



www.landuse.co.uk

Braintree District Publication Draft Local Plan - Sustainability Appraisal Report

Prepared by LUC
May 2017

Project Title: Sustainability Appraisal for Braintree District Publication Draft Local Plan

Client: Braintree District Council

Version	Date	Version Details	Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
0.1	30/3/2017	Internal draft	Jeremy Owen Jonathan Pearson Sarah Smith Sarah Temple Ciara McGuinness Shontelle Williams	Jeremy Owen Jonathan Pearson Sarah Smith	Jeremy Owen
1	19/5/2017	Draft for Council Meeting	Jonathan Pearson Sarah Smith Sarah Temple	Jeremy Owen Jonathan Pearson Sarah Smith	Jeremy Owen



www.landuse.co.uk

Braintree District Publication Draft Local Plan - Sustainability Appraisal Report

Prepared by LUC
May 2017

DRAFT

Planning & EIA
Design
Landscape Planning
Landscape Management
Ecology
Mapping & Visualisation

LUC LONDON
43 Chalton Street
London NW1 1JD
T 020 7383 5784
F 020 7383 4798
london@landuse.co.uk

Offices also in:
Bristol
Glasgow
Edinburgh



FS 566056
EMS 566057

Land Use Consultants Ltd
Registered in England
Registered number: 2549296
Registered Office:
43 Chalton Street
London NW1 1JD

LUC uses 100% recycled paper

Contents

1	Introduction	7
	The Local Plan area	7
	The Braintree District Publication Draft Local Plan	7
	Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment	9
	Structure of this report	13
2	Methodology	15
	Stages of SA	15
	Overarching approach to the assessment	27
	Approach to the SA of site allocations	29
	Difficulties encountered	35
3	Sustainability context for development in Braintree District	36
	Review of plans, policies and programmes	36
	Baseline information	37
	Key sustainability issues and their likely evolution without the Draft Local Plan	38
4	SA findings for the Publication Draft Local Plan Vision and Objectives	45
5	SA findings for the 'Spatial Strategy'	49
6	SA findings for the 'Prosperous District' policies and reasonable alternatives	63
	A Strong Economy	64
	Shops and Services	84
	Homes	97
	Transport & Infrastructure	153
7	SA findings for the 'Creating Better Places' policies and reasonable alternatives	163
	A healthy and active district	166
	Creating high quality spaces	172
	Conservation areas	175
	Heritage assets	182
	Demolition of listed buildings or structures	184
	Enabling development	186
	Sites of archaeological importance	188
	Community facilities	190
8	SA findings for the 'District's Natural Environment' policies and reasonable alternatives	196
	Biodiversity, landscape character and agriculture	197
	Land, water and air quality	208
	Climate change and air quality	210
	Flood risk and surface water drainage	218
	External lighting	224
9	Delivery and Implementation	226
	Implementation and Monitoring	226
10	Summary of SA findings for the site allocations and reasonable alternatives	228

SA findings for the Draft Local Plan site options	228
SA findings for the preferred site allocations	238
SA findings for additional site options	246
Summary of SA findings for the Publication Draft Local Plan site allocations	252
11 Cumulative effects of the Publication Draft Local Plan	261
Introduction	261
Cumulative effects assessment	267
12 Monitoring	277
Monitoring	277
13 Next steps	283
Next steps	283
Appendix 1	
Review of other relevant plans and programmes	
Appendix 2	
Baseline information	
Appendix 3	
Proposed assessment framework for SA of policies	
Appendix 4	
Proposed assessment framework for SA of site allocations	
Appendix 5	
Screening of site options for the potential to have significant effects	
Appendix 6	
Detailed assessment forms for site allocation options	
Appendix 7	
Detailed assessment forms for sites allocated in the Publication Draft Local Plan	
Appendix 8	
Consultation comments on SA at Issues and Scoping stage, and the Draft Local Plan stage	
Appendix 9	
Reasons for selecting or rejecting site options	
Appendix 10	
Maps showing the locations of allocated sites	

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This Sustainability Appraisal Report has been prepared by LUC as part of the integrated Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the emerging Braintree Local Plan.
- 1.2 This report relates to the Publication Draft Local Plan being prepared for Regulation 19¹ consultation and it should be read in conjunction with that document.

The Local Plan area

- 1.3 Braintree District is a rural district in the north of Essex and is the second largest district by area in the County. Just over half of the residents live in the three main towns of Braintree, Witham and Halstead, with the remainder living in the attractive rural areas, where there are about 60 villages, including six larger villages. The District lies between the regional growth centres of Chelmsford, Colchester and Cambridge and is close to Stansted Airport and the M11, the Haven Ports and is about 45 minutes journey time by rail from London.
- 1.4 Braintree is the main market town in the District and provides employment, town centre retailing and community services. In addition, on the edge of the town, the Freeport Factory Outlet Centre and adjacent retail park provide retail and leisure facilities, which serve an area that extends outside of the District.
- 1.5 Witham and Halstead are smaller market towns which provide employment, retail and community services. All three of the settlements contain town centres with some areas in need of regeneration. There are also two large areas in need of regeneration at former factory sites in Silver End (between Braintree and Witham) and Sible Hedingham (north west of Halstead). Witham is situated on the main London to Norwich railway line, as are the adjoining villages of Hatfield Peverel and Kelvedon, and there are significant levels of commuting from these stations, particularly to London and Chelmsford. The towns of Haverhill and Sudbury adjoin the District and provide services for residents in the northern, more isolated, rural areas of the District.

The Braintree District Publication Draft Local Plan

The Environment Report should include:

'an outline of the contents and main objectives of the plan or programme and of its relationship with other relevant plans and programmes'

(SEA Regulations Schedule 2(1))

- 1.6 The Braintree District Core Strategy was adopted in 2011. A Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) was produced in the first half of 2014 to update the Council's evidence on housing need. The SHMA indicates that between 761 and 883 new dwellings are required per year in the District to 2026; this is substantially more than the annual provision in the Core Strategy (based on the old East of England Regional Strategy target) of 273 dwellings per year. In light of this new housing evidence and the new national policy requirements in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the Council resolved in June 2014 not to proceed with its draft Site Allocations and Development Management Plan, for which Publication consultation had been completed, and instead commence work on a new Local Plan.

¹ Of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

- 1.7 The Braintree District Local Plan will include all major planning policy for the District in a single document and will need to meet the requirements of the NPPF, key aspects of which are set out in Chapter 3 of this SA Report. Once complete, it will replace both the Core Strategy (adopted 2011) and the Local Plan Review saved policies (adopted 2005). Responsibilities for minerals and waste development plans will remain at the County level and the Braintree District Local Plan will therefore need to take account of the Essex Minerals Local Plan (adopted 2014) and the saved policies of the Essex Waste Local Plan (adopted 2001) until the emerging Replacement Waste Local Plan is adopted. Local communities may choose to produce a neighbourhood plan for their area in order to set out a vision and planning policies for the use and development of land in a neighbourhood. Any such plans will need to be in conformity with the strategic policies in the Braintree District Local Plan.
- 1.8 The work completed on the Site Allocations and Development Management Plan and the comments which were received during consultation on the Publication draft of that document will be rolled forward into the new Local Plan. It is therefore not the intention of the Council to review in detail all the decisions relating to minor site allocations and settlement boundary changes which have been agreed by the Local Development Framework (LDF) Sub Committee and Council over the last two years. The Council also adopted an Interim Planning Policy Statement in September 2014 which states, *'The Council accordingly adopts the land allocations and development management policies detailed within the ADMP for use within development management decision-making. The Council is of the view that these robust and clear statements should be given appropriate weight in all matters under consideration and that these are material considerations for the Council'*.
- 1.9 The Local Plan will set out the Council's strategy for future development and growth in the District up to 2033 and will include strategic policies, development management policies and site allocations. Having completed a SHMA, the Council carried out a study to calculate its Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) which indicates a need for 845 net new homes per annum during 2013-2037 and a suggested housing target in the range 793-845 net new homes per annum. The Council also carried out a Call for Sites during August-October 2014 to identify potential sites for development.
- 1.10 As the Council has to plan for a larger number of new homes in the District than were provided for in the Core Strategy, it will need to look at larger and/or more numerous development sites. This could include urban extensions like Great Notley, which was built in the early 2000s, or new settlements which could follow Garden City or Garden Suburb design principles.
- 1.11 The Local Plan is not just about new homes but must ensure that housing growth is supported by infrastructure, jobs and community facilities. Various other evidence documents are being or have been prepared to support the Local Plan, including on landscape, open space, economic development and highways. The Council is working with key stakeholders such as the NHS, education and highways authorities to ensure that vital community facilities such as schools, GP surgeries and roads and public transport links are in place to support existing residents as well as new communities. Open spaces and community facilities will also be protected and new spaces and facilities will be supported.
- 1.12 An important objective of the Plan is to promote economic growth and prosperity in the District. The Plan will need to ensure that land is available to support new employment areas and that the right jobs can be provided in the right places for local residents.
- 1.13 The Council is also working with other local neighbouring authorities to ensure that any cross-boundary issues are dealt with appropriately and to ensure that growth across all authorities can be delivered effectively, with the necessary infrastructure improvements.
- 1.14 Three versions of the Local Plan have been published for consultation as follows:
- Issues and Scoping document – this was published for consultation during January-March 2015.
 - Draft Local Plan, setting out preferred options – This was published for consultation during June-August 2016.
 - Publication Draft Local Plan, also known as Proposed Submission, Pre-Submission or Regulation 19 stage – currently scheduled for consultation from 16th June to 28th July 2017.

- 1.15 Following consultation on the Publication Draft Local Plan, it may be necessary for the Council to prepare focussed changes to the Plan and consult on these prior to submission of the Local Plan to the Planning Inspectorate and subsequent Examination in public. Each change to the Publication Draft Local Plan may require further SA work, depending upon the significance of the change being made.

Relationship with the Section One Local Plan

- 1.16 Braintree District Local Plan has been prepared in two sections. A Strategic Plan for North Essex has been jointly prepared by Braintree District, Colchester Borough and Tendring District and represents Section One of the respective Council's Local Plans. The Strategic Plan reflects the Duty to Co-operate as it concerns strategic matters with cross-boundary impacts in North Essex and its main purposes are to:
- Articulate a spatial portrait of the area, including its main settlements and strategic infrastructure, as a framework for accommodating future planned growth;
 - Provide a strategic vision for how planned growth in North Essex will be realised; set strategic objectives and policies for key growth topics;
 - Set out the numbers of additional homes and jobs across the area that will be needed covering the period to 2033. The choices made, particularly in relation to the location of garden communities, will also set the framework for development well beyond the plan period; and
 - Highlight the key strategic growth locations across the area and the necessary new or upgraded infrastructure to support this growth.
- 1.17 The potential sustainability effects of the Section One Local Plans have been separately appraised by Place Services in their SA of that document.

Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment

- 1.18 Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a statutory requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It is designed to ensure that the plan preparation process maximises the contribution that a plan makes to sustainable development and minimises any potential adverse impacts. The SA process involves appraising the likely social, environmental and economic effects of the policies and proposals within a plan from the outset of its development.
- 1.19 Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is also a statutory assessment process, required under the SEA Directive², transposed in the UK by the SEA Regulations (Statutory Instrument 2004, No 1633). The SEA Regulations require the formal assessment of plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment and which set the framework for future consent of projects requiring Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)³. The purpose of SEA, as defined in Article 1 of the SEA Directive is *'to provide for a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of plans....with a view to promoting sustainable development'*.
- 1.20 SEA and SA are separate processes but have similar aims and objectives. Simply put, SEA focuses on the likely environmental effects of a plan whilst SA includes a wider range of considerations, extending to social and economic impacts. National Planning Practice Guidance⁴ shows how it is possible to satisfy both requirements by undertaking a joint SA/SEA process, and to present an SA report that incorporates the requirements of the SEA Regulations. The SA/SEA of Braintree District's Local Plan is being prepared in the spirit of this integrated approach and throughout this report the abbreviation 'SA' should therefore be taken to refer to 'SA incorporating the requirements of SEA'.

² SEA Directive 2001/42/EC

³ Under EU Directives 85/337/EEC and 97/11/EC concerning EIA.

⁴ <http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/>

Meeting the requirements of the SEA Directive

- 1.21 This SA Report includes some of the required elements of the final 'Environmental Report' (the output required by the SEA Regulations). Table 1.1 signposts the relevant sections of the SA Report that are considered to meet the SEA Regulations' requirements. This table has been included in the SA Report at each stage of the SA process to show how the SEA Regulations requirements have been met.

DRAFT

Table 1.1 Requirements of the SEA Regulations and where these have been addressed

SEA Regulations Requirements	Where covered in this SA report
Preparation of an environmental report in which the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the plan or programme, are identified, described and evaluated. The information to be given is (Part 3 and Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations):	This document together with the SA Reports produced to accompany consultation on the Issues and Scoping and the Draft versions of the Local Plan together constitute the 'Environmental Report'.
a) An outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme, and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes	Chapters 1 and 3.
b) The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme	Chapter 3.
c) The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected	Chapter 3 and Appendix 2.
d) Any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme including, in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC.	Chapter 3.
e) The environmental protection, objectives, established at international, Community or national level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental, considerations have been taken into account during its preparation	Chapter 3 and Appendix 1.
f) The likely significant effects on the environment, including on issues such as biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors. (Footnote: These effects should include secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects)	Chapters 4-11.
g) The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme;	Chapters 4-11
h) An outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with, and a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information;	Chapters 2, 4-11 and Appendix 9.
i) a description of measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Reg. 17;	Chapter 12.
j) a non-technical summary of the information provided under the above headings	Non-Technical Summary
The report shall include the information that may reasonably be required taking into account current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme, its stage in the decision-making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process to avoid duplication of the assessment (Reg. 12(3))	The Environmental Report adheres to this requirement.

SEA Regulations Requirements	Where covered in this SA report
<p>Consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> authorities with environmental responsibility, when deciding on the scope and level of detail of the information which must be included in the environmental report (Reg. 12(5)) 	<p>Consultation on the SA Scoping report for the Braintree District Local Plan was undertaken between January and March 2015. Subsequent updates to this were published for consultation in the Draft Local Plan and are included in this report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> authorities with environmental responsibility and the public, shall be given an effective opportunity to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme (Reg. 13(3), 13(4)) 	<p>Consultation on the Draft Local Plan and the accompanying SA report took place between November 2015 and January 2016. Consultation is being undertaken in relation to the Publication Draft Local Plan between June and July 2017. The current consultation documents are accompanied by this SA report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> other EU Member States, where the implementation of the plan or programme is likely to have significant effects on the environment of that country (Reg. 14). 	<p>Unlikely to be relevant to the Braintree District Local Plan.</p>
<p>Taking the environmental report and the results of the consultations into account in decision-making (Reg. 16)</p>	
<p>Provision of information on the decision: When the plan or programme is adopted, the public and any countries consulted under Regs 13 and 14 must be informed and the following made available to those so informed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the plan or programme as adopted a statement summarising how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme and how the environmental report of Reg. 12, the opinions expressed pursuant to Reg. 13(2)(d) and the results of consultations entered into pursuant to Reg. 14(4) have been taken into account, and the reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and the measures decided concerning monitoring (Reg. 16(4)(f)) 	<p>Requirement will be met at a later stage in the SA process.</p>
<p>Monitoring of the significant environmental effects of the plan's or programme's implementation (Reg. 17)</p>	<p>Chapter 12.</p>
<p>Quality assurance: environmental reports should be of a sufficient standard to meet the requirements of the SEA Regulations.</p>	<p>This report has been produced in line with current guidance and good practice for SEA/SA and this table demonstrates where the requirements of the SEA Regulations have been met.</p>

Habitats Regulations Assessment

- 1.22 Under Article 6 (3) and (4) of the Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Fauna and Flora (Habitats Directive) land use plans, including Local Plans, are also subject to Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). The purpose of HRA is to assess the impacts of a land use plan against the conservation objectives of a European Site and to ascertain whether it would adversely affect the integrity of that site.
- 1.23 The HRA for the Braintree District Local Plan is being undertaken by LUC on behalf of Braintree District Council during the plan making process. While the HRA is reported on separately, its findings have been taken into account in the SA, where relevant, to inform judgements about the likely effects of the Publication Draft Local Plan on biodiversity.
- 1.24 The HRA Screening of the Publication Draft Local Plan concluded that Section 2 of the Local Plan would not give rise to any likely significant effects on European sites alone. However, the HRA concluded that there is potential for likely significant effects in-combination with the North Essex Authorities Shared Strategic Part 1 for Local Plans with regards to recreation disturbance at the following sites:
- Blackwater Estuary SPA and Ramsar.
 - Colne Estuary SPA and Ramsar.
 - Essex Estuaries SAC.
- 1.25 An Appropriate Assessment was carried out to determine whether the Local Plan Part 2, in-combination with the Local Plan Part 1, would lead to adverse effects on the integrity of these European sites. This resulted in a number of recommendations for the Local Plan, including implementation of Recreation Avoidance and Mitigation Strategies (RAMS), in order to avoid and mitigate any adverse effects. The HRA concluded that, providing the recommendations and mitigation requirements are fully developed and included in the Local Plan, there would be no adverse effects on European sites as a result of the plan. This is considered further in **Chapter 11**.

Structure of this report

- 1.26 This chapter has described the background to and subject matter of the new Braintree District Publication Draft Local Plan and the requirement to undertake SA and HRA. The remainder of this report is structured into the following chapters:
- Chapter 2 sets out the approach to the SA, including the framework of SA objectives. Detailed appraisal criteria and associated assumptions that will be used to appraise the Publication Draft Local Plan's policies and sites are set out in **Error! Reference source not found.** and **Error! Reference source not found.** respectively.
 - Chapter 3 sets out the relationship of the Publication Draft Local Plan to other relevant plans and programmes; provides a summary of environmental, social and economic policy objectives identified by the detailed review of plans and programmes in Appendix 1; and provides a summary the main sustainability issues of relevance to the Braintree District Publication Draft Local Plan, drawing on the detailed review of baseline information in **Error! Reference source not found.**
 - Chapter 4 describes the findings of the SA for the Publication Draft Local Plan's vision and objectives.
 - Chapter 5 describes the findings of the SA for the Publication Draft Local Plan's Spatial Strategy and its reasonable alternatives.
 - Chapters 6, 7, 8 and 9 describe the findings of the SA for the Publication Draft Local Plan policies and their reasonable alternatives.
 - Chapter 10 sets out the SA findings for the site allocations and their reasonable alternatives.

- Chapter 11 looks across the Publication Draft Local Plan to consider the cumulative effects of all preferred policies and site allocations, including with the North Essex Authorities Shared Strategic Section 1 for Local Plans.
- Chapter 11.1 provides recommendations for monitoring the significant effects identified.
- Chapter 13 describes the arrangements for consultation on the Publication Draft Local Plan and SA Report, and the next steps for the SA.

DRAFT

2 Methodology

Stages of SA

- 2.1 In addition to complying with legal requirements, the approach being taken to the SA of the Braintree District Publication Draft Local Plan is based on current best practice and the guidance on SA/SEA set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance, which involves carrying out SA as an integral part of the plan-making process. **Table 2.1** sets out the main stages of the plan-making process and shows how these correspond to the SA process.

