the preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on some of the sustainability objectives than the alternative option. However, it was recommended that the second criterion and the text within the preferred option are amended to include reference to the scale, mass and orientation; and minor changes are made to the supporting text.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Agricultural, Forestry and Other Occupational Dwellings (DM18)

A preferred option but no specific separate alternatives were considered for this issue within the Discussion and Consultation Document. No distinct, realistic alternatives were identified.

The preferred option would have a positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives. No amendments are proposed.

The preferred option should therefore be taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Temporary Agricultural Dwellings (DM19)

A preferred option but no specific separate alternatives were considered for this issue within the Discussion and Consultation Document. No distinct, realistic alternatives were identified.

The preferred option would have a positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives. No amendments are proposed.

The preferred option should therefore be taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Basements in the Green Belt (DM20)

One preferred option and two alternative options were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

As stated in the previous SA, the preferred option would have a positive and negative impact on a number of sustainability objectives, however, alternative option A would have a greater positive impact, particularly in terms of landscape impact.

Therefore, it was recommended that the policy should amend to include the first point of the preferred option, with generic wording in the last sentence to include the permitted development rights. In addition, it was suggested that the supporting text is amend to include basement extensions within the 25% increase in floorspace allowance for dwellings in the Green Belt.

Alternative option A, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward in the development of the Submission document.

The Replacement or Rebuild of Existing Dwellings in the Green Belt (DM21)

One preferred option and one alternative option were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The previous SA found that the preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on some of the sustainability objectives than the alternative option. However, it was advised that “to the Council’s satisfaction” is removed from the preferred option, and the last sentence should be amended to generic working about permitted development rights, and this should be amended elsewhere in the plan.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Extension of Domestic Gardens in the Green Belt (DM22)

A preferred option but no specific separate alternatives were considered for this issue within the Discussion and Consultation Document. No distinct, realistic alternatives were identified. The preferred option would have a positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives. However, it was suggested that additional requirements are included in the preferred option. In addition, a sentence to be added to include “permitted development rights”.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Conservation Areas and the Green Belt (DM23)

One preferred option and two alternative options were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The preferred option would have a positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives. No amendments are proposed.

The preferred option should therefore be taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Houseboats (DM24)

One preferred option and one alternative option were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The previous SA found that the preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on some of the sustainability objectives than the alternative option. However, it was recommended that reference to potential impact on the wider historic environment is referred to in the preferred option.

Houseboats (DM24)

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Trees and Woodlands (DM25)

This policy was introduced at the Submission stage; and was found to have a positive impact on sustainability objectives.

Other Important Landscape Features (DM26)

One preferred option and one alternative option were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The previous SA found that the preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on some of the sustainability objectives than the alternative option. However, it was recommended that additional criteria to be added to the policy, thus encourage the creation of new habitats with new development.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Species and Habitat Protection (DM27)

This policy was introduced at the Submission stage; and was found to have a positive impact on sustainability objectives.

Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs) (DM28)

This policy was introduced at the Submission stage; and was found to have a positive impact on sustainability objectives.

Air Quality (DM29)

This policy was introduced at the Preferred Policy Options stage; and was found to have a positive impact on sustainability objectives. The policy was therefore taken forward to the Submission stage

Parking Standards (DM30)

One preferred option and one alternative option were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The preferred option would have a positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives. No amendments are proposed.

The preferred option should therefore be taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Traffic Management (DM31)

A preferred option but no specific separate alternatives were considered for this issue within the Discussion and Consultation Document. No distinct, realistic alternatives were identified.

The preferred option would have a positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives. It was, however, recommended that additional conditions should be inserted to ensure the protection and enhancement of the environment, reference to be made to the natural and historic environment with additional criteria inserted on the delivery of high quality, safe and inclusive design.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward in the development of the Submission Document

Employment Land (DM32)

A preferred option but no alternatives were considered for this issue within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The preferred option would have a positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives. It was, however, recommended in the previous SA that criteria are added to ensure that any infrastructure commensurate with new employment land, or existing employment land, is phased. Some other design related criteria should also be considered. In addition, the reasons for preferring the predominance of B1 and B2 uses should be explained further within the supporting text and that the compatibility of alternative uses with existing uses is included within the option.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments addressed in the Submission document, was therefore taken forward to the next stage.

