

# **Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement**

---

## **Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement**

Rochford District Council adopted the Development Management Plan as a Development Plan Document on 16 December 2014.

This statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

As an integral part of the preparation of the Development Management Plan, and in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Section 19 (5), the Plan has been subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The SA process assesses the likely significant economic, social and environmental effects of the Plan.

The SA of the Rochford District Core Strategy fully incorporates the requirements of the European Directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment (Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004), and has played an important role in the development of the Development Management Plan.

In accordance with Regulation 16 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, this statement addresses each of the following issues in relation to the Development Management Plan:

- how sustainability considerations have been integrated into the Development Plan Document;
- how the options and consultation responses received on the Development Plan Document and Sustainability Appraisal reports have been taken into account;
- the reasons for choosing the development plan document in light of other reasonable alternatives; and
- monitoring measures.

Each of the above matters is considered in turn within this SA/SEA Statement.

## **How sustainability considerations have been integrated into the Development Plan Document**

An overarching SA Scoping Report generic to all Rochford Development Plan Documents was produced as part of the preparation of the Core Strategy, and as such the overarching SA of the Council's planning policies is the Core Strategy 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.

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

---

## Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement

---

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.

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.

The SEA Baseline Information Profile for the District, which contains a wealth of environmental, economic and social information, and is appended to the SA Report for the Development Management Plan was used to inform the appraisal of Plan.

The stages in the SA process for the Development Management Plan were as follows:

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.

Each stage of the Development Management Plan has been the subject of an SA which has been prepared alongside the appropriate document. The milestones for the preparation of the Development Management Plan are set out below:

- Consultation with statutory bodies on the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken between 5 March 2009 and 3 April 2009
- Public consultation on the Development Management DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document was undertaken between 17 March 2010 and 30 April 2010
- Informal public consultation on the Development Management DPD: Preferred Policy Options Document and Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken between 16 January 2012 and 27 February 2012
- Pre-Submission consultation on the Development Management Submission Document and the Sustainability Appraisal was undertaken between 3 June 2013 and 18 July 2013

## Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement

---

- Submission to the Secretary of State on 13 December 2013
- Examination in Public – a hearing session took place on 26 March 2014
- Consultation a Schedule of Modifications to the Submission Document was undertaken between 29 July and 25 September 2014
- Adoption.

The stages of the SA scoping process (Stage A) were as follows:

Task	Purpose
A1: Reviewing Relevant Policies, Plans and Programmes	To identify other relevant plans, policies, programmes and sustainability objectives, and assess the context provided by them, in particular relevant environmental, social and economic objectives and requirements.
A2: Collecting baseline information	To provide the basis to predict and monitor effects and help to identify sustainability problems and alternative ways of dealing with them.
A3: Identifying the sustainability issues and the appraisal objectives	To define key issues for the DPD and develop sustainability plan objectives and options to link to evidence by reference to baseline information.
A4: Considering options and alternatives	To identify the effects of 'reasonable alternatives' as set out in the SEA Directive, as appropriate. However, there is no need to devise alternatives simply to comply with the Directive.
A5: Developing the SA Framework	To identify SA Objectives, where possible to be expressed in the form of targets and sustainability indicators. The issues to be covered in the SA Framework and the level of detail should be such that they are relevant and proportionate to the plan.
A6: Consultation on Scope of the SA	Statutory, specific and general stakeholders.

The key sustainability issues for the District are identified in the Core Strategy Submission SA Report. It was considered that this list is of relevance to the Development Management Plan. These issues were used in developing the objectives and policies of the document, as detailed below under Task A5. The key sustainability issues for the District are as follows:

## Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement

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.
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.

An SA Framework used to appraise the policies set out in the Development Management Plan was produced. The decision-aiding questions of the SA Framework were adapted from that of the Core Strategy Submission Document to reflect the differing perspectives and scales of the Development Plan Document, where appropriate. The SA Framework was developed having regard to consultation response, and the final SA Framework used was as follows:

	SA Objective	Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?
	<b>Balanced Communities</b> (SEA topic: Population & Human Health, Material Assets)	
1	To ensure the delivery of high quality sustainable communities where people want to live and work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will it ensure the phasing of infrastructure, including community facilities to meet ongoing and future needs?</li> <li>● Will it ensure the regeneration and enhancement of existing rural and urban communities?</li> <li>● Will it ensure equal opportunities and that all sections of the community are catered for?</li> <li>● Will it meet the needs of an ageing population?</li> </ul>

**Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement**

	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the policies and options proposed seek to enhance the qualifications and skills of the local community?</li> <li>Will income and quality-of-life disparities be reduced?</li> </ul>
<b>Healthy &amp; Safe Communities</b> (SEA topic: Population & Human Health)		
2	Create <b>healthy and</b> safe environments where crime and disorder or fear of crime does not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it ensure the delivery of high quality, safe and inclusive design?</li> <li>Will it improve health and reduce health inequalities?</li> <li>Will it promote informal recreation and encourage healthy, active lifestyles?</li> <li>Will green infrastructure (non-vehicular infrastructure routes and links) and networks be promoted and/or enhanced?</li> <li>Will it minimise noise pollution?</li> <li>Will it minimise light pollution?</li> </ul>
<b>Housing</b> (SEA topic: Population & Human Health)		
3	To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent home	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it increase the range and affordability of housing for all social groups?</li> <li>Will a mix of housing types and tenures be promoted?</li> <li>Will it reduce the number of unfit homes?</li> <li>Does it promote high quality design?</li> <li>Is there sustainable access to key services?</li> <li>Does it meet the resident's needs in terms of sheltered and lifetime homes or those that can be easily adapted so?</li> </ul>
<b>Economy &amp; Employment</b> (SEA topic: Population & Human Health, Material Assets)		
4	To achieve sustainable levels of economic growth/prosperity and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does it promote and enhance existing centres by focusing development in such centres?</li> <li>Will it improve business development?</li> </ul>

**Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement**

	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?</b>
	promote town centre vitality/viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it enhance consumer choice through the provision of a range of shopping, leisure, and local services to meet the needs of the entire community?</li> <li>• Does it promote mixed use and high density development in urban centres?</li> <li>• Does it promote a wide variety of jobs across all sectors?</li> <li>• Does it secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District?</li> <li>• Will it aid the realisation of London Southend Airport’s economic potential?</li> </ul>
<b>Accessibility</b> (SEA topic: Population & Human Health, Air, Climatic Factors)		
5	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it increase the availability of sustainable transport modes?</li> <li>• Will it seek to encourage people to use alternative modes of transportation other than the private car, including walking and cycling?</li> <li>• Will it contribute positively to reducing social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services?</li> <li>• Will it reduce the need to travel?</li> <li>• Does it seek to encourage development where large volumes of people and/or transport movements are located in sustainable accessible locations?</li> <li>• Does it enable access for all sections of the community, including the young, the socially deprived, those with disabilities and the elderly?</li> <li>• Does it secure more opportunities for residents to work in the District, and for out-commuting to be reduced?</li> <li>• Does it enable access to green infrastructure and the wider natural environment to all sections of the community?</li> </ul>

**Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement**

	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?</b>
	<b>Biodiversity</b> (SEA topic: Fauna & Flora)	
6	To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment as an integral part of social, environmental and economic development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it conserve and enhance natural/semi natural habitats, including the District's distinctive estuaries and salt marshes?</li> <li>• Will it conserve and enhance species diversity, and in particular avoid harm to protected species and priority species?</li> <li>• Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest?</li> <li>• Will it conserve and enhance sites of geological significance?</li> <li>• Does land use allocation reflect the scope of using brownfield land for significant wildlife interest where viable and realistic?</li> <li>• Does new development integrate within it opportunities for new habitat creation, particularly where they could facilitate species movement and colonisation in relation to climate change pressures on biodiversity and its distribution?</li> </ul>
	<b>Cultural Heritage</b> (SEA topic: Cultural Heritage, Landscape)	
7	To maintain and enhance the cultural heritage and assets of the District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it protect and enhance sites, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?</li> <li>• Will it support locally-based cultural resources and activities?</li> </ul>
	<b>Landscape &amp; Townscape</b> (SEA topic: Landscape, Cultural Heritage)	
8	To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does it seek to enhance the range and quality of the public realm and open spaces?</li> <li>• Will it contribute to the delivery of the enhancement, effective management and appropriate use of land in the urban fringe?</li> <li>• Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?</li> </ul>

**Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement**

	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it conserve (as preservation is neither realistic or desirable) the landscape character areas of the plan area?</li> <li>Will it preserve and/or enhance townscape character and value?</li> </ul>
<b>Climate Change &amp; Energy</b> (SEA topic: Climatic Factors)		
9	To reduce contributions to climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by reducing energy consumption?</li> <li>Will it lead to an increased proportion of energy needs being met from renewable sources?</li> <li>Does it adapt to and provide for the consequences of climate change in a largely low-lying area?</li> </ul>
<b>Water</b> (SEA topic: Water, Fauna & Flora)		
10	To improve water quality and reduce the risk of flooding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will it improve the quality of inland water?</li> <li>Will it improve the quality of coastal waters?</li> <li>Will it provide for an efficient water conservation and supply regime?</li> <li>Will it provide for effective wastewater treatment?</li> <li>Will it require the provision of sustainable drainage systems in new development?</li> <li>Will it reduce the risk of flooding?</li> <li>Will it integrate sustainable flood management which works with natural processes, presents habitat enhancement opportunities and is landscape character sensitive?</li> </ul>
<b>Land &amp; Soil</b> (SEA topic: Soils)		
11	To maintain and improve the quality of the District's land and soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does it ensure the re-use of previously-developed land and urban areas in preference to Greenfield sites, as far as is practicable given the characteristics of the District?</li> <li>Will higher-density development be promoted where appropriate?</li> </ul>

**Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement**

	<b>SA Objective</b>	<b>Decision-Aiding Question Will it (the Policy)...?</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will soil quality be preserved?</li> <li>• Will it promote the remediation of contaminated land?</li> <li>• Will the best and most versatile agricultural land be protected?</li> </ul>
<b>Air Quality</b> (SEA topic: Air, Climatic Factors)		
12	To improve air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will air quality be improved through reduced emissions (e.g. through reducing car travel)?</li> <li>• Will it direct transport movements away from AQMAs and/or potentially significant junctions?</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainable Design &amp; Construction</b> (SEA topic: Human Health, Material Assets, Climatic Factors, Fauna & Flora, Water, Air)		
13	To promote sustainable design and construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will it ensure the use of sustainable design principles, e.g. encouraging a mix of uses?</li> <li>• Will climate proofing design measures be incorporated?</li> <li>• Will the local character/vernacular be preserved and enhanced through development?</li> <li>• Will it require the re-use and recycling of construction materials?</li> <li>• Will it encourage locally-sourced materials?</li> <li>• Will it require best-practice sustainable construction methods, for example in energy and water efficiency?</li> </ul>

The second stage in the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal for the Development Management Plan (Stage B) encompassed the development and refinement of policies and assessment of effects. The six main tasks were as set out below.

## Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement

---

Stage	Task
B1	Testing the DPD objectives against the SA framework
B2	Developing the DPD options
B3	Predicting the effects of the DPD
B4	Evaluating the effects of the DPD
B5	Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects
B6	Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the DPD

A detailed assessment of the proposed policies and the alternative options against the SA objectives was undertaken as part of Stage C. A summary of the results was included in the SA Report, within the detailed assessment appended to the report. The results of this assessment were used to shape the Plan, including the selection and rejection of options.

The SA process also identified a number of recommendations to make the Plan more sustainable. The table appended to this document as **Appendix 1** demonstrates how the recommendations suggested at the Discussion and Consultation stage of the SA process was integrated into the Plan prior to finalisation of the draft policies. The appraisal of the draft Submission Document included recommendations embedded within it which were within the proposed policies, as an SA report for the Submission Document was produced alongside the Submission Document and informed its development.

Some of the key recommendations identified through the SA process include:

- Giving consideration to the inclusion of SUDs for small-scale developments of 10 units or less within the plan
- Making reference to the historic environment (such as Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings) as being an undesirable location for telecommunications development
- Providing additional guidance on the appropriate use of previously developed land in the Green Belt, for example for residential, retail and employment use in line with national policy
- Developing an additional policy on species protection

The recommendations identified throughout the SA process assisted in mitigating the potential impacts of the proposed policies and had a positive effect on the sustainability of the Plan. The SA report for the Development Management Submission Document found that overall there would be significant sustainability benefits in adopting the Plan as proposed.

Following the examination hearing session, and receipt of the Inspector's interim report on the soundness of the Development Management Submission Document, a Schedule of

---

## **Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement**

---

Modifications was produced. These modifications were subject to Sustainability Appraisal, and an addendum to the SA Report was produced.

This SA addendum concluded that 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.