Table 2.1 Corresponding stages in plan making and SA

Local Plan Step 1: Evidence Gathering and engagement
SA stages and tasks
<p>Stage A: Setting the context and objectives, establishing the baseline and deciding on the scope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1: Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and sustainability objectives 2: Collecting baseline information 3: Identifying sustainability issues and problems 4: Developing the SA Framework 5: Consulting on the scope of the SA
Local Plan Step 2: Production
SA stages and tasks
<p>Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1: Testing the Plan objectives against the SA Framework 2: Developing the Plan options 3: Evaluating the effects of the Plan 4: Considering ways of mitigating adverse effects and maximising beneficial effects 5: Proposing measures to monitor the significant effects of implementing the Plans
<p>Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1: Preparing the SA Report
<p>Stage D: Seek representations on the Plan and the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1: Public participation on Plan and the SA Report 2(i): Appraising significant changes
Local Plan Step 3: Examination
SA stages and tasks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2(ii): Appraising significant changes resulting from representations

Local Plan Step 4 & 5: Adoption and Monitoring

SA stages and tasks

- 3: Making decisions and providing information

Stage E: Monitoring the significant effects of implementing the Plan

- 1: Finalising aims and methods for monitoring
- 2: Responding to adverse effects

2.2 The methodology set out below describes the approach that has been taken to the SA of the Braintree District Local Plan to date and provides information on the subsequent stages of the process.

Stage A: Scoping

2.3 The SA process began in December 2014 with production of the SA Scoping Report for the Braintree District Council Local Plan Issues and Scoping document. During the scoping stage of the SA, the work that had previously been carried out as part of the SA of the Council's now-withdrawn Publication Site Allocations and Development Management Plan was drawn upon, as much of that work remained valid.

2.4 The scoping stage of the SA involves understanding the social, economic and environmental baseline for the plan area as well as the sustainability policy context and key sustainability issues. The Scoping Report presented the outputs of the following tasks:

- Policies, plans and programmes of relevance to the Local Plan were identified and the relationships between them were considered, enabling any potential synergies to be exploited and any potential inconsistencies and incompatibilities to be identified and addressed.
- In line with the requirements of the SEA Regulations, baseline information was collected on the following 'SEA topics': biodiversity, population, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage (including architectural and archaeological heritage), landscape, and the inter-relationship between these. Data on social and economic issues were also taken in to consideration. This baseline information provides the basis for predicting and monitoring the likely effects of the Local Plan and helps to identify alternative ways of dealing with any adverse effects identified.
- Drawing on the review of relevant plans, policies and programmes and the baseline information, key sustainability issues for the District were identified (including environmental problems, as required by the SEA Regulations).
- A Sustainability Appraisal framework was then prepared, setting out the SA objectives against which Local Plan proposals (policies and sites) are being appraised. The SA framework provides a way in which the sustainability impacts of implementing a particular plan can be described, analysed and compared. The SA framework is designed to set out a series of sustainability objectives and associated questions that can be used to 'interrogate' options and policies drafted during the plan-making process. These SA objectives define the long-term aspirations of the District with regard to social, economic and environmental considerations. During the SA, the performances of the plan options (and later, policies and sites) are assessed against these SA objectives and appraisal questions.

2.5 The review of relevant plans, policies and programmes and the baseline information will continue to be updated as necessary at each stage of the SA process to ensure that they reflect the current situation in Braintree District.

2.6 Public and stakeholder participation is an important element of the SA and wider plan-making processes. It helps to ensure that the SA report is robust and has due regard for all appropriate information that will support the plan in making a contribution to sustainable development. The Scoping Report for the Local Plan was published between January and March 2015 for consultation

alongside the Local Plan Issues and Scoping document with the statutory consultees (Natural England, the Environment Agency and English Heritage), other relevant stakeholders and the public.

- 2.7 **Error! Reference source not found.** lists the comments that were received during the scoping consultation and describes how each one has been addressed. In light of the comments received, a number of amendments were made to the review of plans, policies and programmes, the baseline information, key sustainability issues and the SA framework.

SA framework

- 2.8 The following set of SA objectives is being used as a framework to assess the sustainability performance of the Local Plan:

SA1: Create safe environments which improve quality of life and community cohesion.

SA2: Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home.

SA3: Improve the health of the District's residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities.

SA4: Promote the vitality and viability of all service centres throughout the District.

SA5: Achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth.

SA6: Conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment.

SA7: Promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake.

SA8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development.

SA9: Improve the education and skills of the population.

SA10: Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.

SA11: Reduce contributions to climate change.

SA12: Improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity.

SA13: Reduce the risk of flooding.

SA14: Improve air quality.

SA15: Maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes.

SA16: Safeguard and enhance the quality of soil.

- 2.9 As demonstrated by Table 2.2, these SA objectives:

- Reflect the key sustainability issues facing Braintree District, as identified in **Chapter 3**.
- Take into account the environmental protection objectives set out at the international and national level (a requirement of the SEA Regulations) insofar as they are relevant to the Places and Policies Local Plan (see Appendix 1).
- Cover all of the topics required by the SEA Regulations (see above).

- 2.10 Note that some SA objectives in **Table 2.2** address multiple issues or policy objectives and are therefore repeated in several rows of the table. A sequentially numbered list of these objectives and the associated assessment criteria to be used to help form judgements on the effects of the Local Plan in relation to these objectives are set out in **Error! Reference source not found.** (criteria for SA of policies) and **Error! Reference source not found.** (criteria for SA of sites).

Table 2.2 SA objectives and links to key sustainability issues, policy objectives and SEA Regulations topics

Key sustainability issues (Table 3.1)	Key policy objectives (Appendix 1)	SEA Directive topics	SA objectives
<p>Biodiversity and geodiversity</p> <p>Whilst there are no internationally designated biodiversity sites in Braintree District, a number within Colchester and Tendring Districts are subject to joint monitoring of potential recreational disturbance.</p> <p>Braintree District has sites of national, regional and local ecological significance as well as special roadside verges. In addition, it is also within close proximity to a neighbouring SSSI in Chelmsford. The national designations are all in favourable condition.</p>	<p>International</p> <p>Protect and enhance biodiversity and the natural environment, particularly in respect of habitats/species of International and European importance.</p> <p>National</p> <p>Protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity, including habitats that support it, of International, European, national and local importance.</p> <p>Protect, conserve and enhance geodiversity of European, national and local importance.</p> <p>Target action on Priority Species and Habitats.</p> <p>Ensure value of ecosystem services are fully reflected in decision-making.</p> <p>Reconnect people and nature.</p>	<p>Biodiversity; fauna, flora</p>	<p>SA6: Conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment</p>
<p>Landscape</p> <p>Landscape Character Assessments have identified varying levels of sensitivity to development across the District. The north east part of Braintree District is being considered for the expansion of Dedham Vale AONB.</p>	<p>International</p> <p>Conserve and enhance landscape diversity.</p> <p>Protect, manage and enhance landscapes.</p> <p>National</p> <p>Protect and enhance the quality and character of urban and rural settlements with distinctive qualities.</p> <p>Protect and enhance rural and urban landscapes of particular value.</p>	<p>Landscape; material assets</p>	<p>SA15: Maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes</p>
<p>Soils</p> <p>Braintree District contains some of the most productive agricultural land in the County which could be lost to development.</p> <p>Braintree District contains areas of historically contaminated land which could pose a risk to human health and the natural environment or which could be remediated and brought into appropriate use.</p>	<p>International</p> <p>Prevent pollution of, and improve the quality of the soil.</p> <p>National</p> <p>Take into account the benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land and, where developed, use areas of poorer quality.</p> <p>Minimise and mitigate the contamination of soil.</p> <p>Improve land, soil and water quality.</p>	<p>Soil</p>	<p>SA16: Safeguard and enhance the quality of soil</p>

Key sustainability issues (Table 3.1)	Key policy objectives (Appendix 1)	SEA Directive topics	SA objectives
	<p>Use natural resources, particularly land, prudently.</p> <p>Encourage the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value.</p>		
<p>Open space</p> <p>The large increase predicted in Braintree District's population (23.3% between 2011 and 2035) will place increasing pressure on open space provision.</p>	<p>National</p> <p>Protect and enhance open space and ensure that recreational facilities meet the needs of the community.</p> <p>Recognise that a network of green infrastructure makes a contribution to quality of life.</p>	<p>Material assets, flora, fauna, climatic factors, biodiversity, human health</p>	<p>SA1: Create safe environments which improve quality of life and community cohesion</p> <p>SA3: Improve the health of the Districts' residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities</p> <p>SA6: Conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment</p> <p>SA15: Maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes</p>
<p>Air quality</p> <p>Air quality is not currently a significant issue in the District. However, locations targeted for large scale development could experience significant increases in road traffic from residents and/or employees, resulting in localised adverse effects, along major roads such as the A12 and A120.</p>	<p>International</p> <p>Control and reduce air / noise pollution.</p> <p>National</p> <p>Reduce, control and mitigate air and noise pollution.</p> <p>Reduce and manage exposure to air and noise pollution.</p> <p>Local</p> <p>Reduce, limit and mitigate air pollution.</p>	<p>Air</p>	<p>SA7: Promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake</p> <p>SA14: Improve air quality</p>
<p>Climate change and energy</p> <p>Braintree District is a significant energy consumer and CO₂ emitter but has a relatively small installed renewable energy generation capacity.</p> <p>Road transport is the biggest energy consumer and CO₂ emitter in the District. Braintree District is one of the largest producer per capita emissions in the County.</p>	<p>International</p> <p>Recognise and respond to the challenges posed by climate change.</p> <p>Reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Mitigate the effects of increased extreme weather events.</p> <p>Promote generation and use of renewable energy, alongside energy efficiency.</p> <p>Improve energy efficiency of buildings.</p> <p>National</p>	<p>Climatic factors; human health; landscape</p>	<p>SA7: Promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake</p> <p>SA11: Reduce contributions to climate change</p>

Key sustainability issues (Table 3.1)	Key policy objectives (Appendix 1)	SEA Directive topics	SA objectives
	<p>Generate 15% of energy from renewable energy sources by 2020.</p> <p>Help drive investment in new jobs and businesses in the renewable energy sector.</p> <p>Plan for new development in locations and ways which reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Actively support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings.</p> <p>Promote and facilitate the planning and development of decentralised community energy initiatives.</p> <p>Support the development of buildings and infrastructure which are resilient to a changing climate and extreme weather.</p>		
<p>Water quality and water resources</p> <p>Water resources in Braintree District are heavily abstracted with further consumptive licences unlikely to be granted.</p> <p>None of Braintree District's water bodies meet the water quality requirements of the Water Framework Directive with the River Blackwater and the River Chelmer having the lowest quality.</p>	<p>International</p> <p>Prevent pollution of, and improve the quality of water resources.</p> <p>Ensure water is used in a sustainable way.</p> <p>National</p> <p>Minimise and mitigate the pollution of water courses.</p> <p>Improve land, soil and water quality.</p> <p>Reduce water usage to 120-130 litres, per person, per day, by 2030.</p> <p>Improve water efficiency in new buildings.</p> <p>Ensure appropriate resources are available to deliver the development-related infrastructure needed to create sustainable communities.</p>	Water	SA12: Improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity
<p>Flooding</p> <p>The northern areas of Braintree town are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. These and other areas identified by the Mid Essex SFRA are subject to a higher risk from fluvial flooding.</p> <p>Current surface water flood risk in Braintree District is uncertain, pending completion of the Essex SWMP. The 2007 Mid Essex SFRA recommended that runoff rates should be restricted for both greenfield and brownfield</p>	<p>National</p> <p>Plan for the effects of climate change in terms of flood risk.</p> <p>Improve effectiveness of surface water drainage.</p>	Climatic factors; human health; material assets; biodiversity	SA13: Reduce the risk of flooding

Key sustainability issues (Table 3.1)	Key policy objectives (Appendix 1)	SEA Directive topics	SA objectives
developments in Bocking, Braintree, Witham and Coggeshall in particular. This is also likely to be appropriate within other settlements to ease surface water flooding and drainage capacity exceedance.			
Cultural heritage and townscape Braintree District has a large number of valuable heritage assets which could be sensitive to new development, including scheduled monuments, conservation areas, historic parks and gardens and listed buildings. A number of these are 'at risk'.	International Conserve and enhance cultural heritage. National Provide effective protection to all aspects of the historic environment.	Cultural heritage	SA10: Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings SA15: Maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes
Health The health of Braintree District's population is significantly worse than the England average in respect of overweight or obese adults; infant mortality; hip fractures in people aged 65+; excess winter deaths; people killed or seriously injured on roads; incidence of malignant melanoma; and the suicide rate. Although roughly in line with national averages, Braintree District residents' rates of participation in sport are the third lowest in Essex and well below those in the most active District, which could be contributing to a higher incidence of obesity in Braintree District.	International Fight disease and reduce threats to public health. National Plan for the effects of climate change in terms of flood risk, agricultural output and public health. Provide a high quality of life for all by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reducing health inequalities and improving health services. • Pursuing social improvements. • Valuing open spaces, sport and recreation facilities for, amongst other things, their contribution to healthy lifestyles. • Improving skills and educational attainment levels and standards. • Improving community safety and reducing crime rates. Ensure communities are secure and protected from hazardous development such as high pressure pipe lines and gas compounds.	Human health	SA1: Create safe environments which improve quality of life and community cohesion SA2: Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home SA3: Improve the health of the Districts' residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities SA5: Achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth SA7: Promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake SA13: Reduce the risk of flooding
Population and social issues In Braintree District 26 of 84 areas are seriously deprived with regards to 'Barriers to	International Eradicate poverty. Achieve gender and racial equality.	Population	SA1: Create safe environments which improve quality of life and community cohesion SA2: Provide everyone with the

Key sustainability issues (Table 3.1)	Key policy objectives (Appendix 1)	SEA Directive topics	SA objectives
<p>housing and services’.</p> <p>In Braintree District 23 of 84 areas are seriously deprived with regards to ‘Education, skills and training’.</p> <p>Whilst improving, educational attainment remains low relative to county and national rates.</p>	<p>Secure adequate housing.</p> <p>Increase employment opportunities.</p> <p>National</p> <p>Ensure that communities are serviced with necessary utilities and communications networks.</p> <p>Sustain, enhance and revitalise villages.</p> <p>Ensure development supports existing communities.</p> <p>Improve the quality of the public realm through good design.</p> <p>Recognise that a network of green infrastructure makes a contribution to quality of life.</p>		<p>opportunity to live in a decent home</p> <p>SA4: Promote the vitality and viability of all service centres throughout the District</p> <p>SA15: Maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes</p>
<p>Economy</p> <p>Whilst employment rates in Braintree District are relatively good compared to with regional and national averages, job availability within the District is relatively low and a significant proportion of those working in the District are unable to access its main centres of employment by sustainable modes.</p> <p>Braintree District contains a number of sites preferred or reserved for mineral extraction. Other forms of development in the District may be constrained by the need to safeguard mineral resources for extraction.</p>	<p>National</p> <p>Increase and widen employment opportunities to meet the needs of all.</p> <p>Regenerate town centres by making them the focus for mixed-use development in order to ensure they are vibrant places to live, work and visit.</p> <p>Improve access to jobs.</p> <p>Provide a supply of land suitable for the needs of different businesses.</p> <p>Local</p> <p>Provide quality education and training opportunities to all.</p> <p>Enhance the vitality and vibrancy of the District’s town centres through regeneration.</p> <p>Improve the economic stability of the District and diversify the employment base and skills development opportunities.</p> <p>Deliver major social, physical and economic regeneration projects.</p>	<p>Population; material assets; human health</p>	<p>SA4: Promote the vitality and viability of all service centres throughout the District</p> <p>SA5: Achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth</p> <p>SA8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development</p> <p>SA9: Improve the education and skills of the population</p>
<p>Housing</p> <p>Demographic changes, and to a lesser extent, future employment levels and market signals, indicate the need for a significant increase in annual housing delivery in Braintree District to meet objectively assessed need.</p>	<p>National</p> <p>Provide better quality housing.</p> <p>Increase the number of homes built.</p> <p>Significantly increase affordable housing provision.</p>	<p>Population; material assets; human health</p>	<p>SA2: Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home</p> <p>SA15: Maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes</p>

Key sustainability issues (Table 3.1)	Key policy objectives (Appendix 1)	SEA Directive topics	SA objectives
<p>There is the need for a mix of housing types including social rented housing and provision in rural communities.</p> <p>There is a need for affordable housing across Braintree District as the average income of newly formed households is below the minimum required to access entry level private housing in the District.</p> <p>In meeting the housing needs of older people, there is a need to improve the supply and stock of sheltered housing and provide for 'extra care' accommodation to meet the significant growth in the number of people over 85.</p> <p>40 additional Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitches are needed in the District by 2033.</p>			
<p>Transport</p> <p>Availability of public transport is limited in the evenings and in the rural areas where almost half of the District's population live.</p> <p>Braintree District residents have relatively high average travel times by public transport or walking to reach key services, including employment sites.</p> <p>Stansted Airport in Uttlesford District is a major employer of Braintree District residents, increasing out-commuting by car.</p>	<p>International</p> <p>Promote sustainable transport modes.</p> <p>National</p> <p>Direct development to sustainable locations.</p> <p>Reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>Promote more sustainable modes of transport, reduce the reliance on motor cars, and improve public transport.</p> <p>Ensure appropriate resources are available to deliver the development-related infrastructure needed to create sustainable communities.</p>	<p>Material assets, climatic factors, population, human health</p>	<p>SA7: Promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake</p> <p>SA8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development</p>

Stage B: Developing and refining options and assessing effects

2.11 Developing options for a plan is an iterative process, usually involving a number of consultations with public and stakeholders. Consultation responses and the SA can help to identify where there may be other 'reasonable alternatives' to the options being considered for a plan.

2.12 In relation to options, the SEA Regulations require the following.

Part 3 of the SEA Regulations 12(2) require that:

'The report shall identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of:

(a) Implementing the plan or programme; and

(b) Reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the Plan or Programme.'

Schedule 2 (h) of the SEA Regulations requires that the Environmental Report includes a description of:

'(h) an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with'

2.13 Therefore, the SA must appraise not only the policies or site allocations included in the Local Plan but 'reasonable alternatives' to those policies and allocations. This implies that alternatives that are not reasonable do not need to be subject to appraisal. As stated in the SEA Regulations, reasonable alternatives should take into account the objectives of the plan, as well as its geographical scope. Therefore, alternatives that do not meet the objectives of the Local Plan or national policy (e.g. as set out in the NPPF), or are outside the Plan area are unlikely to be reasonable. Site options that are unavailable or undeliverable are also unlikely to be reasonable. Although there is no requirement in the SEA Regulations for all possible alternatives to be subject to appraisal, the SA process ensures that reasonableness is not defined too narrowly in order to fully and properly test an appropriate range of reasonable alternatives, as informed by national policy, the baseline situation, the views of consultees, and the objectives of the Local Plan.

2.14 This section provides an overview of how the appraisal of options has fed into the development of the policies and sites that are now set out in the Publication Draft Local Plan.

2.15 The appraisal methodology used to assess the effects of Publication Draft Local Plan options is described later in this Chapter.