Working From Home (DM33)

A preferred option but no specific separate alternatives were considered for this issue within the Discussion and Consultation Document. No distinct, realistic alternatives

Working From Home (DM33)

were identified.

The preferred option would have a positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives. However, it was recommended that the first point is amended from 'is ancillary to the residential use' to 'remains linked to the residential use', and it was recommended that this option should not restrict uses within dwellings to B1 as other uses may be compatible with residential uses which do not fall within this class.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward in the development of the Submission Document.

Town Centre Shopping Frontages (DM34)

One preferred option and two alternative options were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on a range of sustainability objectives than alternative options A and B. However, it is recommended that an explanation of what constitutes a cluster of uses is provided, and additional text on what threshold for retail use should be applied if the Retail and Leisure Study is not up to date should be provided.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Upper Floor Locations in Town Centres (DM35)

One preferred option and one alternative option were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The preferred option would have a positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives. However, it was recommended minor changes to be made to the supporting text.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Village Shops and Neighbourhood Shopping Areas (DM36)

One preferred option and one alternative option were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The preferred option would have a positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives. However, it was recommended that on-street parking is included to ensure that this is taken into consideration in the determination of applications for non-retail uses.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Advertisements (DM37)

One preferred option and one alternative option were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

The preferred option would ensure a greater positive impact on a number of sustainability objectives than the alternative option. However, it was recommended in the previous SA that minor changes should be made to the supporting text, and appropriate guidance on advertisements should be referred to.

The preferred option, with the proposed amendments, was therefore taken forward to the next stage of the document.

Advertisements affecting Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings (DM38)

One preferred option and one alternative option were considered within the Discussion and Consultation Document.

No amendments were proposed in the Discussion and Consultation SA.

The policy performs well against sustainability objectives.

4 Consultation on the Development Management DPD and the SA Report

- 4.1 The initial stage of the Development Management DPD (the Discussion and Consultation Document) was consulted upon in March and April 2010 and elicited responses from a range of stakeholders, including statutory bodies, parish councils, members of the public, developers, agents and landowners. In total 209 representations were received. A summary of the responses to the consultation, which includes the issues raised and officers' initial responses to these, was also published.

- 4.2 The draft SA Report of the Discussion and Consultation document was published in early 2012 and key stakeholders were consulted on this document (which included statutory consultees, developers and agents) for a six week period between 16 January 2012 and 27 February 2012 . The document was also published on the Council's website. The issues raised and the responses to the SA are presented within Appendix 4. These responses have been taken into account as appropriate.
- 4.3 The Submission Document and SA Report will be consulted on for a period of six weeks along with the publication of the Development Management Submission Document.

5 How the Plan has Incorporated SA Recommendations

- 5.1 An explanation of how the Development Management DPD: Preferred Policy Options Document has incorporated the SA recommendations for mitigation and enhancement at the Discussion and Consultation stage is provided in Appendix 12.
- 5.2 The appraisal of the Submission Document has recommendations embedded within it which have been addressed within the proposed policies, as this SA report has been produced alongside the Submission Document and has informed its development. The detailed assessment of the proposed policies should be referred to.