The SA Addendum of the Schedule of Modifications to the Development Management Submission Document found that, overall, the proposed modifications would have positive sustainability benefits.

### **How the options and consultation responses received on the development plan document and sustainability appraisal reports have been taken into account**

Statutory consultees (Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency) were consulted on the draft SA Framework for the Development Management Plan between 5 March 2009 and 3 April 2009 by letters dated 5 March 2009.

Responses were received from Natural England, which have been taken into account and a revised SA Framework has subsequently been produced.

The initial stage of the Development Management Plan (the Discussion and Consultation Document) was consulted upon between 17 March and 30 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.

The draft SA Report was published in early 2012 alongside the Preferred Policy Options Document (an informal consultation stage) and general and specific consultees, including members of the public, were consulted on these documents 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 these are presented within the Development Management Submission Document SA Report (Appendix 4). These responses have been taken into account as appropriate.

The Submission Document and SA Report were consulted on for a period of six weeks between 3 June and 18 July 2013. The results of this consultation were considered through the examination process, culminating in the modifications to the Plan as set out in the Schedule of Modifications and, following further Sustainability Appraisal, incorporated into the adopted Plan.

**The reasons for choosing the development plan document in light of other reasonable alternatives**

The inclusion of the effects of ‘reasonable alternatives’ is required by the SEA Directive. ‘Reasonable alternatives’ should form part of both the SA and the plan, and the guidance notes that within DPDs will take the form of options.

The themes addressed in the Development Management Plan derive from the overarching approach of the Core Strategy and the 2006 Rochford District Replacement Local Plan policies saved beyond 15 June 2009.

The Discussion and Consultation Document set out the preferred options for each of the themes addressed and, where appropriate, a range of alternative options. An explanation accompanied each alternative option setting out why these were not preferred in each case. Comments were invited on these options between 16 January 2012 and 27 February 2012.

The reasoning for the different options presented in the Discussion and Consultation stage are detailed in Chapter 2-7 of the document which was out for formal consultation between 17 May 2010 and 30 April 2010.

Since then, other alternative options have been identified during the preparation of the Preferred Options and Submission of the Development Management Plan. The preferred options along with any other additional options which did not form part of the Discussion and Consultation Document were appraised within Appendix 3 of the Submission Document SA. These include the five newly-formed options identified during the preparation of the Development Management Plan.

The reasons for choosing the Development Plan Document in light of other reasonable alternatives – rejecting or selecting options – is set out in **Appendix 2**.

**Monitoring measures**

The SA process identified suitable indicators to monitor the SA Framework objectives. These are as follows:

<b>Potential Indicators</b>	
<b>1. Balanced Communities</b>	
	To ensure the delivery of high quality sustainable communities where people want to live and work
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Changing educational attainment at GCSE Level</li><li>• Proportion of persons in the local population with a degree level qualification.</li><li>• Parishes with a GP, post office, play area, pub, village hall</li><li>• Percentage of completed retail, office and leisure development in town centre</li><li>• Mix of housing tenure within settlements</li><li>• Provision of new <u>youth and</u> community facilities secured through new developments</li></ul>

<b>Potential Indicators</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Provision of open space secured through new developments</u></a></li> </ul>
<b>2.</b>	<p><b>Healthy &amp; Safe Communities</b></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"> <li>• Monitor the number of domestic burglaries, violent offences, vehicle crimes, vandalism and all crime per 1,000 population.</li> <li>• Percentage of residents surveyed who feel ‘fairly safe’ or ‘very safe’ during the day whilst outside in their Local Authority.</li> <li>• Indexes of Multiple Deprivation throughout the District.</li> <li>• Monitor the type and number of applications permitted in the greenbelt.</li> <li>• Life expectancy</li> <li>• Hectares of new greenspace created</li> <li>• Percentage of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award standard</li> <li>• Death rates from circulatory disease, cancer, accidents and suicide</li> <li>• Residents description of Health</li> <li>• Obesity levels</li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Provision of open space secured through new developments</u></a></li> </ul>
<b>3.</b>	<p><b>Housing</b></p> <p>To provide everybody with the opportunity to live in a decent home</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of unfit homes per 1,000 dwellings.</li> <li>• Indices of Multiple Deprivation – Housing and Services Domain</li> <li>• Percentage of households rented from the Council or in Housing Association/Registered Social Landlords properties</li> <li>• Percentage of new housing which is affordable</li> <li>• Average house price compared with average earnings</li> <li>• Number of housing Completions</li> <li>• <a href="#"><u>Percentage of Lifetime Homes</u></a></li> </ul>
<b>4.</b>	<p><b>Economy &amp; Employment</b></p> <p>To achieve sustainable levels of economic growth/prosperity and promote town centre vitality/viability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The changing diversity of main town centre uses (by number, type and amount of floorspace)</li> <li>• The changing density of development</li> <li>• Percentage change in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area</li> </ul>

<b>Potential Indicators</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of employees commuting out of the District to work</li> <li>• Amount of land developed for employment (by type)</li> <li>• Retail health checks/economic prosperity of smaller towns and villages</li> <li>• <u>Number of jobs created through new developments</u></li> </ul>	
<p><b>5. Accessibility</b></p> <p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes in the travel to work mode of transport</li> <li>• Indices of Multiple Deprivation most notably the Housing and Services Domain</li> <li>• Car ownership</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Kilometres of cycle routes and facilities for cyclists</li> <li>• Kilometres of new walking routes provided</li> <li>• Number of houses within a specified radius of services/facilities</li> <li>• Number of houses within a suitable distance of <u>open space (based on Natural England’s Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards – ANGSt<sup>1</sup>)</u></li> </ul>	
<p><b>6. Biodiversity</b></p> <p>To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment as an integral part of social, environmental and economic development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Net change in natural/ semi natural habitats</li> <li>• Change in areas and populations of biodiversity importance</li> <li>• Condition of designated sites</li> <li>• Change in area of woodland</li> <li>• Proportion of new developments delivering habitat creation or restoration</li> <li>• <u>Number of management plans for designated sites prepared and implemented</u></li> <li>• <u>Proportion of new developments delivering habitat mitigation</u></li> <li>• <u>Proportion of new developments delivering wildlife corridors</u></li> <li>• <u>Areas of geological significance safeguarded and/or extracted</u></li> </ul>	

<sup>1</sup> Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards available from: [http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east\\_of\\_england/ourwork/gi/accessiblenaturalgreenspacestandards/ngst.aspx](http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/regions/east_of_england/ourwork/gi/accessiblenaturalgreenspacestandards/ngst.aspx)