Identification of alternatives and selection of preferred options

2.16 The alternative options for Publication Draft Local Plan policies have been identified by the Council based on the most up-to-date evidence, in particular in relation to the levels of development required in the District. Alternatives to some policies in the Local Plan were proposed within the Local Plan Draft Document for Consultation 27th June 2016 and a number of alternatives to policies were received from the subsequent public consultation. Published alternatives and alternatives received during public consultation were considered by the Council within Local Plan Sub-Committees reports between October and May 2016/17. For several of the proposed policy approaches, reasonable alternatives were not identified as any approach other than the preferred approach would not be in conformity with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

2.17 Development site options were identified through the Council's 'call for sites' exercise held between August and October 2014 with a small number of additional sites submitted during the Issues and Scoping consultation in early 2015 and a number of sites were submitted during the Draft Local Plan Consultation from June to August 2016. The Council then eliminated sites which did not represent a reasonable alternative for allocation through the Local Plan process for one of the following reasons:

- Sites with an area of less than 0.25 ha and therefore not able to deliver 10 or more dwellings.
- Sites which are outside the District boundary in their entirety.

- Sites which are entirely within Flood Zone 2 or Flood Zone 3, other than previously developed regeneration sites.
- Sites which are within a parish where there is no development boundary and hence not consistent with the NPPF principle of focusing significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.

2.18 The Council's consideration of employment site options was also informed by a viability review carried out in 2012⁵.

Draft Local Plan (2016)

2.19 All of the reasonable site options and policy options were subject to SA prior to the preparation of the Draft Local Plan in 2016, in accordance with the methodology that was set out in the Scoping Report (also described later in this chapter). The draft findings were shared with the Braintree District Council officers preparing the Draft Local Plan. These working papers were intended to inform the plan preparation process rather than constituting a formal SA report and were not, therefore, made publicly available at the time.

2.20 The Council took into account the findings of the SA when deciding which site and policy options to select and develop into preferred approaches in the Draft Local Plan. The SA findings were not the only relevant factors taken into account by the Council when determining which preferred options to take forward in the Local Plan. Indeed, there were often both positive and negative sustainability effects identified for individual options, and it was not therefore possible to 'rank' the options based on sustainability performance in order to select the most sustainable. Factors such as public opinion, deliverability and conformity with national policy were also taken into account by the Council when selecting preferred options.

2.21 An initial options appraisal was undertaken during development of the Draft Local Plan on the basis of high level options that were identified by the Council. In some cases, additional detail about the options was included in the Draft Local Plan which had not been available to the SA team while the initial options appraisal work was being carried out. Where this was the case, the options appraisal work was updated to take account of the additional detail, prior to the appraisal of the preferred approaches. The options appraisal work presented in the SA report of the Draft Local Plan incorporated that additional work where relevant. In most cases, the SA scores remained unchanged from those set out in the initial SA working paper that was prepared for the Council to inform the preparation of the Draft Local Plan.

Publication Draft Local Plan (2017)

2.22 Following consultation on the Draft Local Plan, a number of new site and policy options were identified and these have now also been subject to SA, using the same methodology. The SA findings for all policy and site options are summarised in Chapter 10 of this SA Report. This work incorporates the SA findings for all the reasonable alternative options that have been considered at both stages, including the options that have come forward since consultation on the Draft Local Plan.

2.23 The detailed assessments for all reasonable alternative sites can be found in Appendices 6 and 7. As at the Draft Local Plan stage, the Council has taken into account the findings of the SA as well as other factors when deciding which options to take forward in the Publication Draft Local Plan. The preceding text provides the outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with required by the SEA Regulations. Further understanding of this can be gained by the justifications for the selected policies set out in the Publication Draft Local Plan itself. In addition, **Error! Reference source not found.** lists the site options considered by the Council and its reasons for selecting or rejecting each one for inclusion as a preferred option in the Draft Local Plan.

Stage C: Preparing the Sustainability Appraisal report

2.24 This SA report describes the process that has been undertaken to date in carrying out the SA of Braintree District's Publication Draft Local Plan. It sets out the findings of the appraisal of

⁵ Viability Review of Employment Sites in Braintree District, Lambert Smith Hampton on behalf of Braintree District Council, 2012

options, preferred approaches included in the Draft Local Plan and policies and sites included in the Publication Draft Local Plan, highlighting any likely significant effects (both positive and negative, and taking into account the likely secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term and permanent and temporary effects), making recommendations for improvements and clarifications that may help to mitigate negative effects and maximise the benefits of the plan as it is drafted in full. It also describes the reasons for selecting or rejecting certain options during the preparation of the Publication Draft Local Plan.

Stage D: Consultation on the Braintree District Publication Draft Local Plan and this SA Report

- 2.25 Braintree District Council is inviting comments on the Publication Draft Local Plan and this SA Report. Both documents are being published on the Council's website for a six week consultation period from 16th June to 28th July 2017.

Stage E: Monitoring implementation of the Local Plan

- 2.26 Recommendations for monitoring the social, environmental and economic effects of implementing Braintree District's Local Plan, as currently drafted, are presented in Chapter 12.

Overarching approach to the assessment

- 2.27 The SA work on the Local Plan takes into account the sustainability issues facing the District, such as those set out in Chapter 3, and of the need to weigh up potentially opposing sustainability effects that are often associated with development. For example, whilst there may be environmental disadvantages associated with some aspects of proposed housing and economic development, it is important to strike a balance with the likely social and economic advantages of, for example, addressing deprivation and housing need. Another area where such tensions often need to be considered is in weighing up the need to seek support from developers for infrastructure and affordable housing against the need to ensure that delivery of housing is not threatened by the level of obligations placed on developers.

Types of effect

- 2.28 For those alternatives deemed reasonable, the SA sets out their sustainability effects in comparative terms.

The SEA Regulations, Schedule 2(6) require the Environmental Report to consider:

The likely significant effects on the environment, including short, medium and long term effects, permanent and temporary effects, positive and negative effects and secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects, on issues such as (a) biodiversity, (b) population, (c) human health, (d) fauna, (e) flora, (f) soil, (g) water, (h) air, (i) climatic factors, (j) material assets, (k) cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, (l) landscape and (m) the inter-relationship between the issues referred to in sub-paragraphs (a)–(l).

Form of assessment and use of SA matrices

- 2.29 Each policy and site allocation option in the Publication Draft Local Plan has been assessed and a judgement made as to the likely effect of the option on the baseline in relation to the SA objectives. The findings of the SA have been recorded in SA matrices, which include a colour coded score for the alternatives against each of the SA objectives, along with a concise justification for the score given.
- 2.30 The SA scores differentiate between significant effects and other more minor effects through the use of colour coded symbols, as shown in the key below. Mixed effects were recorded for an SA objective where there was potential for positive effects in relation to one aspect of the objective but potential for negative effects in relation to another. Temporary effects were identified in the related justification text, where relevant.

Key to sustainability scores to be used in the SA of the Local Plan

++	Significant positive effect likely
+	Minor positive effect likely
0	No or negligible effect likely
-	Minor negative effect likely
--	Significant negative effect likely
+/-	Mixed effect likely
?	Likely effect uncertain

- 2.31 The dividing line between sustainability scores is often quite small. Where we have distinguished significant effects from more minor effects this was because, in our judgement, the effect of the allocation or policy on the SA objective will be of such magnitude that it will have a noticeable and measurable effect compared with other factors that may influence the achievement of that objective.

Cumulative effects

- 2.32 Each reasonable alternative policy and site option considered in developing the Publication Draft Local Plan was assessed on its own merits. Once the Local Plan development reached a stage where preferred policies and sites were identified, the cumulative effects of all preferred policies and sites was also assessed. The assessment of individual effects and cumulative effects of policies and sites were revised to reflect the effects of the Publication Draft Local Plan.
- 2.33 The cumulative effects assessment also considered the extent to which the effects identified are likely to be mitigated by strategic or development management policies set out elsewhere in the

Local Plan, by national planning policy, or by other regulatory mechanisms. In particular, the cumulative effects of the Section 2 Local Plan with the Publication Draft of the North Essex Authorities Shared Strategic Section 1 for Local Plans have been assessed (see Chapter 11), drawing on the SA undertaken for that document.

Approach to the SA of site allocations

- 2.34 The approach described above applies to the SA of all aspects of the Local Plan. In order to prepare the Publication Draft Local Plan, the Council identified a large number of site allocation options and the approach described below was applied to the SA of these. By setting out clear assumptions to be applied in arriving at SA scores for sites, this approach ensured that the assessed effects were objective, transparent, consistent between sites and assessors, and able to be arrived at efficiently.
- 2.35 Following the SA of the Draft Local Plan, updates were made to the assessment criteria for the SA of sites (Appendix 4) with regard to SA objectives 1, 5, and 12. SA objective 1: Community safety & cohesion now contains a criterion on proximity to waste sites. This was in response to concerns raised by the Environment Agency during consultation of the Draft Local Plan (see Table A8.2 in Appendix 8 for details). Given that this change introduced a new sub-objective, the assessments of all options considered at Draft Local Plan stage were revised to account for this. These updated assessments were sent to the Council for consideration.
- 2.36 An update to the existing criterion on Broadband availability under SA objective 5: Economy was also made, as the data source underlying the assumptions of the SA framework (superfastessex.com interactive map) was updated to show broadband connectivity for individual properties, rather than postcode areas as a whole.
- 2.37 Lastly, SA objective 12: Water environment has been updated since publication of the BDC Water Cycle Study (2017). All sites were previously assessed as being uncertain due to lack on an up to date Water Cycle Study, therefore the SA framework has been updated to account for the fact that the capacity of Water Recycling Centres (WRCs) and the foul sewerage network are now known. The assessment criteria for the SA of sites including these updates can be found in Appendix 4.
- 2.38 The locations of sites allocated in the Publication Draft Local Plan are shown in Appendix 10. The locations of all site options that were not allocated in the Publication Draft Local Plan are shown in Appendix 11.

Context

- 2.39 The SEA Regulations state that the assessment is concerned with likely significant effects on the environment. They further state that the information to be included in the environmental report (i.e. the SA Report) should take account of the stage of the plan in the decision-making process and the extent to which certain matters are more appropriately assessed at different levels in that process. This is in order to avoid duplication of the assessment and information may therefore be provided by reference to relevant information obtained at other levels of decision-making. In addition, national Planning Practice Guidance on the level of detail required in an SA states that the SA *'should focus on the environmental, economic and social impacts that are likely to be significant. It does not need to be done in any more detail, or using more resources, than is considered to be appropriate for the content and level of detail in the Local Plan.'*
- 2.40 As a guide to what effects may be considered significant, LUC has made reference to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) guidance. Although EIA is a separate process to SA/SEA with different regulatory requirements, the screening stage of EIA is nonetheless concerned with whether a proposed project is likely to have a significant effect on the environment. This is recognised in Regulation 5(2) of the SEA Regulations which requires SEA of certain types of plan or programme which *'set[s] the framework for future development consent of projects listed in Annex I or II to Council Directive 85/337/EEC on the assessment of certain public and private*

projects on the environment, as amended by Council Directive 97/11/EC(a)' (i.e. the EIA Directive).

- 2.41 Schedule 2 of the EIA Regulations sets out 'exclusion thresholds' below which EIA does not need to be considered, provided that the proposed development is not in a 'sensitive area' (see definition below). LUC has referred to the thresholds set out in the second column of Table 2.3 to assist in judgements about the potential for site allocations to have significant effects. As set out in the final column of Table 2.3, further guidance is provided by national Planning Policy Guidance, comprising indicative thresholds and criteria to help local authorities determine whether significant effects are likely from a proposed development and hence whether EIA will be required. These have not been used because they require some information about the proposed developments which was not available at this stage of the plan-making process. This represents a precautionary approach since the indicative thresholds are higher than those set out in the EIA Regulations.
- 2.42 Taking all of the above into account, LUC followed an approach to the SA which was designed to meet the requirements of the SEA Regulations and focus on those effects which are likely to be significant. The key features of this approach are described below.

Reference to relevant information already obtained

- 2.43 Although the Council is no longer taking forward its Site Allocation and Development Plan, that Plan reached an advanced stage of preparation in 2014, and was published for consultation at Draft Plan and Proposed-submission stages in January 2013 and February 2014 respectively. Each of these stages was accompanied by an SA Report.
- 2.44 The earlier SA work on baseline environmental conditions, sustainability issues facing Braintree District and the framework of sustainability objectives against which the effects of the Braintree District Local Plan were assessed were reviewed and updated where necessary as a starting point for the SA of the new Local Plan.

Focus on effects that are likely to be significant

- 2.45 In order to focus the resources available to carry out the SA on those effects that are likely to be significant, the SA applied a tiered approach to appraisal of the site options that were being considered for allocation at Draft Local Plan stage. Site options were first subject to a high level, screening assessment to determine whether they were individually capable of having significant effects. If the potential for significant effects existed then the site option was subject to detailed assessment; the remaining site options were not subject to further individual assessment, although a separate assessment of cumulative effects was carried out (see paragraph 2.65 below). Screening out of individual site options from the SA does not imply that they will not have any sustainability effects but rather that such effects are not significant in the context of the content and level of detail in the Local Plan; minor effects that may arise from development at these sites are more appropriately considered through the development consent process.
- 2.46 This tiered approach was only applied to site options at the before preferred options were identified and did not apply to the preferred options at Draft Local Plan stage or allocations in the Publication Draft Local Plan.

High level screening assessment of site options

- 2.47 When considering site options, an initial, high level assessment was carried out to determine whether site options were individually capable of having significant effects. All site options exceeding certain criteria and thresholds were deemed to have the potential for significant effects and were flagged for detailed assessment. The SA drew on the indicative thresholds and criteria for determining significant effects that are set out in the EIA Regulations, as referred to above. The main EIA thresholds of relevance to the types of allocation made by the Braintree District Publication Draft Local Plan are the two categories of 'Infrastructure Projects' reproduced in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3 EIA thresholds indicating the potential for significant effects

Development type	EIA Regulations Schedule 2 criteria and thresholds	Indicative criteria and thresholds in national Planning Policy Guidance on EIA (not applied at this stage of the SA)
(a) Industrial estate development projects;	The area of the development exceeds 5 hectares.	Site area of the new development is more than 20 hectares.
(b) Urban development projects, including the construction of shopping centres and car parks, sports stadiums, leisure centres and multiplex cinemas;	(i) The development includes more than 1 hectare of urban development which is not dwelling house development; or (ii) the development includes more than 150 dwellings; or (iii) the overall area of the development exceeds 5 hectares.	Environmental Impact Assessment is unlikely to be required for the redevelopment of land unless the new development is on a significantly greater scale than the previous use, or the types of impact are of a markedly different nature or there is a high level of contamination. Sites which have not previously been intensively developed: (i) area of the scheme is more than 5 hectares; or (ii) it would provide a total of more than 10,000 m ² of new commercial floorspace; or (iii) the development would have significant urbanising effects in a previously non-urbanised area (e.g. a new development of more than 1,000 dwellings).

- 2.48 Taking into account the EIA guidance above and the limited information available about the site allocation options at this stage of plan making, the site options that were screened in for detailed assessment of their potential effects in relation to all SA objectives were sites with either:
- an area of more than five hectares, or;
 - capacity for more than 150 dwellings.
- 2.49 Exceedance of one of these size thresholds was not taken to imply that the proposed development would have significant effects but rather that more detailed assessment was necessary to determine whether such effects are likely.
- 2.50 National Planning Practice Guidance on use of the indicative criteria and thresholds in Table 2.3 states that in judging the potential for a proposed development to have a significant effect consideration should also be given to whether it is in a 'sensitive area'. The guidance on EIA Screening defines sensitive areas as:
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest and European sites.
 - National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
 - World Heritage Sites and scheduled monuments.
- 2.51 The EIA guidance goes on to say that other local designations which are nonetheless environmentally sensitive, may also be relevant in determining whether EIA is required. In considering the sensitivity of a particular location, regard should also be had to whether any national or internationally agreed environmental standards (e.g. air quality) are already being approached or exceeded.
- 2.52 Taking this EIA guidance on the potential for significant effects as a reference point, the criteria in Table 2.4 were used by the SA to indicate whether an allocated site was in a sensitive area and should therefore be flagged for detailed assessment of its potential effects on a particular sensitive receptor. It should be noted that these criteria are additional to the site size/scale of development-based criteria and thresholds in Table 2.3, providing an additional check for smaller scale proposals. We included all of the 'sensitive area' criteria listed in EIA guidance. Many other environmental receptors which were considered when assessing the effects of the larger developments exceeding the size thresholds in Table 2.3 do not form part of the sensitive area criteria. This was on the basis that that effect of smaller development would not be significant on the asset/receptor as a whole (for example the effect of small scale development in relation to loss of high quality agricultural land or sterilisation of mineral reserves). We did, however, include certain other environmental receptors in Table 2.4 which, in our judgement, were

sensitive in a local context and where even small development sites may be capable of effects that are significant.

Table 2.4 'Sensitive area' criteria indicating the potential for significant effects

Type of 'sensitive area'	Criteria indicating potential for significant effects on a particular receptor	SA objectives against which site will be assessed	Justification for criteria
Sites of Special Scientific Interest and European sites	Any part of allocation falls within a SSSI or European site, or Allocation falls within 2 km of a SSSI	SA6: Conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment	EIA screening guidance. Impact Risk Zones define zones around each SSSI according to the particular sensitivities of the features for which it is notified and specify the types of development that have the potential to have adverse impacts. 2 km zone is the furthest one from SSSI boundaries in which effects from residential development are considered.
Other biodiversity assets	Any part of allocation falls within a locally designated wildlife site (Local Wildlife Site, Local Nature Reserve), or area of Ancient Woodland.	SA6: Conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment	Stipulation in EIA guidance that other local designations which are environmentally sensitive may also be relevant.
National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty	There are no National Parks or AONBs within the District. Any part of allocation falls within the area of search for the proposed extension of Dedham Vale AONB, which will be treated as an existing AONB for the purposes of this test.	SA15: Maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	EIA screening guidance. The area of search for the proposed extension of Dedham Vale AONB will be treated as an existing AONB for the purposes of this test.
World Heritage Sites and scheduled monuments	There are no World Heritage Sites within the District. Any part of allocation falls within a scheduled monument.	SA10: Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	EIA screening guidance.
Flood zone	Any part of allocation falls within Flood Zone 3a or 3b or any Critical Drainage Areas identified by a future Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP).	SA 13: Reduce the risk of flooding	The importance of potential risk to life or property warrants inclusion of smaller scale sites/developments in detailed assessment.
Other heritage assets	Any of allocation falls within a Registered Park and Garden or Conservation Area or a listed building falls within the allocation.	SA10: Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	Stipulation in EIA guidance that other local designations which are environmentally sensitive may also be relevant.
Socially or economically deprived	Any part of an allocation falls within a Lower Super Output Area having an Index of Multiple Deprivation which ranks it amongst the 20% most deprived in the country.	SA1: Create safe environments which improve quality of life and community cohesion SA2: Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home SA3: Improve the health of the District's residents and mitigate/reduce potential health	To reflect socio-economic sensitivities in the receiving environment, in response to consultation comments.

Type of 'sensitive area'	Criteria indicating potential for significant effects on a particular receptor	SA objectives against which site will be assessed	Justification for criteria
		inequalities SA5: Achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth	

2.53 Having identified site options with the potential for significant effects by reference to the site size criteria in **Table 2.3** and the 'sensitive area' criteria in Table 2.4, we then assessed their sustainability effects as described below.