6 Implementation and Monitoring

- 6.1 Indicators and targets are important tools to help monitor the sustainability effects of the LDF (forming Stage E). Targets and/or indicators for each sustainability objective have been identified (from the SA Framework) within Section 8 of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report to provide a suggested list for discussion, and refined further to consider the significant sustainability effects of the plan as required by the SEA Directive.
- 6.2 Monitoring of the LDF will take place through the publication of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The proposed LDF monitoring strategy and further information is detailed within Section 8 of the Core Strategy Submission SA Report.
- 6.3 The proposed LDF monitoring strategy should:
- Clearly set out who is responsible for the monitoring, as well as it's timing, frequency and format for presenting results;
 - By collecting new information, update and strengthen original baseline data, rectifying any deficiencies, and thereby provide an improved basis for the formulation of future plans;

- Establish a mechanism for action to enhance positive effects of the plan, mitigate any negative ones and assess any areas that were originally identified as containing uncertainty. The aim should be to keep the LDF working at maximum effectiveness for the benefit of the community; and,
- Empower all of the community by providing a clear and easily understandable picture of how actual implementation of the LDF is affecting the District. Is it moving the area towards or away from the more sustainable future we intended? Are any significant effects identified actually happening? Are any unforeseen consequences being felt? Are any mitigation measures that were proposed operating effectively?

6.4 Indicators aim to measure all relevant aspects of life in the District social and economic as well as environmental. These are drawn from:

- Objectives and targets set out in the LDF - these will mostly be quantitative and may be expressed as maps, graphs, diagrams or percentages (e.g. Percentage of new housing built on brownfield land, target of 10% of energy on major new developments to be provided by renewables etc.);
- Indicators already identified and used in the SA process, again mostly likely to be quantitative;
- Measures drawn from the baseline data collected during the early stages of the LDF or from the previous Local Plan (e.g. air quality, extent of wildlife habitats, need for affordable housing); and,
- Any other measures suggested by the community. These might be more qualitative (e.g. quality of life) and could be useful in enriching understanding and giving people a sense of ownership of the LDF.

6.5 The Core Strategy Submission SA Report identifies potential indicators for monitoring which relate to the SA Framework objectives. The Development Management DPD is a key component to deliver the Core Strategy. The potential indicators for monitoring the Development DPD are set out in the table below. Suggested amendments have been highlighted.

Potential Indicators	
1. Balanced Communities	<p>To ensure the delivery of high quality sustainable communities where people want to live and work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing educational attainment at GCSE Level • Proportion of persons in the local population with a degree level qualification.

Potential Indicators
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parishes with a GP, post office, play area, pub, village hall • Percentage of completed retail, office and leisure development in town centre • Mix of housing tenure within settlements • Provision of new <u>youth and</u> community facilities secured through new developments • <u>Provision of open space secured through new developments</u>
<p>2. Healthy & Safe Communities</p> <p>Create healthy and safe environments where crime and disorder or fear of crime does not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor the number of domestic burglaries, violent offences, vehicle crimes, vandalism and all crime per 1,000 population. • Percentage of residents surveyed who feel 'fairly safe' or 'very safe' during the day whilst outside in their Local Authority. • Indexes of Multiple Deprivation throughout the District. • Monitor the type and number of applications permitted in the greenbelt. • Life expectancy • Hectares of new greenspace created • Percentage of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award standard • Death rates from circulatory disease, cancer, accidents and suicide • Residents description of Health • Obesity levels • <u>Provision of open space secured through new developments</u>
<p>3. Housing</p> <p>To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent home</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings. • Indices of Multiple Deprivation – Housing and Services Domain • Percentage of households rented from the Council or in Housing Association/Registered Social Landlords properties • Percentage of new housing which is affordable • Average house price compared with average earnings • Number of housing Completions • <u>Percentage of Lifetime Homes</u>

Potential Indicators

4. Economy & Employment

To achieve sustainable levels of economic growth/prosperity and promote town centre vitality/viability

- The changing diversity of main town centre uses (by number, type and amount of floorspace)
- The changing density of development
- Percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area
- Percentage of employees commuting out of the District to work
- Amount of land developed for employment (by type)
- Retail health checks/economic prosperity of smaller towns and villages
- Number of jobs created through new developments

5. Accessibility

To promote more sustainable transport choices both for people and moving freight ensuring access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling

- Changes in the travel to work mode of transport
- Indices of Multiple Deprivation most notably the Housing and Services Domain
- Car ownership
- Percentage of new residential development within 30 minutes public transport time of a GP, hospital, primary and secondary school, employment and a major health centre
- Kilometres of cycle routes and facilities for cyclists
- Kilometres of new walking routes provided
- Number of houses within a specified radius of services/facilities
- Number of houses within a suitable distance of open space (based on Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards – ANGSt⁴)

⁴ Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards available from:
http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east_of_england/ourwork/gi/accessiblenaturalgreenspacestandardsangst.aspx

Potential Indicators

6. Biodiversity

To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment as an integral part of social, environmental and economic development

- Net change in natural/ semi natural habitats
- Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance
- Condition of designated sites
- Change in area of woodland
- Proportion of new developments delivering habitat creation or restoration
- Number of management plans for designated sites prepared and implemented
- Proportion of new developments delivering habitat mitigation
- Proportion of new developments delivering wildlife corridors
- Areas of geological significance safeguarded and/or extracted

7. Cultural Heritage

To maintain and enhance the cultural heritage and assets of the District

- Buildings of Grade I and II at risk of decay
- Condition of Conservation Areas
- Number of historic parks and gardens

8. Landscape & Townscape

To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes

- To monitor the number of parks awarded Green Flag Status
- To monitor the number of landscape or built environment designations
- Hectares of new development outside settlement boundaries
- Hedgerow and/or veteran tree loss
- Area of /change in landscape designations
- Percentage of development on previously developed land

Potential Indicators

9. Climate Change & Energy

To reduce contributions to climate change

- Changes in the travel to work mode of transport
- Greenhouse gas emissions
- Renewable energy capacity installed by type
- Percentage of new development including renewable energy generation
- Energy consumption
- Code for Sustainable Homes/BREEAM compliance
- Percentage of the tonnage of household waste arisings which have been recycled
- Percentage of household waste sent by the Authority for composting or treatment by anaerobic digestion

10. Water

To improve water quality and reduce the risk of flooding

- Changing water quality
- Groundwater levels
- Percentage of new development incorporating water efficiency measures
- Water consumption per household
- Number of homes built against Environment Agency advice on flooding
- Number and types of Sustainable Drainage Systems approved and implemented

11. Land & Soil

To maintain and improve the quality of the District's land and soil

- Use of previously developed land
- Density of new residential development
- Number of sites/hectares decontaminated as a result of new development

Potential Indicators	
12. Air Quality	<p>To improve air quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AQMA designations or threshold designations • Growth in cars per household • Growth in car trip generation • Type of travel mode to work • Percentage change in public transport patronage • Number of days in the year when air quality is recorded as moderate or high for NO₂, SO₂, PM₁₀, CO and Ozone on average per site.
13 Sustainable Design & Construction	<p>To promote sustainable design and construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of new development incorporating energy and water efficiency measures, and sustainable drainage systems • Percentage of new development meeting BREEAM very good/excellent standards • Percentage use of aggregates from secondary and recycled sources

7 Conclusion and Next Steps

- 7.1 The SA report has appraised the housing, greenbelt, environment, transport, economic development and retail options set out in the Development Management DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document, additional options identified through the SA process, and the proposed policies within the Development Management Submission Document. The potential cumulative, short, medium and long-term, temporary or permanent effects have also been identified where possible.
- 7.2 Some of the policies would have an impact on SA objectives. However, all the short term impacts could be mitigated through other policies within the LDF. Over the longer term, one of the proposed policies (DM7) may have some negative impacts on the sustainability objectives of housing. Nonetheless, the effect should be insignificant.
- 7.3 Throughout the SA report has made a number of recommendations in relation to various alternative options and the proposed policies. The SA report, alongside consultation responses received, has been used to inform the preparation of the pre-submission Development Management Document. The recommendations identified throughout the SA process have assisted in mitigating the potential impacts of the proposed policies and had a positive effect on the sustainability of the plan.
- 7.4 Overall there are significant sustainability benefits in adopting the plan as proposed.