<b>Potential Indicators</b>	
<b>7. Cultural Heritage</b>	<p>To maintain and enhance the cultural heritage and assets of the District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Buildings of Grade I and II at risk of decay</li><li>• Condition of Conservation Areas</li><li>• Number of historic parks and gardens</li></ul>
<b>8. Landscape &amp; Townscape</b>	<p>To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To monitor the number of parks awarded Green Flag Status</li><li>• To monitor the number of landscape or built environment designations</li><li>• Hectares of new development outside settlement boundaries</li><li>• Hedgerow and/or veteran tree loss</li><li>• Area of /change in landscape designations</li><li>• Percentage of development on previously developed land</li></ul>
<b>9. Climate Change &amp; Energy</b>	<p>To reduce contributions to climate change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Changes in the travel to work mode of transport</li><li>• Greenhouse gas emissions</li><li>• Renewable energy capacity installed by type</li><li>• Percentage of new development including renewable energy generation</li><li>• Energy consumption</li><li>• <u>Code for Sustainable Homes/BREEAM compliance</u></li><li>• <u>Percentage of the tonnage of household waste arisings which have been recycled</u></li><li>• <u>Percentage of household waste sent by the Authority for composting or treatment by anaerobic digestion</u></li></ul>
<b>10. Water</b>	<p>To improve water quality and reduce the risk of flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Changing water quality</li><li>• Groundwater levels</li><li>• Percentage of new development incorporating water efficiency measures</li><li>• Water consumption per household</li><li>• Number of homes built against Environment Agency advice on flooding</li><li>• <u>Number and types of Sustainable Drainage Systems approved and implemented</u></li></ul>

<b>Potential Indicators</b>	
<b>11. Land &amp; Soil</b>	<p>To maintain and improve the quality of the District's land and soil</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use of previously developed land</li><li>• Density of new residential development</li><li>• Number of sites/hectares decontaminated as a result of new development</li></ul>
<b>12. Air Quality</b>	<p>To improve air quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• AQMA designations or threshold designations</li><li>• Growth in cars per household</li><li>• Growth in car trip generation</li><li>• Type of travel mode to work</li><li>• Percentage change in public transport patronage</li><li>• Number of days in the year when air quality is recorded as moderate or high for NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, CO and Ozone on average per site.</li></ul>
<b>13 Sustainable Design &amp; Construction</b>	<p>To promote sustainable design and construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Percentage of new development incorporating energy and water efficiency measures, and sustainable drainage systems</li><li>• Percentage of new development meeting BREEAM very good/excellent standards</li><li>• Percentage use of aggregates from secondary and recycled sources</li></ul>

## Appendix 1 – Inclusion of SA Recommendations in Policy Progression

Development management option/policy changes are marked in red and underlined (additions) and ~~striketrough~~ (deletions).

Development Management DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document 2010	Development Management Submission Document (2013)
<b>Housing, Character of Place and Residential Amenity</b>	
DM1 – Design of New Developments	Policy DM1 – Design of New Developments
DM2 – Density of New Developments	Policy DM2 – Density of New Developments
DM3 – Infilling and Residential Intensification	Policy DM3 – Infilling and Residential Intensification
DM4 – Habitable Floorspace for New Developments	Policy DM4 – Habitable Floorspace for New Developments
DM5 – Light Pollution	Policy DM5 – Light Pollution
DM6 – Telecommunications	Policy DM6 – Telecommunications
DM7 – Local List	Policy DM7 – Local List
DM8 – Demolition within Conservation Areas	Policy DM8 – Demolition within Conservation Areas
DM9 – Development <del>on the edge of</del> Conservation Areas	Policy DM9 – Development <u>outside, but close to the boundary of,</u> Conservation Areas
<b>The Green Belt and Countryside</b>	
-	<u>DM10 – Redevelopment of Previously Developed Land in the Green Belt</u>
DM <del>10</del> – Existing Businesses in the Green Belt	DM <del>10</del> <u>11</u> – Existing Businesses in the Green Belt
DM <del>11</del> – Rural Diversification	DM <del>11</del> <u>12</u> – Rural Diversification

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Development Management DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document 2010	Development Management Submission Document (2013)
DM <del>12</del> – Conversion of Existing Agricultural Buildings in the Green Belt	DM <del>12</del> <u>13</u> – Conversion of Existing Agricultural <u>and Rural</u> Buildings in the Green Belt
DM <del>13</del> – Green Tourism	Policy DM <del>13</del> <u>14</u> – Green Tourism
DM <del>14</del> – Equestrian Facilities	Policy DM <del>14</del> <u>15</u> – Equestrian Facilities
DM <del>15</del> – Playing Pitches and Other Leisure and Recreational Activities	Policy DM <del>15</del> <u>16</u> – Playing Pitches and Other Leisure and Recreational Activities
DM <del>16</del> – Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt	Policy DM <del>16</del> <u>17</u> – Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt
DM <del>17</del> – Agricultural, Forestry and Other Occupational Dwellings	Policy DM <del>17</del> <u>18</u> – Agricultural, Forestry and Other Occupational Dwellings
DM <del>18</del> – Temporary Agricultural Dwellings	Policy DM <del>18</del> <u>19</u> – Temporary Agricultural Dwellings
DM <del>19</del> – Basements in the Green Belt	Policy DM <del>19</del> <u>20</u> – Basements in the Green Belt
DM <del>20</del> – The Replacement or Rebuild of Existing Dwellings in the Green Belt	Policy DM <del>20</del> <u>21</u> – The Replacement or Rebuild of Existing Dwellings in the Green Belt
DM <del>21</del> – Extension of Domestic Gardens in the Green Belt	Policy DM <del>21</del> <u>22</u> – Extension of Domestic Gardens in the Green Belt
DM <del>22</del> – Conservation Areas and the Green Belt	Policy DM <del>22</del> <u>23</u> – Conservation Areas and the Green Belt
<b>Environmental Issues</b>	
DM <del>23</del> – Houseboats	Policy DM <del>23</del> <u>24</u> – Houseboats
-	<u>Policy DM<del>24</del><u>25</u> – Trees and Woodlands</u>
DM <del>24</del> – Other Important Landscape Features	Policy DM <del>24</del> <u>26</u> – Other Important Landscape Features