Overarching approach and criteria for SA of site options

2.54 Sustainability effects of the Local Plan have been assessed taking into account factors such as the nature of nearby features, pathways between sources of effects and receptors and the vulnerability of receptors to effects. We used a Geographic Information System (GIS) to undertake the assessment of sites. Error! Reference source not found. sets out the detailed criteria that were applied in assessing the sustainability effects of the reasonable alternative site options for housing and for employment that had the potential for significant effects. The criteria generally related to the proximity of the site to relevant receptors such as designated biodiversity sites.

2.55 The detailed criteria in Error! Reference source not found. took as a starting point those developed by Place Services for the SA of Braintree District's now-withdrawn Site Allocations and Development Management Plan. The detailed criteria and the sustainability objectives and key criteria to which they relate from the earlier SA work have already been subject to stakeholder consultation and found to be fit for purpose. They also took account of the particular spatial data sets that are available for the District. As previously described, LUC reviewed the SA objectives and made two amendments. We also made some modifications to the key criteria and assumptions developed by Place Services for SA of site allocations for the following reasons:

- To amend the significance of effects attributed to certain criteria where LUC's professional judgement differs from that of Place Services. This resulted in more criteria giving rise to significant rather than minor effects compared to the assessment framework devised by Place Services.
- To reduce the total number of criteria used to assess effects in relation to the SA objectives, particularly criteria that will not result in a significant or uncertain (but potentially significant) effect in any circumstances. This helped to ensure that significant effects are not lost amongst large numbers of insignificant effects and that the resources required to carry out the SA were appropriate for the content and level of detail in the Draft Local Plan.
- Where the evidence sources / data used by Place Services to inform the assessment were not available to the Council.

2.56 The larger an individual new housing allocation is, the less likely that it can be accommodated within the boundary of an existing settlement where it is likely to be closer to existing services and facilities. In general, the SA does not make any assumptions about new services and facilities that will be required as part of large new housing developments, with the following exceptions, as advised by the Council⁶:

- Allocated housing sites with a capacity of at least 700 new dwellings were assumed to incorporate a new primary school and a bus stop with at least one bus per day, seven days per week (referred to as an 'infrequent' service).
- Allocated housing sites with a capacity of at least 3,000 new dwellings were assumed to incorporate at least one new primary school, a new secondary school, a bus stop with at least

⁶ Based on conversation between Braintree District Council and Essex County Council dated 7th November 2014, in relation to developer contributions.

one bus per hour, seven days per week (referred to as a 'frequent service'), plus an appropriate level of community facilities.

- 2.57 The Council confirmed that developers would be required to divert any existing public rights of way that might otherwise be lost to development. Information was not available at this stage of the plan making process to determine whether site allocations would result in any new or improved public rights of way being provided by new developments. These aspects were not, therefore, assessed in the SA of sites.
- 2.58 In appraising the effects of potential site allocations, each site was assessed on its own merits. This facilitated comparison of the positive and negative effects likely to be associated with each site, thereby assisting the Council in considering sustainability as part of the site selection process. The potential for the sustainability effects of sites to be modified by other policies in the Draft Local Plan did not form part of the assessment of individual sites but was rather considered through an assessment of cumulative effects (see below).
- 2.59 It was assumed that most of the land area of each allocated site is likely to be developed, giving limited scope to avoid constraints. Accordingly, we assumed that where 25% (typically) or more of an allocated site overlies a constraint, a significant effect is likely to occur. Uncertainty exists as to whether significant adverse effects can be avoided by layout of development within the site boundary and this was reflected in the detailed site assessment criteria.
- 2.60 Many of the detailed appraisal criteria were proximity based and considered whether an allocated site was within 'walking distance' of various services, facilities and environmental features. Various pieces of research provide a variety of recommended guidance distances for walking. For example, the Institute of Highways and Transportation categorises distances depending upon location and purpose of the trip, and 'desirable', 'acceptable', and 'preferred maximum' as set out in Table 2.5.

Table 2.5 Institute of Highways and Transport recommended walking distances

	Town centres (m)	Commuting/School/Sight-seeing (m)	Elsewhere (m)
Desirable	200	500	400
Acceptable	400	1,000	800
Preferred maximum	800	2,000	1,200

- 2.61 For the purposes of the appraisal, a standard straight line 'walking distance' of 800 m was assumed, unless otherwise stated. The professional judgement of LUC and BDC officers were used to vary this standard distance in relation to certain services and facilities. For example, the standard distance of 800 m was used for railway stations but a shorter distance of 400 m was used for bus stops, reflecting the fact that individuals are likely to be prepared to walk greater distances to larger scale facilities. Increasing cycling is also an important sustainability objective for the District and positive sustainability scores relating to development allocations being within convenient walking distance of services and facilities also reflected the fact that such allocations are also likely to increase the proportion of trips made by bike. Where travel distances of 1 km or more were tested, this was based on driving distance via the road network (estimated using GIS-based network analysis) rather than straight line distance.
- 2.62 The SA criteria included analysis of the proximity of residential areas to main employment areas. Major employment opportunities will be located throughout the District, not only in the areas allocated for employment, but also in the Town Centres, retail parks, hospitals, and in small scale premises around the towns as well as large scale businesses concentrated at the employment areas. Although there is no guarantee that people will find jobs at the employment areas closest to them, it was considered that provision of homes close to major sources of employment would support people in making shorter journeys to work.

Approach to SA of preferred sites

- 2.63 Once the Council had selected its preferred sites, each of these was then subject to appraisal in relation to the full set of SA objectives and criteria relevant to the proposed use. Whilst small sites that do not fall within sensitive areas were still considered to be incapable of significant effects individually, these sites were nevertheless subject to appraisal against all SA objectives at the preferred options stage in order to provide readers of the SA Report with a more rounded picture of likely effects, whether significant or not, for those sites being proposed for allocation by the Council.
- 2.64 The Publication Draft Local Plan includes some allocations that already have planning permission or permission for Change of Use Prior Approval. Those allocations with extant planning permission were not subject to SA, as the Local Plan cannot influence the decision to develop these sites and therefore the sites could be considered part of the baseline.

Assessing cumulative effects of site allocations

- 2.65 All of the methodological steps above aimed to assess each site allocation option on its own merits. Once the Local Plan development reached a stage where preferred sites were identified, the cumulative effects of all preferred sites was also assessed.
- 2.66 The cumulative effects assessment also considered the extent to which the effects identified are likely to be mitigated by strategic or development management policies set out elsewhere in the Draft Local Plan, by national planning policy, or by other regulatory mechanisms. This focused on the spatial distribution of development since the total amount of development is specified by the Shared Strategic Plan which has been subject to separate SA by Place Services.

Difficulties encountered

The SEA Regulations, Schedule 2(8) require the Environmental Report to include:

'...a description of how the assessment was undertaken including any difficulties (such as technical deficiencies or lack of know-how) encountered in compiling the required information.'

- 2.67 Not all baseline data are currently available or are possible to collect. SEA Guidance recognises that data gaps will exist but suggests that where baseline information is unavailable or unsatisfactory, authorities should consider how it will affect their assessments and determine how to improve it for use in the assessment of future plans. The collection and analysis of baseline data is regarded as a continual and evolving process, given that information can change or be updated on a regular basis. Not all the relevant information was available at the local level and as a result there are some gaps within the data set but it is believed that the available information provides a sufficiently comprehensive view of the sustainability issues within the plan area. In collating the baseline data, problems encountered included the difficulty of obtaining ward or district level data consistently and the difficulty of identifying trends in some data sets.
- 2.68 During the appraisal of the policy options at Draft Local Plan stage, neither the preferred approach nor the reasonable alternatives had been worked up in detail and it was difficult to assess in detail the likely effects of the options on each SA objective. Once the preferred approaches had been worked up into a full policy wording, the preferred policy was reassessed as it was then possible to draw more certain conclusions about the likely effects.
- 2.69 There was a need to ensure that a large number of site options could be appraised consistently. This was achieved by the use of assumptions relating to each SA objective, as described above and detailed in **Error! Reference source not found.**
- 2.70 Where site allocations were close to the Braintree District boundary, the spatial analysis was hampered by the fact that some spatial data required for proximity-based assessments were not available for neighbouring districts, or for part of them. In these cases, a note was added to the table of assessment criteria in **Error! Reference source not found.** to explain how SA scores were modified to reflect the uncertainty caused by this lack of spatial data.

3 Sustainability context for development in Braintree District

Review of plans, policies and programmes

- 3.1 Braintree District's Local Plan is not being prepared in isolation, being greatly influenced by other plans, policies and programmes and by broader sustainability objectives. It needs to be consistent with international and national guidance and strategic planning policies and should contribute to the goals of a wide range of other programmes and strategies, such as those relating to social policy, culture and heritage. It must also conform to environmental protection legislation and the sustainability objectives established at an international and national level.
- 3.2 A review was undertaken of the other plans, policies and programmes of relevance to the Local Plan. This review was amended since it was originally presented in the SA Scoping Report, in light of comments received during the scoping consultation. Further updates have been carried out to ensure the information presented in this report is up to date. The updated review of relevant plans, policies and programmes can be seen in full in Appendix 1 and the key findings are summarised below.

Environmental, social and economic policy objectives

The Environment Report should include:

'The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the plan or programme and the way those objectives and any environmental considerations have been taken into account during its preparation.'

(SEA Regulations Schedule 2(5))

- 3.3 There are a wide range of plans and programmes at the international and national levels that are relevant to the emerging Braintree District Draft Local Plan. The full review of other relevant plans and programmes can be seen in Appendix 1 and the key components are summarised below.

Key international plans, policies and programmes

- 3.4 At the international level, Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (the 'SEA Directive') and Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora (the 'Habitats Directive') are particularly significant as they require Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to be undertaken in relation to the emerging Draft Local Plan. These processes should be undertaken iteratively and integrated into the production of the Local Plan in order to ensure that any potential negative environmental effects (including on European-level nature conservation designations) are identified and can be mitigated.
- 3.5 There is a wide range of other EU Directives relating to issues such as water quality, waste and air quality, most of which have been transposed into UK law through national-level policy; however, the international directives have been included in Appendix 1 for completeness.

Key national plans, policies and programmes

- 3.6 The most significant development in terms of the policy context for the emerging Draft Local Plan has been the publication of the NPPF which replaced the suite of Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) and Planning Policy Guidance (PPGs). The purpose of the NPPF was to streamline national planning policy, having reduced over a thousand pages of policy down to around 60 pages. The

Braintree District Local Plan must be consistent with the requirements of the NPPF, which sets out information about the purposes of local plan-making. It states that:

'Local Plans must be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. To this end, they should be consistent with the principles and policies set out in this Framework, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development.'

- 3.7 The NPPF also requires Local Plans to be 'aspirational but realistic'. This means that opportunities for appropriate development should be identified in order to achieve net gains in terms of sustainable social, environmental and economic development; however significant adverse impacts in any of those areas should not be allowed to occur.
- 3.8 The NPPF requires local planning authorities to set out the strategic priorities for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:
- the homes and jobs needed in the area;
 - the provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development;
 - the provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the provision of minerals and energy (including heat);
 - the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local facilities; and
 - climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape.
- 3.9 In addition, Local Plans should:
- plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of this Framework;
 - be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date;
 - be based on co-operation with neighbouring authorities, public, voluntary and private sector organisations;
 - indicate broad locations for strategic development on a key diagram and land-use designations on a proposals map;
 - allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary, and provide detail on form, scale, access and quantum of development where appropriate;
 - identify areas where it may be necessary to limit freedom to change the uses of buildings, and support such restrictions with a clear explanation;
 - identify land where development would be inappropriate, for instance because of its environmental or historic significance; and
 - contain a clear strategy for enhancing the natural, built and historic environment, and supporting Nature Improvement Areas where they have been identified.

Baseline information

- 3.10 Information on the current state of relevant aspects of the environment, society and economy in Braintree District provides the context for assessing the sustainability of proposals in Braintree District's Local Plan, allowing existing trends to be identified and providing a baseline against which to predict the likely effects of the plan.
- 3.11 The collection of information on the current state of the environment is also a requirement of the SEA Regulations.

The 'Environmental Report' should include:

- 'The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme'
- 'the environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected'
- 'any existing environmental problems which are relevant to the plan or programme, including in particular, those relating to any areas of a particular environmental importance, such as any areas designated pursuant to Council Directive 79/409/EEC on the conservation of wild birds and the Habitats Directive.'

SEA Regulations Schedule 2 (2, 3 and 4)

- 3.12 Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations requires data to be gathered on biodiversity, population, human health, flora, fauna, soil, water, air, climatic factors, material assets, cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the inter-relationship between the above factors. As an integrated SA and SEA is being carried out, baseline information relating to other 'sustainability' topics has also been included; for example information about housing, social inclusiveness, transport, energy, waste and economic growth.
- 3.13 The baseline information included within this SA Report took that presented in the SA of the Publication Site Allocations and Development Management Plan⁷ as its starting point. This information has been amended, where relevant, to take account of new information that has become available since the earlier SA work and consultation comments received on the SA Scoping Report for the Braintree District Local Plan. The baseline information is presented in **Error! Reference source not found..**

Key sustainability issues and their likely evolution without the Draft Local Plan

- 3.14 As reproduced above, the SEA Regulations require that the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme be described in the Environmental Report. They also require a description of existing environmental problems. These requirements were met by Table 3.1 which drew on the baseline information in **Error! Reference source not found..** These issues also informed the choice of SA objectives against which the Local Plan's sustainability was appraised, as set out in Table 2.2.

Table 3.1 Key sustainability issues of relevance to the Braintree District Local Plan

Key issues	Likely evolution without the Local Plan
Biodiversity and geodiversity	
Whilst there are no internationally designated biodiversity sites in Braintree District, a number within Colchester and Tendring Districts are subject to joint monitoring of potential recreational disturbance.	Population growth in Essex has the potential to increase recreational disturbance on internationally designated biodiversity sites in Colchester and Tendring Districts.
Braintree District has sites of national, regional and local ecological	Although sites in Braintree District are all in favourable condition, uncoordinated development and policies could place pressure on national and local ecological sites resulting in adverse effects upon their condition.

⁷ SA and SEA of Braintree District Publication Site Allocation and Development Management Plan, Place Services for Braintree District Council, February 2014, <http://bit.ly/139ewLd>

Key issues	Likely evolution without the Local Plan
<p>significance as well as special roadside verges. In addition, it is also close proximity to a SSSI in neighbouring Chelmsford. The national designations are all in favourable condition.</p>	<p>The NPPF (paragraph 7) states that the planning system has a key environmental role including, '<i>contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity...</i>'. Therefore, even without the new Local Plan this issue is being addressed to some extent by other policy. However, given the current pressures for growth and development within the district, a Local Plan can help to ensure that less environmentally sensitive locations are chosen, thereby reducing development pressure on wildlife which may already be under pressure from climate change. Therefore the opportunity to protect and enhance the environment and achieve net biodiversity gains (e.g. through restoration) could be greatly enhanced by a Local Plan.</p>
<p>Landscape</p>	
<p>Landscape Character Assessments have identified varying levels of sensitivity to development across the District. The north east part of Braintree District is being considered for the expansion of Dedham Vale AONB.</p>	<p>There is the potential for development to contribute to detrimental changes in landscape character in Braintree District. In the absence of a plan, there is the potential that new development could be located in sensitive areas leading to negative impacts on valued landscapes, including those being considered for an extension to the Dedham Vale AONB, protected lanes, and sensitive river valleys.</p>
<p>Soils</p>	
<p>Braintree District contains some of the most productive agricultural land in the County which could be lost to development.</p>	<p>Continued population growth and economic growth are likely to continue to increase the pressure to develop greenfield sites, with the risk of loss of high quality agricultural land.</p> <p>The NPPF requires local planning authorities to encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value, and to take into account the benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be used in preference to those of a higher quality. Without a Local Plan, National policies would still provide protection to the best agricultural land within Braintree District, but local policies can ensure that development on the best and most versatile agricultural land is, where possible, avoided or required to be temporary and reversible.</p>
<p>Braintree District contains areas of historically contaminated land which could pose a risk to human health and the natural environment or which could be remediated and brought into appropriate use.</p>	<p>The NPPF requires planning policies to ensure that sites are suitable for their new use, taking account of ground conditions including pollution from previous uses, any proposals for remediation and impacts on the natural environment arising from that remediation. This offers some protection from the potential adverse effects of contamination in the absence of a Local Plan. A Local Plan underpinned by evidence on areas of contamination could positively identify and support development which achieves remediation of contaminated sites and avoid development which poses a risk to human health or the wider natural environment.</p>
<p>Open space</p>	
<p>The large increase predicted in Braintree District's population (23.3% between 2011 and 2035) will place increasing pressure on open space provision.</p>	<p>With the rising population, pressures on the quality and availability of open space are likely to continue without a planned approach to development. Without the Local Plan, there is less opportunity to adopt a co-ordinated, spatial approach to the enhancement of open green spaces/green networks for recreation, walking and cycling networks, and wildlife.</p>
<p>Air quality</p>	
<p>Air quality is not currently a significant issue in the District. However,</p>	<p>Without action from the Local Plan to direct development to sustainable locations and increase provision of sustainable transport infrastructure, the trend for increasing car ownership and travel is likely to continue with</p>

Key issues	Likely evolution without the Local Plan
<p>locations targeted for large scale development could experience significant increases in road traffic from residents and/or employees, resulting in localised adverse effects, along major roads such as the A12 and A120.</p>	<p>associated emissions of air pollutants are likely to increase.</p>
<p>Climate change and energy</p>	
<p>Braintree District is a significant energy consumer and CO₂ emitter but has a relatively small installed renewable energy generation capacity.</p>	<p>Continued population growth and economic growth are likely to continue to increase energy consumption and associated CO₂ emissions.</p> <p>In the absence of the Local Plan, National renewable energy and carbon reduction targets and the NPPF require local authorities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and actively support energy efficiency and renewable energy. Braintree District's Climate Local Strategy and Action Plan 2015-2018 (2014) include objectives to ensure future development in the District is sustainable and prepared for climate change.</p> <p>The Local Plan can further contribute to energy efficiency and climate change mitigation through policies which reduce the need to travel and provide for sustainable transport; provide opportunities for renewable and low carbon energy generation; provide opportunities for decentralised energy and heating; and promote low carbon design approaches to reduce energy consumption in buildings.</p>
<p>Road transport is the biggest energy consumer and CO₂ emitter in the District. Braintree District is one of the largest per capita emitters of CO₂ in the County.</p>	<p>Continued population growth and economic growth are likely to continue to increase road traffic and associated CO₂ emissions.</p> <p>In the absence of the Local Plan, National renewable energy and carbon reduction targets and the NPPF require local authorities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>The Local Plan can further contribute to reducing the energy consumption and CO₂ emissions associated with road transport by promoting sustainable patterns of development which reduce the need to travel and facilitate the use of sustainable modes.</p>
<p>Water quality and water resources</p>	
<p>Water resources in Braintree District are heavily abstracted with further consumptive licences unlikely to be granted.</p>	<p>Population growth, together with the hotter, drier summers expected under climate change, are likely to put ever greater pressure on the District's water resources. National plans and strategies encourage new development to meet water efficiency standards and water companies must plan to reduce leaks from the water supply network as well as improve water efficiency. Without the Local Plan, however, it will be more difficult to adopt a co-ordinated approach to water resource planning with water companies and more difficult to implement water efficient design in new development.</p>
<p>None of Braintree District's water bodies meet the water quality requirements of the Water Framework Directive with the River Blackwater and the River Chelmer having the lowest quality.</p>	<p>The Water Framework Directive has set targets for the protection of all inland water courses. The UK has a legal obligation to meet this target and Local Authorities have a duty to work to achieve this. National Planning policy encourages the prevention of both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution.</p> <p>Therefore, in the absence of the Local Plan, National Planning policy is likely to provide some protection to Braintree District's water bodies. However, a Local Plan provides opportunities to facilitate cooperation with water companies and the Environment Agency, helping to ensure that wastewater treatment infrastructure is provided in step with increased demand. It can also steer polluting uses away from the most sensitive water environments (e.g. groundwater source protection zones) and specify that new development incorporates appropriate design features to reduce pressure on wastewater treatment infrastructure, e.g. sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).</p>

Key issues	Likely evolution without the Local Plan
Flooding	
<p>The northern areas of Braintree town are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. These and other areas identified by the Mid Essex SFRA are subject to a higher risk from fluvial flooding.</p>	<p>All development needs to take account of national policy on flood risk, including the NPPF requirement that <i>'inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk, but where development is necessary, making it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere'</i> (paragraph 100).</p> <p>The severity and likelihood of flooding is likely to increase with climate change. Without a Local Plan, it will be more difficult to meet the requirements of the NPPF.</p>
<p>Current surface water flood risk in Braintree District is uncertain, pending completion of the Essex SWMP. The 2007 Mid Essex SFRA recommended that runoff rates should be restricted for both greenfield and brownfield developments in Bocking, Braintree, Witham and Coggeshall in particular. This is also likely to be appropriate within other settlements to ease surface water flooding and drainage capacity exceedance.</p>	<p>Any surface water flood risk identified by the forthcoming SWMP for Braintree is likely to be more difficult to manage in the absence of a Local Plan. The Local Plan offers the opportunity to direct inappropriate types of development away from areas of high surface water flood risk as well to specify appropriate design measures in new development to restrict surface runoff.</p>
Cultural heritage and townscape	
<p>Braintree District has a large number of valuable heritage assets which could be sensitive to new development, including scheduled monuments, conservation areas, historic parks and gardens and listed buildings. A number of these are 'at risk'.</p>	<p>Continued development pressure means that the risk of harm to heritage assets would be likely to continue and may be exacerbated without a planned local approach to development. International and national protection is afforded by various strategies and policies (e.g. 1992 European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage; 1999 European Spatial Development Perspective; 2005 UK Sustainable Development Strategy 'Securing the Future'; and the NPPF. Paragraph 17 of NPPF states that the planning system should <i>'conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations'</i>.</p> <p>Therefore, whilst these policies make provision for the protection of listed buildings and conservation areas, it is considered that the implementation of more specific policies for Braintree District through the new Local Plan would provide greater protection for heritage assets at the local level, especially sites at risk, historic features of the landscape and urban areas identified as potentially sensitive to development. The Local Plan also affords opportunities for enhancement, for example improving the condition of 'at risk' assets and addressing detracting elements of conservation areas.</p>
Health	
<p>The health of Braintree District's population is varied compared with the England average.</p>	<p>The planning system has relatively limited influence on public health and the Local Plan is therefore likely to have relatively little effect on them. However, the NPPF states that, <i>'local planning authorities should work with public health leads and health organisations to understand and take account of the health status and needs of the local population (such as for sports, recreation and places of worship), including expected future changes, and any information about relevant barriers to improving health and well-being'</i> (paragraph 171).</p> <p>Although the NPPF seeks to improve health and wellbeing, Local Plan policies relating to health and wellbeing in Braintree District, for example increased provision of facilities for sport and recreation or spatial policies to facilitate increased walking and cycling, would provide more certainty in relation to how</p>

Key issues	Likely evolution without the Local Plan
	health issues will be addressed.
<p>Although roughly in line with national averages, Braintree District residents' rates of participation in sport are the second lowest in Essex and well below those in the most active District, which could be contributing to a higher incidence of excess weight in adults in Braintree District.</p>	<p>The NPPF recognises that <i>'access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities.'</i> (paragraph 73)</p> <p>A Local Plan can address specific local needs by ensuring that there is adequate provision of facilities to meet the needs of communities, which may help to improve participation and prevent obesity which is proportionally higher in Braintree District, compared to the rest of England.</p>
Population and society	
<p>In Braintree District 26 of 84 areas are seriously deprived with regards to 'Barriers to housing and services'.</p>	<p>The spatial distribution of deprivation and inequality in access to housing and services amongst communities within Braintree District is likely to continue in the absence of an appropriate local policy response.</p> <p>In order to achieve sustainable development, the NPPF states that the planning system has <i>'a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being'</i> (paragraph 7) Planning policies should seek to <i>'ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services'</i> (Paragraph 70)</p> <p>Therefore, the new Local Plan provides the opportunity to improve equality of opportunity by increasing the availability of housing provision for the most deprived groups. The Local Plan could also help to ensure that there is improved access and integration of services through improved transport links to community facilities across Braintree, especially in areas where there is the most need.</p>
<p>In Braintree District 23 of 84 areas are seriously deprived with regards to 'Education, skills and training'.</p>	<p>In the absence of a new Local Plan, the spatial distribution of deprivation and social exclusion in relation to education, skills and training is likely to continue.</p> <p>The NPPF states that <i>'the Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity, building on the country's inherent strengths, and to meeting the twin challenges of global competition and of a low carbon future'</i> (paragraph 18). Furthermore, <i>'local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century.'</i></p> <p>Improving the education and skills base of local residents requires a range of interventions, some of which will happen through national initiatives in respect of education. However, a new Local Plan can respond to the specific needs of the local economic context by supporting the growth of key sectors and new employment to areas, which may indirectly improve education and skills levels and access to training.</p>
<p>Whilst improving, educational attainment remains low relative to county and national rates.</p>	<p>Paragraph 20 of the NPPF states that <i>'to help achieve economic growth, local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century.'</i></p> <p>In the absence of a Local Plan, educational attainment amongst Braintree District's population could continue to be poor in comparison to the rest of the region and lead to higher levels of unemployment. Improving the education and skills base of local residents requires a range of interventions, some of which will happen through national initiatives in respect of education. Therefore, a Local Plan could set out policies and strategies to improve access to education and support the creation of a wider range of job opportunities and vocational training within the District.</p>
Economy	

Key issues	Likely evolution without the Local Plan
<p>Whilst employment rates in Braintree District are relatively good compared to with regional and national averages, job availability within the District is relatively low and a significant proportion of those working in the District are unable to access its main centres of employment by sustainable modes.</p>	<p>The NPPF states that <i>'the Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity, building on the country's inherent strengths, and to meeting the twin challenges of global competition and of a low carbon future'</i> (paragraph 18). Therefore, even without the new Local Plan this issue is being addressed to some extent by other policy.</p> <p>In the absence of a Local Plan, these economic issues may endure. The implementation of up to date policies in the new Local Plan would help address individual's access to employment and could help stimulate growth in the number of jobs available in the district, for example by ensuring that sufficient local businesses have access to the amounts and types of new employment space they require for expansion.</p>
<p>Braintree District contains a number of sites preferred or reserved for mineral extraction. Other forms of development in the District may be constrained by the need to safeguard mineral resources for extraction.</p>	<p>There will be increased pressure to develop areas containing mineral reserves, in order to support housing, employment and community facilities for an increased population.</p> <p>The NPPF states that <i>'since minerals are a finite natural resource, and can only be worked where they are found, it is important to make best use of them to secure their long-term conservation.'</i> (paragraph 142). To this end, Local Planning Authorities should <i>'identify and include policies for extraction of mineral resource of local and national importance in their area,'</i> and <i>'define Minerals Safeguarding Areas and adopt appropriate policies in order that known locations of specific minerals resources of local and national importance are not needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development, whilst not creating a presumption that resources defined will be worked; and define Minerals Consultation Areas based on these Minerals Safeguarding Areas'.</i></p> <p>The Local Plan can help ensure that there is a coordinated approach to allocating land for social and economic uses that minimises the risk of sterilising mineral resources.</p>
Housing	
<p>Demographic changes, and to a lesser extent, future employment levels and market signals, indicate the need for a significant increase in annual housing delivery in Braintree District to meet objectively assessed need.</p>	<p>The NPPF identifies that local planning authorities should, <i>'plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes)'</i> (paragraph 50). Without the implementation of the new Local Plan it is therefore uncertain whether there will be sufficient land allocations to develop new housing.</p>
<p>There is the need for a mix of housing types including social rented housing and provision in rural communities.</p>	<p>The NPPF identifies that local planning authorities should, <i>'plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes)'</i> (paragraph 50). Although the NPPF encourages a mix of housing development, it is anticipated that this requirement would be implemented at the local level through an up-to-date policy in the new Local Plan and without this the mix of housing supply is less likely to match need.</p>
<p>There is a need for affordable housing across Braintree District as the average income of newly formed households is below the minimum required to access entry level private housing in the District.</p>	<p>Without the Local Plan, an on-going lack of affordable housing is likely to lead to many people being priced out of the market and the population profile of the district may become distorted. This may have secondary effects on the economy, reducing the district's ability to attract key workers in particular. Therefore, the implementation of targeted housing objective in the new Local Plan would provide more certainty in relation to how affordable housing provision will be addressed locally.</p>
<p>In meeting the housing needs of older people, there is a need to improve the supply and stock of sheltered housing and</p>	<p>The NPPF identifies that local planning authorities should, <i>'plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes)'</i> (paragraph 50). Although the</p>

Key issues	Likely evolution without the Local Plan
provide for 'extra care' accommodation to meet the significant growth in the number of people over 85.	NPPF encourages a mix of housing development, it is anticipated that this requirement would be implemented at the local level through an up-to-date policy in the new Local Plan. This would provide more certainty regarding the issue being addressed.
There is a need for additional Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitches in the District.	<p>The National Planning policy for Traveller Sites seeks to ensure that traveller sites are located in appropriate locations with planning permission, to maintain an appropriate level of supply.</p> <p>The Local Plan could help to ensure that sufficient land is allocated for new or extended private as well rented sites which enable gypsy and traveller communities to access education, health, welfare and employment. This could help to prevent unauthorised development, which could affect the local landscape and increase social inclusion of these groups, as well as reduce tensions between traveller communities and with settled communities.</p>
Transport	
Availability of public transport is limited in the evenings and in the rural areas where almost half of the District's population live.	<p>The lack of public transport between rural communities and local centres, could lead to increasing car usage, which could lead to increasing air, noise and light pollution and carbon emissions.</p> <p>The NPPF states that planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas by '<i>supporting sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors</i>'. '<i>This should include supporting the provision and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations where identified needs are not met by existing facilities in rural service centres</i>'.</p> <p>The Local Plan provides an opportunity to improve connections between rural communities and local centres, through improving public and sustainable transport routes, which could support reductions in car use throughout the District.</p>
Braintree District residents have relatively high average travel times by public transport or walking to reach key services, including employment sites.	The Local Plan provides an opportunity to improve connections between key services, including employment centres, and public transport routes. In the absence of the Plan, local business may experience barriers to attracting future employees and job seekers without access to a car, may find it difficult to access employment opportunities.
Rail services between Braintree town and London are infrequent, being constrained by its location on a single track branch line.	<p>In the absence of a Local Plan, the limited transport between Braintree Town and London could make Braintree Town less attractive to investors and labour.</p> <p>The NPPF encourages local authorities to work with '<i>transport providers to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development</i>'.</p> <p>The new Local Plan provides an opportunity for Braintree District Council to work with National Rail to develop appropriate ways in which to expand the service provision for Braintree Town.</p>
Stansted Airport in Uttlesford District is a major employer of Braintree District residents, increasing out-commuting by car.	<p>In the absence of a Local Plan, there is likely to be a continued growth in car usage, which could lead to increasing congestion on roads out of the district, particularly in locations targeted for large scale development. This could lead to adverse effects on residents and employees, particularly along the A120.</p> <p>The Local Plan provides an opportunity to allocate new development and employment in locations that help to reduce the need to travel and to require new development to be designed in a way that encourages the use of sustainable transport.</p>

4 SA findings for the Publication Draft Local Plan Vision and Objectives

4.1 This section describes the findings of the SA in relation to the overarching vision and supporting objectives that will set the context for the Plan policies.

4.2 The Vision for the Publication Draft Local Plan is:

“By 2033, the District will be the most successful in Essex. Jobs and businesses will have increased in both quantity and quality making the District a desirable place to live and work.

Housing growth has been achieved, with the expansion of the main town of Braintree providing sustainable, attractive new homes within a market town setting. Witham, Kelvedon and Feering have also continued to expand making the most of their excellent transport links to provide high-quality homes and new community facilities. Two new garden communities are being built within the District at West of Braintree and providing new communities within a high quality environment. Smaller scale growth will continue in other areas of the District, including Halstead, meeting the local needs of smaller rural communities.

The strategic transport routes of the A120, A12 and rail routes from Braintree and Witham have been improved allowing fast and reliable connections to London, London Stansted Airport, the east coast ports and other key regional centres.

Developments in the District will have been designed and built to the highest quality, making the best use of new technologies to ensure suitability and sustainability now and in the future. High-speed reliable broadband is accessible for all homes and businesses.

All residents in the District will have access to the highest quality community facilities including health and education provision. Outstanding leisure facilities continue to be provided to ensure residents can make healthy choices, and retail and other community needs are met. The unique natural and historic environment continues to be protected and enhanced.

Braintree District continues to be an aspirational place to live with a successful economy, wide range of affordable, sustainable homes situated within a high-quality urban and rural landscape, all within easy reach of London and the wider region.”

4.3 The Vision is supported by twelve strategic Objectives. The likely sustainability effects of the Vision and Objectives have been appraised and the results are presented in Table 4.1.

4.4 The Vision for Braintree District sets a general aspiration for development in the district to take place in a sustainable way, supported by social, economic and environmental aspirations, which will enable Braintree to be an attractive place to live, work and invest.

4.5 This Vision is therefore likely to have minor positive effects (+) in relation to the majority of the SA objectives set out in the SA Framework. However, the Vision’s contribution to the achievement of the following objectives is likely to be negligible: SA objective 12: Water environment, SA objective 13: Flood risk, SA objective 14: Air quality and SA objective 16: Soil. The Vision is unlikely to lead to any significant adverse effects in relation to the SA objectives. Most of the effects of the Vision and many of the Objectives are subject to some uncertainty since their achievement will depend on the details of the Draft Local Plan policies and site allocations which are designed to implement them. The effects of the options being considered for the policies and sites are examined later in the SA report.

- 4.6 The Objectives are unlikely to have any significant negative effects (--). Most of the Objectives are likely to have significant positive (++) or minor positive effects (+) in relation to the SA objectives, or negligible (0) effects. All the Objectives have at least one significant positive effect where they directly address SA objectives, although a small number of minor negative effects (-) have also been identified.
- 4.7 The Objective Housing Need and the Objective Creating a Successful Economy focus on the delivery of housing or employment land and therefore respectively score a significant positive effect (++) in relation to SA objective 1: Housing and SA objective 3: Economy. However most of the objective are likely to result in a mixture of positive and negative effects (+/-) or minor negative effects, because while they would help to achieve the housing and employment development needed in the District, construction of new homes and employment development could have potentially negative effects on environmental receptors and could result in increased car traffic within the District. However, there would be opportunities for good design and construction techniques to mitigate potential effects and even have beneficial effects, e.g. on the setting of a heritage asset. For some of the SA objectives, the possibility for minor positive effects is not identified, but the potential minor negative effect is shown as uncertain (-?), as it will depend on how and where the housing and employment development is delivered across the District.
- 4.8 The Objective Retail and Town Centres focuses on improving the vibrancy and service provision of town centres. Therefore, it is considered likely to have significant positive effects (++) on SA objective 4: Service centre vitality and SA objective 5: Economy.
- 4.9 The Objective Transport Infrastructure seeks to improve the road network in the area, including the delivery of sustainable transport modes at new developments, ensuring safety and aiding congestion as well as improving connections to the wider network. Therefore, this objective directly addresses SA objective 7: Sustainable travel, SA objective 8: Accessibility and SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation with a significant positive effect for each.
- 4.10 The Objective Broadband, and Education and Skills are likely to have a significant positive effect for SA objective 5: Economy. The provision of broadband will support businesses and home-workers, while access to education and skills will help provide the skills necessary for businesses in the district to thrive. The objective Education and skills is also directly linked to for SA objective 9: Education and skills and so a significant positive effect is also likely for this SA objective. For both objectives, all SA objectives relating to the environment are likely to score a negligible effect (0).
- 4.11 Two Objectives, Protection of the Environment and Good Quality Design are likely to result in significant positive effects (++) or minor positive (+) in relation to most SA objectives. Both of these Objectives seek to improve the quality of the local environment, by protecting the historic environment and landscape character. Therefore, both of these Objectives directly address SA Objective 10: Historic environment and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes and so significant positive effects are expected for these SA objectives. The objective Protection of the Environment will also have a significant positive effect on SA objective 3: Health and SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity.
- 4.12 Overall, the Healthy Communities Objective is likely to result in minor positive (+) or negligible (0) effects for most SA objectives, with three significant positive (++) effects. The objective focuses on encouraging active and healthy choices by ensuring the retention and creation of outdoor community areas for sport and recreation, while also encouraging sustainable travel by providing cycle ways and pedestrian links. The policy also addresses the expansion of local health facilities. Therefore, this Objective is identified as having a significant positive (++) effect in relation to SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion, SA objective 3: Health and SA objective 7: Sustainable travel.
- 4.13 The Objective Social Infrastructure would have a significant positive effect for SA objective 1: Community Safety and cohesion and SA objective 8: Accessibility. The policy focuses on providing access to local and community facilities. A couple of other minor positive (+) effects have been identified for some SA objective, however the majority of SA objective score a negligible (0) for this objective.

- 4.14 The Objective Sustainability, directly addresses resource efficiency and energy efficiency, by promoting renewables and minimising the use of natural resources. The Objective also seeks to ensure that development takes place in well-connected areas making the best use of previously developed land. Therefore, this policy is identified as having a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 8: Accessibility and SA: objective 11: Climate change mitigation.
- 4.15 The Objective Empowering Local People would have a significant positive effect for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion. The Objective focuses on creating an environment where local residents and businesses feel fully involved and engaged in shaping the future of the district. Documents will be written in ways which are accessible and transparent. This will help support social inclusion. All other SA objective will have a negligible score.