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Development Management DPD: Discussion and Consultation Document 2010	Development Management Submission Document (2013)
-	<a href="#">Policy DM27 – Species and Habitat Protection</a>
-	<a href="#">Policy DM28 – Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs)</a>
-	<a href="#">Policy DM29 – Air Quality</a>
<b>Transport</b>	
DM25 – Parking Standards	Policy DM30 – Parking Standards
DM26 – Traffic Management	Policy DM31 – Traffic Management
<b>Economic Development</b>	
DM27 – Employment Land	Policy DM32 – Employment Land
DM28 – Working from Home	Policy DM33 – Working from Home
<b>Retail and Town Centres</b>	
DM29 – Town Centre Shopping Frontages	Policy DM34 – Town Centre Shopping Frontages
DM30 – Upper Floor Locations in Town Centres	Policy DM35 – Upper Floor Locations in Town Centres
DM34 – Village and Neighbourhood Shops	Policy DM36 – Village <a href="#">Shops</a> and Neighbourhood <a href="#">Shops-Shopping Areas</a>
DM32 – Advertisements	Policy DM37 – Advertisements
DM33 – Advertisements affecting Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings	Policy DM38 – Advertisements affecting Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings

## Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

The table below demonstrates how the recommendations suggested throughout the SA process have been integrated into the document prior to finalisation of the proposed draft policies.

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
<b>Housing, Character of Place and Residential Amenity</b>		
DM1 – Design of New Developments	<p>Additional explanatory text on the purpose of Concept Statements should be considered within the text preceding the options.</p> <p>Rewording the second paragraph may ensure a greater positive impact on equal opportunities through making sure that all of the criteria specified are taken into account in the determination of planning applications, as appropriate. It is therefore recommended that ‘in particular, consider’ is replaced with ‘take into account the following’.</p> <p>Inclusion of criteria relating to light pollution could strengthen the policy.</p> <p>The option could be strengthened by including criteria to account for lifetime and sheltered homes.</p> <p>In terms of conserving and enhancing natural/semi natural habitats, this option could be strengthened. In terms of facilitating species movement and colonisation, this option could also be strengthened.</p>	<p>Additional information explaining the purpose of the concept Statements has been included within the document.</p> <p>The second paragraph has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>This issue is covered elsewhere in the LDF and has not been included.</p> <p>This issue is covered elsewhere in the LDF and has not been included.</p> <p>The retention of trees has been included in the policy.</p>

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p>This option makes reference to considering the ‘impact on designated sites’ which could be considered ambiguous in terms of seeking to maintain and enhance sites designated for their nature conservation interest. It is recommended that this text is amended to strengthen the consideration of sites of nature conservation importance in the design of development and the determination of applications. The option may be amended as follows: ‘impact on the natural environment such as sites of nature conservation importance’ to reflect the varying scales of nature conservation designations.</p> <p>The criteria relating to the impact on designated sites, Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings could be strengthened to specifically make reference to the wider historic environment (such as archaeological features).</p> <p>This option could be more explicit in linking local open space requirements with the findings of the Open Space Study.</p> <p><u>Consideration should be given to the inclusion of SUDs for small-scale developments of 10 units or less within the plan. This would ensure that all new development would consider the inclusion of SUDs into their design which would have a greater positive impact on this objective.</u></p>	<p>The amendment has been made to the text accordingly.</p> <p>The amendment has been made to the text accordingly.</p> <p>Reference has been made to the Open Space Study in the policy.</p> <p><u>A new policy relating to the implementation of SUDs for development of 10 units or less has been included in the Submission Document.</u></p>

**Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1**

<b>Initial Options/ Proposed Policy</b>	<b>Recommendations for policy development and mitigation</b>	<b>How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?</b>
DM2 – Density of New Developments	<p>It may be advisable to replace ‘optimise the capacity of the site’ in the first paragraph of the option with ‘make efficient use of the site area’ to ensure this requirement is clear.</p> <p>The plan acknowledges that density varies across the District, however, it may be advisable to include an illustration of this variation by sampling densities by ward area for example.</p>	<p>The amendment has been made to the text accordingly.</p> <p>A diagram showing the average sampled density of the District has been included in the accompanying text.</p>
DM3 – Infilling and Residential Intensification	<p>Rewording the first sentence of this option may ensure a greater positive impact on equal opportunities through making sure that all of the criteria specified are taken into account in the determination of planning applications, as appropriate. It is therefore recommended that ‘will be assessed against the following criteria’ with ‘should consider’.</p> <p>To further aid the delivery of good design within development proposals it is recommended that an additional criterion is included within the option in relation to the avoidance of tandem relationships between dwellings. Additional explanatory text should also be provided to accompany this option.</p>	<p>The amendment has been made to the policy accordingly.</p> <p>The amendment has been made to the policy accordingly.</p>
DM4 – Habitable Floorspace for New	<p>The text within the option should be amended to avoid duplication and misinterpretation.</p>	<p>The text within the policy has been revised.</p>

**Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1**

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
Developments	It is recommended that reference to the Lifetime Homes Standard is made within the option to ensure that this requirement is also taken into consideration in the design of developments and the determination of applications. Further reference to this standard and explanatory text should be provided to support the option.	This has been included within the policy and explanatory text provided in the preamble to the policy.
DM5 – Light Pollution	It is recommended that this option is further expanded upon to include reference 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. This should also be explained in the accompanying text.	Suitable wording relating to the design, appearance and scales of proposed lighting has been included where appropriate.
DM6 – Telecommunications	<p>It is recommended that ‘and should be to the Council’s satisfaction’ is removed from this option to ensure clarity and avoid misinterpretation.</p> <p>It is recommended that explicit reference is made to the importance of local, national and international sites in the determination of applications both within the option and accompanying text.</p> <p>Reference is made to the impact of proposals on the built environment in the supporting text to this option; however, it is recommended that reference is made to the historic environment (such as Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings) being an undesirable location for telecommunications development.</p>	<p>The text has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>Appropriate reference has been made to areas of nature conservation importance, and other sensitive areas.</p> <p>Reference has been made to need to give consideration to areas of historic importance within point ii of the policy when proposing telecommunications development.</p>

**Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1**

<b>Initial Options/ Proposed Policy</b>	<b>Recommendations for policy development and mitigation</b>	<b>How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?</b>
DM7 – Local List	<p>It is recommended that in the first sentence ‘be sensitive to’ should be replaced with ‘complement’ to make the requirement to take into consideration the existing character of the building more flexible in design terms.</p> <p>It is suggested that the third paragraph is moved from the preferred option to the supporting text, and ‘We expect owners’ in the fourth paragraph is replaced with ‘Owners should’ to reflect the lack of statutory protection for buildings and structures on the Local List.</p> <p>It is recommended that the second paragraph of the option is amended as follows: ‘Extensions should be sensitive to the character and visual balance of the building, unless circumstances exist which outweigh the need to conserve the original building.’ Amending this sentence would bring this option in line with guidance in Planning Policy Statement 5 regarding impact on heritage assets which are not designated assets.</p>	<p>The text has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>The text has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>The text has been amended accordingly.</p>

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
DM8 – Demolition within Conservation Areas	-	<i>No recommendations were proposed for this option/policy.</i>
DM9 – Development on the edge of Conservation Areas	<p>It is recommended that the section heading, supporting text and option heading are amended to make it clear what exactly this option relates to (i.e. the area outside but close to the boundary of a Conservation Area). This would ensure clarity and avoid misinterpretation.</p> <p>It is recommended that the second paragraph of this option is amended to make this clearer and to avoid misinterpretation. This would further aid the delivery of good design.</p>	<p>The supporting text, headings and policy have been amended as appropriate.</p> <p>The second paragraph has been amended accordingly.</p>
<b>The Green Belt and Countryside</b>		
DM10 – Existing Businesses in the Green Belt	<p>It is recommended that additional supporting text is added to explain what the ‘original building’ in this option refers to. This would make this clearer and avoid misinterpretation.</p> <p>It is recommended that the 25% threshold for extensions referred to in the supporting text should be included within this option should it be taken forward.</p> <p>This option does not consider the potential impact of extensions to existing business premises on the historic environment. It is recommended, however, that the impact on the historic environment is included within this option.</p>	<p>Additional text to explain the meaning of ‘original building’ has been included within the supporting text.</p> <p>The 25% threshold has been removed from the supporting text (see below). Applications for extensions will be determined on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The historic environment has been included as a consideration within this policy.</p>

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p>Rather than supporting potentially significant extensions to existing business premises in the Green Belt for all original buildings regardless of their size, it is recommended that the supporting text of the preferred option is amended to remove the 25% allowance and include text on determining such applications on a case by case basis. This would ensure that there is a greater positive impact on landscape character and the openness of the Green Belt through balancing this against the needs of the business in question, the potential size of the building with an extension and PPG2.</p> <p><u>It is considered that the policy could be further strengthened through the inclusion of text that would ensure that development would not adversely impact on the countryside and areas of ecological importance.</u></p>	<p>The suggested amendment has been made accordingly.</p> <p><u>Additional text has been included in the policy.</u></p>
DM11 – Rural Diversification	<p>It is recommended that ‘agricultural buildings’ within the supporting text should be amended to ‘agricultural and rural buildings’ to ensure that this option encompasses a range of agricultural and non-agricultural buildings. Where ‘agricultural and farm buildings’ is referred to in the plan, these should also be amended accordingly to ensure consistency.</p> <p>This option could be further strengthened by the inclusion of a reference to the historic environment.</p> <p>It is recommended that the term ‘agricultural potential’ within this option is amended to ‘agricultural value’ to make this clearer.</p>	<p>The suggested amendment has been made accordingly in the plan.</p> <p>The policy includes reference to the historic environment.</p> <p>This has been amended within the policy accordingly.</p>

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p><u>It is suggested that the policy should state whether new buildings, and in particular infilling, would be permitted as part of rural diversification, as this could have an impact on landscape character.</u></p>	<p><u>Additional text has been included within the policy to state that such development is not supported.</u></p>
	<p><u>It is considered that the policy could be further strengthened through the inclusion of text that would ensure that development would not adversely impact on the countryside and areas of ecological importance.</u></p>	<p><u>Additional text has been included within the policy.</u></p>
	<p><u>With the change to national policy, it may also be useful in terms of the promotion of sustainable development to provide additional guidance on the appropriate use of previously developed land in the Green Belt, for example for residential, retail and employment use. This would ensure that windfall development on previously developed land is appropriate to its location and has positive sustainability implications for the local landscape as well as the wider community.</u></p>	<p><u>An additional policy that addresses the development of previously developed land in the Green Belt has been included within the Submission Document.</u></p>
<p>DM12 – Conversion of Existing Agricultural Buildings in the Green Belt</p>	<p>It is recommended that ‘original building’ referred to in this option should have the same definition as elsewhere in the plan (relating to agricultural or rural buildings) to ensure consistency and avoid misinterpretation. As such ‘(at the date of application)’ should be removed from this option.</p>	<p>The suggested amendments have been made accordingly.</p>

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p>This option does not support the conversion of existing agricultural buildings for residential use as set out in the supporting text. However, this should be further explained and this should be explicitly set out in this option to make it clearer and avoid misinterpretation.</p> <p>Whilst this option supports the conversion of listed agricultural buildings, however, it should be further reinforced in the supporting text that this option complements the potential for rural diversification in the Green Belt, but it does not support the resurrection of redundant agricultural and rural buildings.</p> <p>The objectives of this option could be further strengthened by the inclusion of a reference to locally listed agricultural and rural buildings to ensure that the same consideration is given to Listed Buildings and those on the Local List in the determination of proposals.</p> <p><u>It is considered that the policy could be further strengthened through the inclusion of text that would ensure that development would not adversely impact on the countryside and areas of ecological importance.</u></p>	<p>This amendment has been included within the policy.</p> <p>The suggested amendment to the supporting text has been made accordingly.</p> <p>The suggested amendment has been made to the supporting text.</p> <p><u>Additional text has been included within the policy.</u></p>
DM13 – Green Tourism	<p>This option could be strengthened through including reference to the historic environment.</p> <p>It is recommended that the term ‘agricultural potential’ within this option is amended to ‘agricultural value’ to make this clearer.</p>	<p>This amendment has been included within the policy.</p> <p>The suggested amendment has been made accordingly.</p>

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p><u>It is considered that the policy could be further strengthened through the inclusion of text that would ensure that development would not adversely impact on the countryside and areas of ecological importance.</u></p>	<p><u>Additional text has been included within the policy.</u></p>
<p>DM14 – Equestrian Facilities</p>	<p>This option does not include reference to light pollution, and given the likely rural nature of any development, it therefore gives rise to the potential for light pollution. It is therefore recommended that to strengthen the management of equestrian facilities future policies should include reference to minimising light pollution.</p> <p>It is recommended that the impact on the historic environment is included within this option.</p> <p>It is recommended that the second criterion should be amended to ‘proposals for buildings to serve private or commercial livery use are located near to existing settlements and in a sustainable location, unless justification for alternative siting is demonstrated’, as other potentially more rural areas may be suitable for such development.</p> <p>Reference to landscape character areas should be included within this option to strengthen this consideration.</p> <p>This option does not consider the potential impact of equestrian development on the different grades of agricultural land. It is recommended that the impact on the agricultural land is included within this option.</p>	<p>The policy has been amended to include reference to light.</p> <p>The suggested amendment has been made accordingly.</p> <p>The suggested amendment has been made accordingly.</p> <p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p> <p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p>