DRAFT

Table 4.1 Summary of SA scores for Publication Draft Local Plan Visions and Objectives

Vision / objective	SA Objectives															
	SA1: Community safety & cohesion	SA2: Housing	SA3: Health	SA4: Service centre vitality	SA5: Economy	SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	SA7: Sustainable travel	SA8: Accessibility	SA9: Education and skills	SA10: Historic environment	SA11: Climate change mitigation	SA12: Water environment	SA13: Flood risk	SA14: Air quality	SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	SA16: Soil
Vision	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	0
Creating a successful economy	+	0	+	+	++	-?	+	+	+	0	+/-	0	+	+/-	+	-
Retail & town centres	+	0	+	++	++	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	0
Housing need	+	++	+	0	+	-?	0	0	0	0	+/-	0	+	+/-	-?	0
Transport infrastructure	0	0	+	0	+	0	++	++	0	0	++	0	0	+	0	0
Broadband	+	+	0	0	++	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Education and skills	+	0	+	0	++	0	0	+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Protection of the environment	0	0	++	0	+	++	0	0	0	++	+	+	+	+	++	+
Good quality design	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	++	+	+	+	+	++	0
Healthy communities	++	0	++	0	+	+	++	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0
Social infrastructure	++	0	+	0	+	0	0	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sustainability	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	++	0	0	++	0	0	+	0	+
Empowering local people	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5 SA findings for the 'Spatial Strategy'

- 5.1 The Spatial Strategy section of the Publication Draft Local Plan categorises the District's settlements according to the size, function and service provision of each one. It then goes on to state that taking both this settlement hierarchy and the Council's analysis of opportunities and constraints into account, the broad spatial strategy should concentrate development on Braintree, planned new garden communities, Witham and the A12/Great Eastern Mainline (GEML) corridor, and Halstead.
- 5.2 The Spatial Strategy section of the Publication Draft Local Plan includes a single policy, LPP 1: Development Boundaries, the assessment for which is presented at the end of this section. The spatial strategy is also implemented through the more detailed spatial policies of the Publication Draft Local Plan, notably the New Garden Community policies of the Shared Strategic Plan, Policy LPP 2: Location of Employment Land, Policy LPP 11: Primary Shopping Areas, Policy LPP 12: District Centre, Policy LPP 19 Housing Provision and Delivery, and the Strategic Growth Location policies LPP20-LPP25. Each of these policies and the related site allocations is individually assessed in the following sections of this SA Report or by Place Services in their SA of the Shared Strategic Plan. In addition, an assessment of the cumulative effects of the Publication Draft Local Plan is made in Chapter 11.
- 5.3 An assessment of the spatial strategy as a whole and assessments of the reasonable alternatives considered are presented below. The scores for the option included in the Publication Draft Local Plan are shown in the column titled 'Pub. LP' here and throughout the rest of this document.

Summary of Spatial Strategy options:

Publication: Main Towns, A12/GEML Corridor and Garden Communities (AS6) A hybrid option that mixes the spatial strategy of concentrating development around Braintree with the strategy of focusing on sites with good access to sustainable transport. This includes some limited distribution to other population centres at Witham and Halstead, and a strategic allocation at Feering. There is limited development along the Braintree branch line outside of main towns due to the limited level of service provision in existing villages immediately adjacent to stations. Cross border Garden Communities are identified as broad areas of search which would not be deliverable until the end of the plan period.

A: Excluding Large Sites (AS1) In this strategy, the maximum sized site was set at 100-200 dwellings. This strategy would achieve diversity and improve deliverability, however a large quantum of sites would have to be identified. Many of the possible development sites near towns have a capacity of greater than 200 dwellings, whereas many of the smaller possible development sites are more rural. As such, this option is expected to rely heavily on development in rural areas.

B: Large Developments Only (AS2) A series of large developments would bring a higher level of planning gain and large sites have the viability to support more infrastructure. Large sites are being promoted by landowners around the existing settlements of Braintree, Witham, Halstead, Feering, Kelvedon and Coggeshall and sustainable urban extensions would be allocated to these as they had some infrastructure to support early phases.

C: Sites with high sustainable transport (AS3) All stations along the Great Eastern Main Line (GEML) corridor and Braintree branch line were considered to have the highest levels of sustainable transport capacity. This would be underpinned by being near town

centres with good bus services or being near railway stations. All three GEML stations (Hatfield Peverel, Witham, and Kelvedon/Feering) would be the focus of significant allocations, along with Braintree. A smaller amount would be allocated at Cressing.

D: Centred around Braintree (AS4) With the retention of strategic allocations around Braintree, capacity for a further 7,000 dwellings would need to be found. There is an abundance of land submitted to the SHLAA around Braintree, Bocking and Great Notley. Sites illustrated in this spatial strategy option were land to the south east of Braintree at Cressing and Ford End and land to the west of Braintree, although many other options were available.

E: Rural Distribution (AS5) A high level distribution of housing was made in accordance with the village hierarchy. The main towns would be allocated development where permission is already granted and the remaining quantum of housing distributed formulaically to the 3 tiers of villages.

- 2,600 dwellings to Braintree;
- 1,350 dwellings to Witham;
- 495 dwellings to Halstead;
- 300 dwellings to each of the 5 key service villages;
- 200 dwellings in each of the 7 secondary villages; and
- 100 dwellings for each of the remaining 43 tertiary villages.

SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C	D	E
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA2: Housing	++	++	++?	++	++?	++
SA3: Health	+	-?	+	+	+	-?
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-	+/-
SA5: Economy	+	-?	+	+/-	+	-?
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-?	+/-?	-?	+/-	-?	?
SA7: Sustainable travel	++	--?	+	++	+	-?
SA8: Accessibility	+++	-?	+/-	+	+/-	+/-
SA9: Education and skills	+	-?	+	+	+	-?
SA10: Historic environment	-?	0?	-?	-?	-?	?
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+	-?	+/-	++	+/-	-?
SA12: Water environment	-?	?	-?	-?	-?	?
SA13: Flood risk	-?	?	-?	-?	-?	?
SA14: Air quality	+/-	?	--?	+/-	--?	?
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	?	-?	-?	+/-	-?	?
SA16: Soil	--	-?	-?	--	-?	-?

5.4 While the alternative spatial strategies described by the Council include an indication of possible sites at which the strategy option could be delivered, the SA of alternatives focuses on the broad distribution that would be provided by the spatial option. Assessments of individual site options are provided elsewhere in the SA Report.

SA findings for publication spatial strategy: Main Towns, A12/GEML Corridor and Garden Communities (AS6)

- 5.5 This option will meet the identified housing need (including affordable housing) and is therefore expected to have significant positive effects on SA objective 2: Housing.
- 5.6 In focusing development in main towns and areas with high levels of sustainable transport, this option is expected to lead to development in proximity to existing services or facilities or with sustainable transport links to these. This is likely to have positive effects for SA objectives 4: Service centre vitality, 7: Sustainable travel and 8: Accessibility. This is likely to lead to associated per capita decreases in carbon emissions, resulting in positive implications for SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation. High levels of accessibility are expected to correspond to good access to health, education and employment facilities, leading to positive effects for SA objectives 3: Health, 5: Economy and 9: Education and skills. In addition, garden communities are expected to follow a model that promotes high levels of accessibility and sustainable transport⁸. There is some uncertainty associated with these effects as they depend on particular locations for development.
- 5.7 Development at Braintree, Witham and Feering may lead to negative effects on Local Nature Reserves near these settlements, due to increases in urban edge effects, such as recreation and pet predation, leading to negative effects on SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity. Such effects remain uncertain as they depend on the exact design and location of development.
- 5.8 Listed buildings are generally more concentrated in and around the urban areas of the District, therefore development in and around Braintree, Witham and Halstead is likely to be in proximity to heritage assets. As a result, this option could lead to negative effects on the settings of these assets, or the assets themselves, resulting in a negative effects on SA Objective 10. This remains uncertain as effects depend on the exact location and design of development.
- 5.9 The Water Cycle Study⁹ (WCS) indicates that the Water Recycling Centres (WRCs) at Bocking and Braintree do not have sufficient capacity to serve proposed future development across the District. Without further action, increased wastewater resulting from development could exceed environmental permits and have negative impacts on the quality of watercourses and negative effects on SA Objective 12. However, the WCS concludes that it would be feasible to upgrade these WRCs and revise environmental quality permits to ensure that watercourses are not significantly harmed.
- 5.10 Whilst the district lies largely within Flood Zone 1, which is at low risk of flooding, there are small areas of Flood Zone 3 around Braintree, associated with the River Blackwater and the River Brain. Large developments around Braintree are more likely to be located within or near to areas of Flood Zone 3, resulting in a negative effect against SA Objective 13. This remains uncertain as effects depend on the exact location and design of development.
- 5.11 The effects of this option on SA objective 15: Landscape remain uncertain, as many of the potential development areas, including Braintree, Halstead and Feering are surrounded by a mix of land with low, moderate and high landscape sensitivity, therefore effects depend on the exact location and design of development.
- 5.12 Land around Braintree and Halstead consists of a mix of Grades 2 and 3 agricultural land, whilst the majority of land around the GEML consists mainly of Grade 2 agricultural land, therefore it is

⁸ TCPA (date unavailable) Garden City Principles. Available at: <https://www.tcpa.org.uk/garden-city-principles>, accessed: 16/01/17

⁹ AECOM (2017) Braintree District Council Water Cycle Study

likely that this option will lead to loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. This has resulted in likely significant negative effects on SA objective 16: Soil.

- 5.13 This option is likely to lead to development in proximity to the A12, as the GEML follows this road, with increased road traffic and negative implications for air quality. In addition, Braintree is adjacent to the A120 and therefore this option is likely to increase traffic on this road and increase development within 200m of this road. However, this option is expected to encourage travel by sustainable transport and may reduce the need to travel, which could help to improve air quality. This has resulted in an assessment of mixed effects for SA objective 14: Air quality.

SA findings for Option A: Excluding large sites (AS1)

- 5.14 This option will meet the identified housing need (including affordable housing) and is therefore expected to have significant positive effects on SA objective 2: Housing.
- 5.15 This option is likely to lead to development in rural areas, due to lack of availability of suitably sized sites near existing urban areas. As such, this option could result in substantial amounts of development being directed away from existing service centres and smaller developments may not be of the critical mass required to result in new service centres. Therefore, development is less likely to be in proximity to services and facilities, although development may help to support the few services that are present, such as village schools, although it is uncertain if these will have capacity to serve new residents. As such, this option is assessed as having mixed effects against SA objective 4: Service centre vitality, but overall negative effects against SA objectives 3: Health and 9: Education and skills, although this depends on the exact location of development.
- 5.16 In addition, development may be located further from existing employment areas and smaller developments may not be of a critical mass to encourage development of new local employment opportunities, resulting in negative effects against SA objective 5: Economy.
- 5.17 The majority of designated wildlife sites are located near urban areas, particularly Braintree, Halstead and East Colne. Therefore, concentrating development on smaller sites in rural areas is less likely to result in negative effects on these designated sites. However, rural sites may be more likely to consist mainly of Greenfield land. Therefore mixed effects have been recorded against SA Objective 6, although uncertainty remains as effects depend on the exact location of development.
- 5.18 The wide distribution of development also has significant negative implications for SA objective 7: Sustainable travel, as rural areas are less likely to have good sustainable transport links. This is likely to lead to associated negative implications for SA objective 8: Accessibility and SA objective 11: Climate mitigation, as residents are likely to rely on travel by car, although such effects depend on the exact location of development.
- 5.19 There are a number of heritage assets distributed across the District, but listed buildings are more concentrated in the larger settlements. Whilst smaller sites in rural areas are less likely to be located in proximity to a heritage asset, this is uncertain as it depends on the exact location of development, resulting in neutral effects with uncertainty on SA objective 10.
- 5.20 Development in rural areas under this option is more likely to lead to development in areas of moderate or high landscape sensitivity, leading to a negative effect on SA Objective 15: Landscape. In addition, this option is likely to lead to development primarily on greenfield land, which could have negative implications for landscape. Uncertainty is recorded against SA objective 15, as effects depend on the exact location and design of development.
- 5.21 The majority of the district consists of Grades 2 or 3 agricultural land, therefore it is likely that development dispersed in rural areas will lead to loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (although it is not known whether most areas of Grade 3 agricultural land are Grade 3a or 3b). This has resulted in likely negative effects on SA objective 16: Soil, although effects depend on the exact location of development.
- 5.22 Uncertain effects have been recorded against SA objectives 12, 13 and 14, as effects depend on the exact location and design of development.

SA findings for Option B: Large developments only (AS2)

- 5.23 This option will meet the identified housing need (including affordable housing) and is therefore expected to have significant positive effects on SA objective 2: Housing. However, delivering housing through a small number of large sites could reduce the likelihood of meeting the housing need in the early years of the plan period, due to developer capacity limitations. This has resulted in some uncertainty with regards to SA objective 2.
- 5.24 Larger developments are likely to be focused around existing urban areas, which are likely to have a good level of provision for services and facilities. Larger developments may also provide more opportunity for provision of new services and facilities, including health and education facilities and public transport links. As per the assumptions set out in paragraph 2.48 of the Regulation 18 SA Report¹⁰, housing sites with a capacity of at least 700 new dwellings are assumed to incorporate a new primary school and bus stop, and housing sites with a capacity of at least 3,000 new dwellings are assumed to incorporate at least one new primary school, a new secondary school, a bus stop and community facilities. As a result, this option is likely to have positive effects with regards to SA objectives 3: Health, 7: Sustainable travel and 9: Education and skills, although this depends on the design of development and level of infrastructure provision. Whilst this would have significant positive implications for accessibility, it is also possible that significant increases in the number of houses could increase congestion, particularly in smaller settlements, such as Feering. This has led to an assessment result of mixed effects with regards to SA objective 8: Accessibility.
- 5.25 Listed buildings are generally more concentrated in and around the urban areas of the District, therefore large developments in and around Braintree are likely to be in proximity to heritage assets. As a result, this option could lead to negative effects on the settings of these assets, or the assets themselves, resulting in a negative effects on SA Objective 10. This remains uncertain as effects depend on the exact location and design of development.
- 5.26 In potentially increasing services and facilities and public transport links, this option could reduce the need to travel by car. However, as described above, this option could lead to increased congestion leading to uncertainty with regards to effects on SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation.
- 5.27 The Water Cycle Study¹¹ (WCS) indicates that the Water Recycling Centres (WRCs) at Bocking and Braintree do not have sufficient capacity to serve proposed future development across the District. Without further action, increased wastewater resulting from development could exceed environmental permits and have negative impacts on the quality of watercourses and negative effects on SA Objective 12. However, the WCS concludes that it would be feasible to upgrade these WRCs to ensure that watercourses are not significantly harmed therefore the negative effect is subject to uncertainty.
- 5.28 Likely development locations under this option (Braintree, Witham, Halstead, Feering, Kelvedon and Coggeshall) are all accessible by public transport. Whilst the village of Feering is less well served by public transport, the potential development sites identified by the council would be able to utilise public transport links in Gore Pit and Kelvedon, as well as any new links that may be provided to serve the new development (SA objectives 7: Sustainable travel and 11: Climate change mitigation).
- 5.29 Larger developments have potential to support and enhance service centre viability by supporting the economy of existing towns, as well as creating new local centres, supported by the residents of new development. Such development may increase spending in local centres and increase the local workforce. In addition, Braintree is the main centre of the district and is therefore likely to have most employment opportunities. As Braintree is less well connected to other districts via the GEML, the workforce is more likely to be made up of local residents. This is likely to result in positive effects on SA objective 5: Economy, although mixed effects are expected with regards to SA objective 4: Service centre vitality, as this option could have a negative effect on the vitality of smaller, rural service centres by reducing spending in these areas.

¹⁰ LUC (2016) Braintree district Draft Local Plan – Sustainability Appraisal, Main Report

¹¹ AECOM (2017) Braintree District Council Water Cycle Study

- 5.30 Larger developments may be less likely to be able to avoid areas of high environmental sensitivity. In particular, it is likely that this option will lead to a number of sites where more than 25% of the site is greenfield land. In addition, high levels of development at Witham and Kelvedon may lead to negative effects on Local Nature Reserves near these settlements (Whet Mead and Brockwell Meadows), due to increases in urban edge effects, such as recreation and pet predation, leading to negative effects on SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity.
- 5.31 Whilst the district lies largely within Flood Zone 1, which is at low risk of flooding, there are small areas of Flood Zone 3 around Braintree, associated with the River Blackwater and the River Brain. Large developments around Braintree are more likely to be located within or near to areas of Flood Zone 3, resulting in a negative effect against SA Objective 13. This remains uncertain as effects depend on the exact location and design of development.
- 5.32 This option is likely to lead to development around Braintree, as well as Witham, Kelvedon and Coggeshall, all of which are adjacent to the A120 or the A12, which are identified as having poor air quality due to vehicle emissions¹². As such, this option is likely to have significant negative effects (with uncertainty) with regards to SA objective 14: Air quality.
- 5.33 Most of the area immediately surrounding Braintree is of low or moderate landscape sensitivity, but there are areas of high landscape sensitivity to the north and east of the town. Whilst landscape sensitivity depends on development location, this option is likely to development on large areas of greenfield land, which may have minor negative effects with regards SA Objective 15: Landscape. Uncertainty is recorded against SA objective 15, as effects depend on the exact location and design of development.
- 5.34 The majority of land around Braintree consists of Grades 2 or 3 agricultural land, therefore it is likely that development under this option will lead to loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (although it is not known whether most areas of Grade 3 agricultural land are Grade 3a or 3b). This has resulted in likely negative effects on SA objective 16: Soil, although effects depend on the exact location of development.

SA findings for Option C: Sites with high sustainable transport (AS3)

- 5.35 This option will meet the identified housing need (including affordable housing) and is therefore expected to have significant positive effects on SA objective 2: Housing.
- 5.36 Locating development near sustainable transport links is expected to encourage more people to travel by sustainable transport modes, particularly public transport. This is expected to have significant positive effects with regards to SA objective 7: Sustainable travel. This could also increase accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure, services and facilities, particularly for those who do not own a car (or other private vehicle), therefore having positive effects with regards to SA objective 8: Accessibility. This option is likely to lead to local congestion in the absence of significant investment in road infrastructure at Kelvedon/Feering, resulting in some uncertainty against SA objective 8.
- 5.37 High levels of accessibility are expected to correspond to good access to health and education facilities, leading to positive effects for SA objectives 3: Health and 9: Education and skills. In addition, development is expected to be of such a scale that it could include delivery of a primary or secondary school, if need could be demonstrated. There is some uncertainty associated with these effects as they depend on particular locations for development.
- 5.38 Development near public transport links could increase accessibility to employment opportunities and development, particularly development at Cressing, as this would allow residents to access the main economic centre of Braintree. However, development around GEML train stations could increase out-commuting from the district, for example to London and Chelmsford, reducing the local workforce within Braintree. This has resulted in an assessment of likely mixed effects with regards to SA objective 5: Economy. As this option would lead to expansion of smaller service villages (e.g. Kelvedon), it could increase pressure on local services, although development may

¹² LUC (2014) Sustainability Appraisal for Braintree District Local Plan: SA scoping report, incorporating sustainability commentary on the Issues and Scoping Document

result in new services. In addition, development may contribute to supporting existing services, leading to mixed effects on SA objective 4.

- 5.39 Focussing development at Braintree, Witham and Kelvedon may lead to negative effects on Local Nature Reserves near these settlements (Bocking Blackwater, Hoppit Mead, Whet Mead and Brockwell Meadows), due to increases in urban edge effects, such as recreation and pet predation, leading to negative effects on SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity, although this depends on the exact location and design of development.
- 5.40 There are a number of Listed buildings concentrated in Braintree, Witham and Kelvedon and, to a lesser extent, Hatfield Peverel, therefore focusing development in these areas is likely to result in development in proximity to heritage assets. As a result, this option could lead to negative effects on the settings of these assets, or the assets themselves, resulting in a negative effects on SA Objective 10. This remains uncertain as effects depend on the exact location and design of development.
- 5.41 In encouraging use of sustainable modes of transport, this option could lead to reduction in the use of private vehicles and an associated decrease in greenhouse gas emissions, which would contribute positively to SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation.
- 5.42 The Water Cycle Study¹³ (WCS) indicates that the Water Recycling Centres (WRCs) at Bocking and Braintree do not have sufficient capacity to serve proposed future development across the District. Without further action, increased wastewater resulting from development could exceed environmental permits and have negative impacts on the quality of watercourses and negative effects on SA Objective 12. However, the WCS concludes that it would be feasible to upgrade these four WRCs to ensure that watercourses are not significantly harmed.
- 5.43 Whilst the district lies largely within Flood Zone 1, which is at low risk of flooding, there are small areas of Flood Zone 3 around the GEML, primarily associated with the River Blackwater and some small areas of Flood Zone 3 around Braintree. Development near the GEML is more likely to be located within or near to areas of Flood Zone 3, resulting in a negative effect against SA Objective 13. This remains uncertain as effects depend on the exact location and design of development.
- 5.44 This option is likely to lead to development in proximity to the A12, as the GEML follows this road, with increased road traffic and negative implications for air quality, but in encouraging travel by sustainable transport, it may also help to improve air quality. This has resulted in an assessment of mixed effects for SA objective 14: Air quality.
- 5.45 This option is likely to have mixed effects on SA objective 15: Landscape, as areas around Braintree, Hatfield Peverel and Witham are generally of low sensitivity to change, whereas there are areas of moderate and high sensitivity to change around Kelvedon.
- 5.46 The majority of land around the GEML consists mainly of Grades 1 and 2 agricultural land, therefore it is likely that this option will lead to loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. This has resulted in likely significant negative effects on SA objective 16: Soil.
- SA findings for Option D: Centred around Braintree (AS4)*
- 5.47 This option would include strategic allocations around Braintree and as such is expected to have similar effects to option AS2: Large Developments only.
- 5.48 This option will meet the identified housing need (including affordable housing) and is therefore expected to have significant positive effects on SA objective 2: Housing. However, this option could limit the likelihood of meeting housing need in the early years of the plan period, resulting in some uncertainty against SA objective 2.
- 5.49 Larger developments may provide more opportunity for provision of new services and facilities, including health and education facilities and public transport links. As a result, this option is likely to have positive effects with regards to SA objectives 3: Health, 7: Sustainable travel and 9: Education and skills, although this depends on the design of development and level of infrastructure provision. Whilst this would have significant positive implications for accessibility, it

¹³ AECOM (2017) Braintree District Council Water Cycle Study

is also possible that significant increases in the number of houses could increase congestion. This has led to an assessment result of mixed effects for SA objective 8: Accessibility.

- 5.50 In potentially increasing services and facilities and public transport links, this option could reduce the need to travel by car. In addition, Braintree is accessible by public transport as it has a train station and is served by a number of bus services. Nevertheless, this option is expected to have a negative impact on highways in Braintree town centre and the A120, which is unlikely to be able to be readily addressed by sustainable transport improvements. This has resulted in mixed effects with regards to SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation.
- 5.51 Larger developments have potential to support and enhance service centre viability, by supporting the economy of existing towns, as well as creating new local centres, supported by the residents of new development. Such development may increase spending in local centres and increase the local workforce. In addition, Braintree is the main centre of the district and is therefore likely to have most employment opportunities, which would be more accessible to local residents than opportunities outside of the district. This is likely to result in positive effects on SA objective 5: Economy, although this option could have a negative effect on the vitality of smaller, rural service centres by reducing spending in these areas, resulting in mixed effects on SA objective 4: Service centre vitality.
- 5.52 This option may be more likely to lead to adverse environmental impacts as larger developments are less likely to be able to avoid areas of high environmental sensitivity. In particular, it is likely that this option will lead to a number of sites where more than 25% of the site is greenfield land, leading to potential negative effects on SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity. Development may also have negative impacts on Local Nature Reserves near Braintree, such as Bocking Blackwater and Hoppit Mead, although effects depend on the exact location and design of development.
- 5.53 Listed buildings are generally more concentrated in and around the urban areas of the District, therefore large developments in and around Braintree are likely to be in proximity to heritage assets. As a result, this option could lead to negative effects on the settings of these assets, or the assets themselves, resulting in a negative effects on SA Objective 10. This remains uncertain as effects depend on the exact location and design of development.
- 5.54 The Water Cycle Study¹⁴ (WCS) indicates that the Water Recycling Centres (WRCs) at Bocking and Braintree do not have sufficient capacity to serve proposed future development across the District. Without further action, increased wastewater resulting from development could exceed environmental permits and have negative impacts on the quality of watercourses and negative effects on SA Objective 12. However, the WCS concludes that it would be feasible to upgrade these WRCs to ensure that watercourses are not significantly harmed.
- 5.55 Whilst the district lies largely within Flood Zone 1, which is at low risk of flooding, there are small areas of Flood Zone 3 around Braintree, associated with the River Blackwater and the River Brain. Large developments around Braintree are more likely to be located within or near to areas of Flood Zone 3, resulting in a negative effect against SA Objective 13. This remains uncertain as effects depend on the exact location and design of development.
- 5.56 Braintree is adjacent to the A120 and therefore this option is likely to increase traffic on this road and increase development within 200m of this road. As such, this option is likely to have negative effects (with uncertainty) with regards to SA objective 14: Air quality.
- 5.57 Most of the area immediately surrounding Braintree is of low, or in places moderate, landscape sensitivity, but there are areas of high landscape sensitivity to the north and east of the town. Whilst landscape sensitivity depends on development location, this option is likely to development on large areas of greenfield land, which may have minor negative effects with regards SA Objective 15: Landscape. Uncertainty is recorded against SA objective 15, as effects depend on the exact location and design of development.

¹⁴ AECOM (2017) Braintree District Council Water Cycle Study

5.58 The majority of land around Braintree consists of Grades 2 or 3 agricultural land, therefore it is likely that development under this option will lead to loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (although it is not known whether most areas of Grade 3 agricultural land are Grade 3a or 3b). This has resulted in likely negative effects on SA objective 16: Soil, although effects depend on the exact location of development.

SA findings for Option E: Rural distribution (AS5)

5.59 This option will meet the identified housing need (including affordable housing) and is therefore expected to have significant positive effects on SA objective 2: Housing.

5.60 With the exception of sites with extant planning permission, this option distributes development between villages in the district. Larger service villages would receive a greater quantum of housing, which reflects their higher level of service provision. Nevertheless, this option is expected to lead to a lot of small development sites in smaller settlements and as such, development is less likely to be in proximity to services and facilities, including health and education facilities. This has resulted in negative effects against SA objectives 3: Health and 9: Education and skills, although this depends on the exact location of development. In addition, development may be located further from existing employment areas and smaller developments may not be of a critical mass to encourage development of new local employment opportunities (SA objective 5: Economy).

5.61 Development in larger towns and key service villages is likely to result in development with good access to services and facilities. Smaller (secondary and tertiary) villages are less likely to have either access to services and facilities or capacity to meet increased demand, although development may help to support the viability of the services that are available. This has resulted in mixed effects with regards to SA objective 4: Service centre vitality and SA objective 8: Accessibility.

5.62 Likely effects of this option on SA objectives 6, 10, 13, 14 and 15 remain uncertain, as effects depend on the exact location and design of development, including proximity to designated sites/features and proportion of development on greenfield land. Whilst designated wildlife sites and listed buildings are more numerous in and around the main towns, development in these areas would be largely restricted to extant permissions in these areas, therefore further negative effects on designated features in these areas is not likely as a result of this option.

5.63 This option is likely to have negative effects on SA objective 7: Sustainable travel, as rural areas are less likely to have good sustainable transport links. This is likely to have associated negative impacts on SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation, as residents of new development are more likely to be reliant on car (or other private vehicle) or transport, although such effects depend on the exact location of development.

5.64 The effect of this option on SA objective 12 remains uncertain, as this depends on the location and design of development.

5.65 The majority of the district consists of Grades 2 or 3 agricultural land, therefore it is likely that dispersal of development across the district will lead to loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (although it is not known whether most areas of Grade 3 agricultural land are Grade 3a or 3b). This has resulted in likely negative effects on SA objective 16: Soil, although effects depend on the exact location of development.

5.66 Table 5.1 presents the Council's reasons for selecting the spatial strategy approach included in the Publication Draft Local Plan.

DRAFT

Table 5.1: Braintree District Council's reasons for selecting the publication spatial strategy

Spatial Strategy	Reason for including/ excluding the site as a preferred strategy in the Publication Draft Local Plan
<p>Publication Draft Local Plan: Main Towns, A12/GEML Corridor and Garden Communities (AS6)</p>	<p>A distribution of small sites at accessible locations early in the plan period would help establish a five year housing land supply. The availability of public transport links, infrastructure and access employment at Braintree and Witham would be supplemented by new infrastructure, particularly on the larger sites around Braintree. Even though this scenario allocates units less at Braintree, it is likely that local highways will be strained.</p> <p>Sustainable transport focused developments at the Garden Communities and at Kelvedon and Feering will help focus growth away from Braintree halfway through the plan period. Garden Communities are planned at a scale to provide their own infrastructure and employment while retaining good accessibility to Colchester, Braintree, Chelmsford, Stanstead Airport and London. A focus on Garden Communities could be sustained beyond the plan period.</p> <p>Officers recommend this spatial strategy as a balance between constraints and opportunities. All sites are deliverable within the plan period, a housing land supply could realistically be established and key infrastructure will be provided viably.</p>
<p>Option A: Excluding Large sites (AS1)</p>	<p>More than 74 different rural sites would be required to undertake this spatial strategy.</p> <p>The spatial strategy has the benefit of ensuring earlier delivery subject to capacity of the Council to process planning applications and landowners to resolve any infrastructure capacity issues. Some villages would struggle to reach critical mass to support new schools, shops, sewerage, superfast broadband and road infrastructure mitigation. Delivery of key infrastructure items could be delayed or prevented because of s.106 complexity, including limits to pooling arrangements.</p> <p>Ultimately the environmental strain from landscape and heritage impacts, and the uncertainty regarding infrastructure provision lead officers to discount this scenario.</p>
<p>Option B: Large Developments Only (AS2)</p>	<p>Due to the complexity of large sites, the spatial strategy would struggle to deliver enough units within the first five years. Key new infrastructure could be supported within the new developments. There are unknown but likely negative Strategic Highways impacts resulting from development at Halstead and at Coggleshall. Some of the largest sites in the District are not in the most sustainable areas, near public transport hubs, key retail centres or employment opportunities. Highways links to Colchester, Braintree, Chelmsford, Stanstead Airport and London would be strained.</p> <p>Kelvedon and Feering would have local highways constraints relating to the A12.</p> <p>Officers do not support this spatial strategy due the strategic highways constraints which is not likely to be mitigated to an effective degree within the plan period.</p>
<p>Option C: Sites with high sustainable transport (AS3)</p>	<p>There is a good variety of sites however this distribution is unlikely to deliver a robust five year housing land supply. Existing infrastructure would be supplemented by new infrastructure provision on large sites. Witham and Braintree are sustainable transport hubs with rail and bus provision, however developments on the fringes of these towns are exceeding reasonable walking distance to transport hubs. Development at Witham north of the railway line would strain the local road network.</p> <p>Hatfield Peverel and Kelvedon/Feering would support new secondary schools and key road infrastructure. However development at both villages would have local highways constraints relating to the A12 and the provision of new junctions. Both the GEML and A12 may be strained by largely dormitory settlements heading for employment centres at London, Chelmsford and Colchester.</p> <p>Officers discounted this strategy due to highways constraints leading to uncertainties about deliverability within the plan period.</p>
<p>Option D: Centered around Braintree (AS4)</p>	<p>Smaller sites within Braintree could be brought forward in advance of larger sites. However, there may be problems with the five-year housing land supply within the first five years. Existing infrastructure would be supplemented by new infrastructure provision on large sites however there may be issues around pooling arrangements. There also would uncertainty over how to retrofit existing infrastructure to support higher levels of sustainable transport. Braintree branch line is not expected to be upgraded within the plan period. This strategy would have a severe impact on local and strategic highways within Braintree Town Centre and on the A120.</p>

Spatial Strategy	Reason for including/ excluding the site as a preferred strategy in the Publication Draft Local Plan
	It is not likely that the impact of these proposals could be readily addressed by sustainable transport improvements and overall outcome is likely to be severe congestion.
Option E: Rural distribution (AS5)	<p>While developments in unparished Braintree and Bocking could be granted permission, there would be a delay for establishing neighbourhood plans with allocations across the District. Firstly, there would be no obligation for a parish to become a neighbourhood area and produce a neighbourhood plan. Secondly, smaller parishes may struggle to find human resources and political will for the undertaking, and thirdly, there may also be a resource issue for the Council to support so many neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>Officers are concerned that the level of service provision in most rural villages would not be able to support the proposed level of development whereas no significant new infrastructure could be provided viably.</p>

DRAFT

Policy LPP 1: Development Boundaries

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 5.67 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focusing on those effects which are likely to be significant.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Development outside development boundaries will be strictly controlled to uses appropriate to the countryside while development within development boundaries will be permitted where it can take place without adverse detriment to the settlement.						
A: To not have development boundaries and rely on the NPPF						
B: Have a restricted policy which would specify areas within development boundaries which would be suitable for development. Anything outside of identified areas would not be considered acceptable.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	+	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	+	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	0	++			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 5.68 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 15: Townscapes and landscapes. The policy will prevent rural expansion by strictly controlling development outside of development boundaries, whilst also ensuring that any development protects the character of the countryside. The policy also ensures that development within development boundaries will not have an adverse effect on the character of any settlement.
- 5.69 Positive effects are expected for SA objective 4: Service centre vitality, because focusing development within development boundaries may help to promote existing service centres and increase economic activity within these. Positive effects are also expected for SA objective 7: Sustainable travel and SA objective 8: Accessibility. This is because public transport links and services and facilities are likely to be located primarily within urban areas, therefore focusing development within development boundaries is likely to ensure most development is within

proximity to these. Development within development boundaries will also help contribute positively to reduce social exclusion by ensuring easier access to jobs, shopping, services and leisure facilities for all. Lastly, improved sustainable travel options and better access will help mitigate climate change, giving SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation, a minor positive effect.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 5.70 Policy option A is to have no specific policy and rely on generic policies. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Publication Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.
- 5.71 Policy option B may benefit the quality of landscapes and townscapes by restricting development to specific areas within development boundaries that have been identified as suitable.

DRAFT

6 SA findings for the 'Prosperous District' policies and reasonable alternatives

- 6.1 This chapter of the SA Report describes the findings of the SA on the effects of the Publication Draft Local Plan policies and reasonable alternatives in relation to the economy, shops and services, homes, and transport and infrastructure. The themes and individual policies are appraised below in the order in which they appear in the Publication Draft Local Plan document.
- 6.2 A summary of the likely effects of the preferred approaches set out in the Publication Draft Local Plan as a whole, by SA objective, can be found in Chapter 11.

DRAFT

A Strong Economy

- 6.3 The section of the Publication Draft Local Plan sets out policies in relation to location of employment land, employment policy areas, business uses, design and layout of employment policy areas and business uses, rural enterprise and tourist development.

Policy LPP 2: Location of Employment Land.

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.4 In the Draft Local Plan (June 2016) this policy was LPP 1.
- 6.5 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:									
Publication stage									
The Publication policy differs from the preferred option at Draft Local Plan stage in that it will provide 30.1ha not 23.3ha of industrial land and 19.5ha of office land. Employment sites and sites or buildings in current or recent use as an employment site, will be retained for such uses where they continue to be viable. In addition to the six new strategic employment sites included in the policy at Draft Local Plan stage, four additional new strategic employment sites have been included as follows:									
(a) Land East of Great Notley (within Group A - BLAN 110, 114, 116 & 663)									
(b) Land East of Broad Road (within Group J - BOCN 123 & BOCN 132)									
(c) Land at Feering (Group L - FEER230, FEER232 & FEER233)									
(d) Maltings Lane Business Park (Gershwin Park)									
Note that (d) Maltings Lane Business Park has not been assessed individually below, as this site already has planning permission. The two remaining new Garden Community sites allocated by the policy are subject to separate SA by Place Services.									
Draft Local Plan stage									
A: The council will provide for 23.3ha of industrial land and 20ha of office land – five new strategic employment sites are identified. Employment sites and sites or buildings in current or recent use as an employment site, will be retained for such uses where they continue to be viable. Policy also allocates a number of new strategic employment sites which have been individually assessed:									
(i) Extension to Springwood Drive industrial area in Braintree (site allocation ID number X1)									
(ii) Land to the west of the A131 at Great Notley (site allocation ID number GRNO 260)									
(iii) Extension to Eastways Industrial Estate, Witham (site allocation ID numbers RIVE 362, RIVE 363)									
(iv) Extension to Bluebridge Industrial Estate, Halstead (site allocation ID number COLE 188)									
Remaining sites allocated by policy are subject to separate SA by Place Services.									
(all policy elements above were preferred)									
SA Objective	Pub. LP	(a)	(b)	(c)	A	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	+	0	0	-?	0	0	-
SA2: Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA3: Health	0	+	?	+	0	?	+	+	+
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	?	0	0	0	?	0	0	0
SA5: Economy	++	++	++?	++	++	++	++	++	++
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	-	-	-	0	-	-	0	-
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	?	?	?	0	+	+	-	+
SA8: Accessibility	0	++?	++?	++?	0	--/+/?	++	++/-/?	++
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

SA10: Historic environment	0	?	?	?	0	?	?	?	?
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA12: Water environment	0	0	?	?	0	-	0	0	?
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	?	0	0	0	0	0
SA14: Air quality	0	?	0	?	0	0	0	--?	0
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	-?	-?	-?	0	-	-	-	-
SA16: Soil	0	--	--?	?	0	-	--	--	--

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.6 Four new additional strategic employment site allocations have been added to LPP 2.
- 6.7 The Council's 2015 Employment Land Needs Assessment (and Employment Land Review Guidance on converting office space floor areas requirements to employment land requirements) indicates the need for an additional 19.5 ha of B1 (office, R&D, light industry) employment land. Taking into account a recommendation to release some poorly located or non-functional employment space in the District for other uses, it also identified a requirement for 30.1 ha of new employment land to serve the logistics industry (i.e. B8 storage or distribution use class). This policy makes for these identified needs in full and is therefore expected to have significant positive effects in relation to SA objective 3: Economy.
- 6.8 The Publication policy, like the preferred approach in the Draft Local Plan (Option A), scored a significant positive effect for SA objective 5: Economy. This is because this policy will provide employment, bringing economic benefits to the area.
- 6.9 Effects are set out under (a), (b), and (c) in the first table below, focussing on those which are significant. The effects of the four strategic employment allocated at Draft Local Plan stage remain largely unchanged from the earlier assessment (updated to reflect that these are non-housing allocations) and are set out under (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) in the second table below. This policy is only concerned with the allocation of employment land; where the sites listed have been allocated for housing or other uses, the effects of those allocations have been separately assessed under the relevant policies and are not included here (for example housing at 'Land East of Great Notley' is allocated by policy LPP 20).