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p><u>It is considered that the policy could be further strengthened through the inclusion of text that would ensure that development would not adversely impact on the countryside and areas of ecological importance.</u></p>	<p><u>Additional text has been included within the policy.</u></p>
<p>DM15 – Playing Pitches and Other Leisure and Recreational Activities</p>	<p>This option seeks to take into consideration the potential impact of leisure facilities proposals on areas of nature conservation interest. This would ensure that sites designated for their nature conservation interest are maintained. This requirement should also be referenced within the supporting text to this option.</p> <p>The potential impact of additional development of playing pitches, and other leisure and recreational activities on the historic environment is not considered within this option. It is recommended, however, that the impact on the historic environment is included within this option.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to strengthen this option by adding conditions to take into consideration the quality of agricultural land when locating playing pitches and other leisure and recreational activities, which could have a positive impact on soil quality. It is recommended that the impact of such development on the different grades of agricultural land is included within this option.</p> <p><u>It is considered that the policy could be further strengthened through the inclusion of text that would ensure that development would not adversely impact on the countryside and areas of ecological importance.</u></p>	<p>The suggested amendment has been made to the supporting text.</p> <p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p> <p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p> <p><u>Additional text has been included within the policy.</u></p>

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
DM16 – Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt	<p>It is recommended that the second point is amended to ‘the proposal has been designed so as to avoid impact on the character and appearance of the Green Belt through its scale, mass and orientation’ as any extension to an existing dwelling would impact on openness. This should be further explained in the supporting text.</p> <p>The last sentence within this option in relation to permitted development extensions should be amended to generic wording so that it is not out of date when permitted development rights change. This should be amended elsewhere in the plan to ensure consistency.</p> <p>The supporting text to this option should also state whether the floorspace refers to internal or external floorspace to make this clear.</p> <p><u>It is considered that the policy could be further strengthened through the inclusion of text that would ensure that development would not adversely impact on the countryside and areas of ecological importance.</u></p>	<p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p> <p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p> <p>The suggested amendment has been made to the supporting text.</p> <p><u>Additional text has been included within the policy.</u></p>
DM17 – Agricultural, Forestry and Other Occupational Dwellings	<p><u>It is considered that the policy could be further strengthened through the inclusion of text that would ensure that development would not adversely impact on the countryside and areas of ecological importance.</u></p>	<p><u>Additional text has been included within the policy.</u></p>
DM18 – Temporary Agricultural Dwellings	<p><u>It is considered that the policy could be further strengthened through the inclusion of text that would ensure that development would not adversely impact on the countryside and areas of ecological importance.</u></p>	<p><u>Additional text has been included within the policy.</u></p>

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
DM19 – Basements in the Green Belt	<p>The last sentence within this option in relation to permitted development extensions should be amended to generic wording so that it is not out of date when permitted development rights change. This should be amended elsewhere in the plan to ensure consistency.</p> <p>It is recommended that the supporting text to the preferred option is amended to include basement extensions within the 25% increase in floorspace allowance for dwellings in the Green Belt.</p> <p><u>It is considered that the policy could be further strengthened through the inclusion of text that would ensure that development would not adversely impact on the countryside and areas of ecological importance.</u></p>	<p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p> <p>The suggested amendment was not taken forward as it was considered that basement extensions would not have a fundamental impact on landscape character and the openness of the Green Belt as such, and in any case, development of extensions up to 25% of the original dwelling under Policy DM16 may be permitted.</p> <p><u>Additional text has been included within the policy.</u></p>
DM20 – The Replacement or Rebuild of Existing Dwellings in the Green Belt	<p>It is recommended that ‘to the Council’s satisfaction’ is removed from this option to ensure clarity and avoid misinterpretation.</p> <p>The last sentence within this option in relation to permitted development extensions should also be amended to generic wording so that it is not out of date when permitted development rights change. This should be amended elsewhere in the plan to ensure consistency.</p> <p><u>It is considered that the policy could be further strengthened through the inclusion of text that would ensure that development would not adversely impact on the countryside and areas of ecological importance.</u></p>	<p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p> <p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p> <p><u>Additional text has been included within the policy.</u></p>

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
DM21 – Extension of Domestic Gardens in the Green Belt	<p>There is an opportunity to strengthen this option by adding conditions to ensure that areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value in urban and rural areas are protected. It is therefore recommended that the historic environment is referred to in this option.</p> <p>There is the opportunity to strengthen this option by adding criteria to ensure that the extension of a domestic garden in the Green Belt would not encroach on other areas of open space as set out in PPG17.</p> <p>This option could be further strengthened by including reference to the appropriateness of the boundary treatment proposed for the extended garden area, as this could have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt, character of the countryside and landscape character.</p> <p>The size of the proposed extension should also be taken into consideration in the determination of applications to ensure that this is considered and to minimise the impact of the proposed extension.</p> <p>It is recommended that another sentence is included within this option in relation to permitted development rights. It should be stated that permitted development rights will be restricted for proposals to extend domestic gardens in the Green Belt.</p>	<p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p> <p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p> <p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p> <p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p> <p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p>
DM22 – Conservation Areas and the Green Belt	<p><u>It is suggested that the first part of the second point in the policy is amended to “The use of the building to be replaced is retained” to ensure clarity.</u></p>	<p><u>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</u></p>

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p><u>It is considered that the policy could be further strengthened through the inclusion of text that would ensure that development would not adversely impact on the countryside and areas of ecological importance.</u></p>	<p><u>Additional text has been included within the policy.</u></p>
<b>Environmental Issues</b>		
DM23 – Houseboats	<p>This option could be further strengthened by the inclusion of reference to potential impact on the wider historic environment.</p> <p><u>It could be further strengthened by making reference to other waterways such as natural/man-made lakes to ensure that these are covered. This would ensure a greater positive impact on the natural environment through protecting such areas from inappropriate development.</u></p> <p><u>The definition of houseboats may also be reviewed to include other waterways and to ensure that certain boats are not excluded.</u></p>	<p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p> <p><u>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</u></p> <p><u>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</u></p>
DM24 – Trees and Woodlands	<p><u>To strengthen biodiversity conservation and enhancement further, the inclusion of an additional policy on species protection should be considered. This would ensure that the plan would have a greater positive impact on this objective in the longer term.</u></p>	<p><u>An additional policy on species protection has been included within the Submission Document.</u></p>
DM25 – Other Important Landscape Features [previously DM24]	<p>There is an opportunity to strengthen this option through the inclusion of additional criteria to encourage the creation of new habitats with new development.</p>	<p>Additional text has been included within the policy in relation to the appropriate management or replacement of important landscape features.</p>

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
DM26 – Species Protection	-	<i>No recommendations were proposed for this option/policy.</i>
DM27 – Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs)	-	<i>No recommendations were proposed for this option/policy.</i>
DM28 – Air Quality	-	<i>No recommendations were proposed for this option/policy.</i>
<b>Transport</b>		
DM29 – Parking Standards [previously DM25]	-	<i>No recommendations were proposed for this option/policy.</i>
DM30 – Traffic Management [previously DM26]	<p>There is an opportunity to strengthen this option through the addition of conditions to ensure the protection and enhancement of the environment.</p> <p>This option could be strengthened with the addition of criteria to ensure that the delivery is of high quality, safe and inclusive design through making reference to the Highways Agency guidance ‘Design Manual for Roads and Bridges’. Reference should also be made to Transport Impact Assessments and associated guidance.</p> <p>This option does not consider the impact on the natural environment. There is an opportunity to strengthen this option through the addition of conditions to ensure the protection and enhancement of the environment through traffic management.</p>	<p>The policy has been amended to include reference to the potential impact on the natural, built and historic environment.</p> <p>Transport impact assessments are required within the adopted Core Strategy. The supporting text has been amended to include reference to these impact assessments and appropriate guidance.</p> <p>The policy has been amended to include reference to the natural environment as a consideration when determining planning applications.</p>

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p>There is an opportunity to strengthen this option through the addition of conditions to ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic environment.</p>	<p>The policy has been amended to include reference to the historic and built environment as a consideration when determining planning applications.</p>
<b>Economic Development</b>		
<p>DM31 – Employment Land [previously DM27]</p>	<p>There is the potential to strengthen this option by adding criteria to ensure that any infrastructure commensurate with new employment land, or existing employment land, is phased to meet ongoing and future community needs.</p> <p>This option could be strengthened through the addition of criteria to ensure that the design of any additional employment structures be of a high quality, safe and inclusive design.</p> <p>This option could be strengthened to ensure that any potential increase in light and noise pollution be mitigated against.</p> <p>It is recommended that the reasons for preferring the predominance of B1 and B2 uses on new and existing employment is explained further in the accompanying text to this option.</p> <p>The compatibility of alternative uses with existing uses should also be included within this option and the supporting text (for example the appropriateness of leisure uses to be situated in proximity to heavy industry).</p>	<p>The supporting text has been amended to include reference to the appropriate phasing of associated infrastructure.</p> <p>This has been included within the policy.</p> <p>This has been included within the policy.</p> <p>This has been explained further in the supporting text.</p> <p>This has been explained further in the supporting text.</p>

Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	<p>This option could include reference to sustainable transport issues, which could be further emphasised in the supporting text to this option.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to strengthen this option to include some location specific criteria helping to ensure that employment land is located in the best possible locations but this would be inappropriate given the relationship of this plan with other documents in the LDF such as the Allocations DPD. It is recommended that this is explained in the supporting text to the option as this is covered elsewhere in the LDF.</p>	<p>Appropriate reference has been made to transport methods.</p> <p>The supporting text has been amended accordingly.</p>
<p>DM32 – Working From Home [previously DM28]</p>	<p>It is recommended that the first point within this option is amended from ‘is ancillary to the residential use’ to ‘remains linked to the residential use’ to make this clearer.</p> <p>It is 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 such as nail bars and dog grooming businesses. This should be amended in the option and explained in the supporting text.</p>	<p>The suggested amendment has been made to the policy.</p> <p>The supporting text has been amended accordingly.</p>
<p><b>Retail and Town Centres</b></p>		
<p>DM33 – Town Centre Shopping Frontages [previously DM29]</p>	<p>It is recommended that what constitutes a cluster of uses as set out in the option is explained in the supporting text to ensure clarity and avoid misinterpretation.</p>	<p>The supporting text has been amended accordingly.</p>

**Rochford District Council – Development Management Plan SA/SEA Adoption Statement: Appendix 1**

Initial Options/ Proposed Policy	Recommendations for policy development and mitigation	How have the SA recommendations for policy development and mitigation been taken into account?
	The supporting text should explain what threshold for retail use should be applied if the Retail and Leisure Study is not up to date.	The supporting text has been amended accordingly.
DM34 – Upper Floor Locations in Town Centres [previously DM30]	In the supporting text it is recommended that what constitutes a net loss is explained further.	The supporting text has been amended accordingly.
DM35 – Village and Neighbourhood Shops [previously DM31]	<p>It is recommended that an additional issue is included within this option; on-street parking, to ensure that this is taken into consideration in the determination of applications for non-retail uses.</p> <p>It is considered that this policy could be further strengthened in terms of the mix of retail and non-retail uses in village and neighbourhood shopping frontage areas through the inclusion of criteria relating to the conversion of non-retail units to residential. This would ensure that proposals would not be detrimental to the vitality of the village/neighbourhood.</p>	<p>The policy has been amended as suggested.</p> <p>The policy has been amended to address proposals for the conversion of non-retail units for residential use with villages and neighbourhoods.</p>
DM36 – Advertisements [previously DM32]	The potential for incorrect illumination of advertisements to cause light pollution should be set out within the supporting text to this option. Appropriate guidance on advertisements should also be referred to.	The supporting text has been amended accordingly.
DM37 – Advertisements affecting Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings [previously DM33]	-	<i>No recommendations were proposed for this option/policy.</i>

## **Appendix 2 – Options / Reasonable Alternatives Considered**

The tables below summarise the options / reasonable alternatives considered for the Development Management Plan, 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 Plan, 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.

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.

### **Infilling and Residential Intensification (DM3)**

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.

### **Local List (DM7)**

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

### **Rural Diversification (DM12)**

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.

### **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.

### **Playing Pitches and Other Leisure and Recreational Activities (DM16)**

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

### **Playing Pitches and Other Leisure and Recreational Activities (DM16)**

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.

### **Basements in the Green Belt (DM20)**

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.

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 and the Allocations DPD, 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 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

### **Working From Home (DM33)**

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.