Employment allocation	Site ID	SA findings
(a) Land East of Great Notley	Within Group A (BLAN 110, 114, 116 & 117)	<p>Significant positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 5: Economy, due to planned high speed broadband at the location.</p> <p>A significant positive but uncertain effect was identified in relation to SA objective 8: Accessibility. This is because although the site is directly adjacent to the main towns of Braintree, Bocking and Great Notley giving it a significant positive effect, only parts of the site are within 400m of bus stops (all with a frequent service). The actual effect will depend on which part of the site development is located in, and whether that part of the site is within 400m of bus stops or not. This makes the score uncertain.</p> <p>Significant negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 16: Soil, as approximately 29% of the site is on grade 1 or grade 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>Minor positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 3: Health due to there being no loss of publicly accessible open space as per the BDC site assessment form.</p> <p>Minor negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity due to the site being located on greenfield land.</p> <p>A minor negative but uncertain effect was identified in relation to SA</p>

Employment allocation	Site ID	SA findings
		<p>objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes. This is because the majority of the site is on greenfield land, giving it a minor negative effect. An uncertain effect is given because the eastern half of the site is within an area of low sensitivity to change whereas the western half of the site is within an area of moderate sensitivity to change. The actual effect will depend on which part of the site development will be located.</p> <p>Uncertain effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 4: Service centre vitality because although there will be no change to retail provision in BLAN 110, 114 and 116, there might be in BLAN 633. This is because BLAN 633 currently contains a petrol station, car wash and convenience store. - SA objective 7: Sustainable travel. This is because although the north-south boundary and eastern part of the site are both within 400m of several bus stops, the remainder of the site is not. The actual effect will depend on where development is located within the site. - SA objective 10: Historic environment (no BDC site assessment available of potential effects on significance of listed buildings within the group of sites). - SA objective 14: Air quality, because part of the site (14.6%) is within 200m of the A120 while the remainder is not. The actual effect will depend on where development is located within the site. - SA objective 16: Soil. This is because the south western tip of the site is on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land whereas the remainder of the site is on grade 3 agricultural land. The actual effect will depend on which part of Group A the development will be located.
(b) Land East of Broad Road	BOCN 123, BOCN 127 & BOCN 132	<p>Significant positive but uncertain effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 5: Economy because although the site has access to Fibre Broadband, it is mostly located within a minerals safeguarding area. - SA objective 8: Accessibility. This is because although the site is directly adjacent to the main town of Braintree, only parts of the site are within 400m of bus stops with a frequent service. The actual effect will depend on where development is located within the site. <p>A significant negative but uncertain effect was identified in relation to SA objective 16: Soil, due to a large proportion of the site being located on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. This effect is uncertain due to the site being located on contaminated land. It is unknown whether remediation will be required.</p> <p>Minor positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 1: Community safety & cohesion due to no loss of existing community facilities as per BDC site assessment form.</p> <p>Minor negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity because the site is located on greenfield land.</p> <p>A minor negative but uncertain effect was identified in relation to SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes. This is because the site is on greenfield land, giving it a minor negative effect. An uncertain effect is given because part of the site is within an area of low sensitivity to change whereas the remainder of the site is within an area of moderate sensitivity to change. The actual effect will depend on which part of the site development will be located.</p> <p>Uncertain effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 3: Health because the provision of publicly accessible open space was not assessed by the BDC site assessment form. - SA objective 7: Sustainable travel, because although the north-south west edge and southern boundary of the site are both within 400m of existing bus stops the remainder of the site is not. The actual effect will depend on where development is located within the site. - SA objective 10: Historic environment because the impact on

Employment allocation	Site ID	SA findings
		conservation areas and listed buildings within the vicinity of the site were not assessed by the BDC site assessment form.
(c) Land at Feering	FEER230, FEER232 & FEER233	<p>Significant positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 5: Economy due to Fibre Broadband being available in the area.</p> <p>Minor positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 3: Health due to loss of publicly accessible space.</p> <p>A minor positive but uncertain effect was identified in relation to SA objective 8: Accessibility. This is because although no access issues were identified in the BDC site assessment form (+), only parts of the site are within 400m of bus stops and a railway station (all with a frequent service). Furthermore, although the site is adjacent to Feering, it is very large and actual effects will depend on where in the site employment will be allocated.</p> <p>Minor negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity due to the site being located on greenfield land. A minor negative but uncertain effect was identified in relation to SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes. A minor negative effect was given because the site is located on greenfield land. An uncertain effect was given because part of the site is within an area of moderate sensitivity to change while the remainder is within an area of low sensitivity to change. The actual effect will depend on where employment will be located within the site</p> <p>Uncertain effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 7: Sustainable travel because only the northern parts of the site are within 400m of a bus stop and a small area in the west of the site is within 800m of a railway station. The actual effect will depend on where employment is located within the site. - SA objective 10: Historic environment because the BDC assessment form did not assess the effects on heritage assets within the vicinity of the site. - SA objective 12: Water environment because a small proportion of the site falls within SPZ1. The actual effect will depend on the exact location of employment within the site. - SA objective 13: Flood risk because a small proportion of the site is within flood zone 3. The actual effect will depend on where in the site development is located. - SA objective 14: Air quality because part of the site is located within 200m of the A12 whereas the remainder is not. The actual effect will depend on where in the site development is located. - SA objective 16: Soil because the majority of the site (69.06%) is located on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land whereas the remainder is not. Furthermore, a small part of the site (0.27%) is located on contaminated land whereas the remainder is not. It is also unknown whether remediation will be required. The actual effect will depend on where development is located within the site.

SA findings for the preferred approach

- 6.10 The Council's 2015 Employment Land Needs Assessment (and Employment Land Review Guidance on converting office space floor areas requirements to employment land requirements) indicates the need for an additional 20 ha of B1 (office, R&D, light industry) employment land. Taking into account a recommendation to release some poorly located or non-functional employment space in the District for other uses, it also identified a requirement for 23.3 ha of new employment land to serve the logistics industry (i.e. B8 storage or distribution use class). This policy makes for these

identified needs in full and is therefore expected to have significant positive effects in relation to SA objective 3: Economy.

6.11 Additional, spatially specific effects were identified in relation to the individual employment allocations, as set out below, focussing on those which are significant.

Employment allocation	Site ID	SA findings
(i) Extension to Springwood Drive industrial area in Braintree	None assigned by BDC - LUC assigned code 'X1')	<p>Significant positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 5: Economy, due to planned high speed broadband at the location.</p> <p>Minor positive effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 7: Sustainable travel because the site is within 400m of a bus stop. <p>Minor negative effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity due to the site being located on undesignated greenfield land. - SA objective 12: Water environment due to part of the site falling within SPZ2c. - SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes due to the site being located within an area of moderate sensitivity to change. - SA objective 16: Soil due to the entire site being located on grade 3 agricultural land. <p>A minor negative but uncertain effect was identified in relation to SA objective 1: Community safety & cohesion due to proximity to a waste plant but uncertainty surrounding the provision or loss of community facilities.</p> <p>A mixed effect was recorded for SA objective 8: Accessibility. A significant negative effect due to the site being an allocation to the open countryside, a minor positive effect due to a small proportion of the site being within 400m of a bus stop and an uncertain effect due to uncertainty over highways access.</p> <p>Uncertain effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 3: Health (no BDC site assessment available to identify increase or loss of public open space); - SA objective 4: Service centre vitality (no BDC site assessment available to identify increase or loss of retail) - SA objective 10: Historic environment (no BDC site assessment available of potential effects on significance of listed buildings and a conservation area within 1 km).
(ii) Land to the west of the A131 at Great Notley ('Eastlink 120')	GRNO 260	<p>Significant positive effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 5: Economy, due to high speed broadband availability at the location. - SA objective 8: Accessibility due to the site being located adjacent to the main town of Braintree, Bocking and Great Notley. Furthermore, the eastern part of the site is within 400m of several bus stops with a frequent service. <p>Significant negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 16: Soil, due to a significant proportion of the site being on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>-</p> <p>Minor positive effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 3: Health because there will be no loss of open space

Employment allocation	Site ID	SA findings
		<p>- SA objective 7: Sustainable travel because the site is within 400m of several bus stops.</p> <p>Minor negative effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity due to the site being located on greenfield land. - SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes because the majority of the site (98.90%) is located within an area of moderate sensitivity to change. <p>Uncertain effects were identified in relation to SA objective 10: Historic environment because impacts on heritage assets within the vicinity of the site were not assessed by the BDC site visit.</p>
(iii) Extension to Eastways Industrial Estate, Witham	RIVE 362, RIVE 363	<p>Significant positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 5: Economy, due to high speed broadband availability at the location.</p> <p>-</p> <p>Significant negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 16: Soil, due to a significant proportion of the site being on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>A significant negative but uncertain effect was identified in relation to SA objective 14: Air quality because the site is within 200m of the A12.</p> <p>A mixed effect was identified for SA objective 8: Accessibility. A significant positive effect because the site is adjacent to the main town of Witham, a minor negative effect because the site is more than 800m from a railway station and more than 400m from a bus stop and an uncertain effect because although vehicular access may be possible through site 362 or A12, access can only be gained through Eastways if site 362 is deliverable.</p> <p>Minor positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 3: Health due to there being no loss of public open space.</p> <p>Minor negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 7: Sustainable travel due to proximity to bus stops and SA objective 15: landscapes and townscapes as the site lies within an area of moderate sensitivity to change and more than 25% of the site consists of greenfield land.</p> <p>An uncertain effect was identified in relation to SA objective 10: Historic environment because the impacts on historic assets within the site were no assessed by the BDC site visit.</p>
(iv) Extension to Bluebridge Industrial Estate, Halstead	COLE 188	<p>Significant positive effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 5: Economy, due to high speed broadband availability at the location. - SA objective 8: Accessibility, due to proximity to the Main Town of Witham, which is a population centre, although minor negative effects identified due to lack of proximity to rail/bus services and potential road access issues to site. <p>Significant negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 16: Soil, due to a significant proportion of the site being on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>Minor positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 3: Health (no loss of open space); SA objective 7: Sustainable travel</p>

Employment allocation	Site ID	SA findings
		<p>(proximity to bus stops).</p> <p>Minor negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 1 (site is within 250m of waste site and within 500m AD plant); SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity (greenfield location); SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes (moderate landscape sensitivity and >=25% greenfield).</p> <p>Uncertain effects were identified in relation to SA objective 10: Historic environment (BDC site visit did not assess impact of several listed buildings within the vicinity of this site); SA objective 12: Water environment (part of site falls within SPZ 3).</p>
Major Business Park on the West Braintree Garden Community	N/A	Proposed development at the proposed Garden Communities forms part of the shared strategic plan with neighbouring Colchester and Tendring local authorities that is subject to a separate SA being carried out by Place Services.
Major Business Park on the Marks Tey Garden Community	N/A	Proposed development at the proposed Garden Communities forms part of the shared strategic plan with neighbouring Colchester and Tendring local authorities that is subject to a separate SA being carried out by Place Services.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.12 No reasonable alternatives to this policy in relation to the total amount of employment land were considered by the Council. The effects of the alternative site allocations considered are set out in Chapter 10.

Policy LPP 3: Employment Policy Areas

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.13 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.
- 6.14 At the Draft Plan stage, the SA assessed sites designated as Employment Policy Areas individually. Following further discussion with Braintree District Council, it was established that these sites are already in employment use and are effectively 'safeguarded' through this policy, rather than allocated. As such it was considered that assessment of individual Employment Policy Areas was not appropriate.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication policy is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but now lists a number of sites designated at Employment Policy Areas.						
A. B1, B2 and B8 uses would be acceptable along with repair of vehicles, services provided for the benefit of the business and for waste management uses. (preferred)						
B: To be less restrictive on the potential uses on employment sites and allow retailing, ancillary uses and indoor sports and recreation facilities.						
C: To restrict the uses on employment areas to B1, B2, B8 and waste services only.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C		
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0		
SA2: Housing	0	0	0	0		
SA3: Health	0	0	0	0		
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	+	-	+		
SA5: Economy	+	+	+/-	+		
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0		
SA7: Sustainable travel	+	+	-	+/-		
SA8: Accessibility	+	+	-	+/-		
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0		
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0	0		
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+	+	-	+/-		
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0		
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0		
SA14: Air quality	+	+	-	+/-		
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0	0		
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0		

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.1 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but now lists a number of sites designated at Employment Policy Areas. These Employment Policy Areas are existing employment sites, rather than allocations for new

employment land. As such the assessment of Option A below assessed the concept of protecting existing employment and therefore this assessment still applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach

- 6.2 The preferred policy will preserve industrial estates for B use employment, ensuring that appropriate employment space for these uses remains available for general business uses, including the distribution sector which is important to the District's economy, resulting in minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 5: Economy. Restricting retail and indoor recreation uses on industrial estates will help to ensure that these uses remain in the District's service centres, supporting their vitality and making it more likely that customers will be able to access retail services by sustainable modes, with minor positive effects on SA objective 4: Service centre vitality, SA objective 7: Sustainable travel, SA objective 8: Accessibility, and SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation. The preferred policy also allows on-site provision of services provided for the benefit of industrial estate employees, which should reduce the need to travel, with further benefits for SA objective 7: Sustainable travel, SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation, and SA objective 14: Air quality.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.3 The less restrictive policy option B may benefit retail and indoor recreation businesses by allowing them more flexibility but this could make it harder for traditional B uses to find appropriate employment space with mixed effects in relation to SA objective 5: Economy. Minor negative effects on SA objective 4: Service centre vitality, SA objective 7: Sustainable travel, SA objective 8: Accessibility, SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation, and SA objective 14: Air quality could result from allowing retail and indoor recreation uses to locate in out of centre locations.
- 6.4 Option C is similar to the preferred policy but more restrictive in terms of not allowing vehicles parts/repair business or on-site provision of services provided for the benefit of industrial estate employees. Its sustainability effects are therefore expected to be similar to those of Option A, except that industrial estate employees are likely to need to travel by car to access services that can be provided on-site under Option A. This results in mixed minor positive and minor negative effects in relation to SA objective 7: Sustainable travel, SA objective 8: Accessibility, SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation, and SA objective 14: Air quality rather than the purely positive ones expected under Option A.

Policy LPP 4: Kelvedon Park

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.5 In the Draft Local Plan (June 2016) this policy was named 'Policy LPP 2A: Emergency Services Headquarters'.
- 6.6 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Proposed policy is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with the removal of the criterion to meet emergency services integrated administration facilities needs but the addition of a criterion to meet emergency services parking requirements. Specific reference has been made to additional development on site, which will take up approximately 3.3ha.						
A. Allocate land at Kelvedon Park as a Special Employment Area to meet the requirements of the emergency services for expanded facilities, subject to provision of sufficient parking, boundary screening at rear of site and retention of the parkland setting at the front of the site. Allocation relates to Essex County Fire & Rescue HQ, Kelvedon Park, London Road, Rivenhall End: site ID number RIVE 364. (preferred)						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0				
SA2: Housing	0	0				
SA3: Health	++?	++?				
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0				
SA5: Economy	?	0				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-	-				
SA7: Sustainable travel	+	+				
SA8: Accessibility	++/--	++/--				
SA9: Education and skills	0	0				
SA10: Historic environment	?	?				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0				
SA12: Water environment	0	0				
SA13: Flood risk	0	0				
SA14: Air quality	--?	--?				
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	-	-				
SA16: Soil	--	--				

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.7 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with an additional 3.3ha of development proposed. The site has been re-assessed, including the 3.3ha extension, and the raw site assessment has been presented as 'LPP 4' in Chapter 10 and Appendix 7. This re-assessment concluded that the assessment for Option A below still applies with the following exceptions.

6.8 It is not known whether the extension of Kelvedon Park will lead to creation of additional jobs, leading to uncertain effects against SA objective 5: Economy.

SA findings for the preferred approach

- 6.9 Significant positive effects were identified for this site in relation to SA objective 3: Health as it will provide additional facilities for the emergency services. An uncertain effect was also identified in relation to the potential loss of public space at the site as the presence or otherwise of open space on the greenfield portion of this site was not recorded in the BDC site visit form.
- 6.10 Although application of the standard site assessment framework indicated significant positive effects relation to SA objective 5: Economy as the site lies within an area benefitting from high speed broadband access this score was adjusted to a negligible effect as the emergency services do not constitute economic development.
- 6.11 Significant positive effects were also identified in relation to SA objective 8: Accessibility as the site is within 400 m of two bus stops and Rivenhall is served by frequent bus services. However, significant negative effects were also identified as the site is an allocation to the open countryside rather than a service centre.
- 6.12 Significant negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 16: Soil as most of the site is on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land.
- 6.13 Application of the standard site assessment framework resulted in a significant negative effect in relation to SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes because the site is located entirely within a landscape area with high sensitivity to change. The site-specific policy text provides mitigation in the form of requirements for appropriate boundary screening to the rear of the site and retention of the parkland setting to the front of the site. These are judged to reduce the potential effect to a minor negative.
- 6.14 A minor positive effect was identified in relation to SA objective 7: Sustainable travel (proximity to bus stops).
- 6.15 Uncertain effects were identified in relation to SA objective 10: Historic environment. There is a Scheduled Monument (Rivenhall long mortuary enclosure) and a listed building within 100 m of the site, however the potential impact of development on the historic significance of these assets has not been assessed by the BDC site visit.
- 6.16 A significant negative effect with uncertainty was recorded with regards to SA objective 14: air quality, as a large proportion of the site lies within 200m of the A12.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.17 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 5: Allshot's Farm, Rivenhall

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.18 In the Draft Local Plan (June 2016) this policy was named 'Policy 5A: Former Polish Campsite Employment Area'. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.
- 6.19 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Proposed policy is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan)						
A: Allocate Former Polish Campsite for employment use and structural landscaping subject to criteria relating to avoidance of light pollution and landscaping. Allocation relates to Former Polish Campsite (site ID number KELV 334). (preferred)						
B: To have no site specific policy and rely on the Rural Enterprise Policy.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	+	+	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	++	++	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-	-	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	-	-	0			
SA8: Accessibility	--	--	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	?	?	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	-	-	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+/-	+/-	0			
SA16: Soil	--?	--?	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.20 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.21 The assessment of this policy relates to the spatially specific effects of allocating a site for employment development at this location. The effects of the total amount of employment space to be provided by the Draft Local Plan are assessed under the related policies.
- 6.22 Significant positive effects for allocation of employment space at this location were identified in relation to SA objective 5: Economy because of the availability of high speed broadband internet services at this location.
- 6.23 Significant negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 8: Accessibility because the site is in the open countryside, remote from any service centre. Further negative effects relate to the lack of regular bus or rail services within walking distance from the site. Minor positive effects relate to the fact that no highway access issues have been identified for the site. Overall, the effect is judged to be significant negative.
- 6.24 Significant negative effects were also identified in relation to SA objective 16: Soil because the site is located entirely within an area of grade 1 or grade 2 agricultural land although this effect was judged to be uncertain as it would only be relevant if the new development were to extend beyond the existing developed footprint at the location.
- 6.25 Minor positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 3: Health (no loss of public open space).
- 6.26 Mixed minor positive and minor negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes, the positive effect reflecting the previously developed status of the site and the negative effect reflecting the fact that it is located in a landscape area with moderate sensitivity to change.
- 6.27 Uncertain effects were identified in relation to SA objective 10: Historic environment (potential effects on significance of listed buildings within 1 km).
- 6.28 Minor negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity (site is within 100 m of locally designated wildlife site – Storey’s Wood); SA objective 7: Sustainable travel (no bus or rail services within walking distance); SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (likely increase in transport emissions due to poor accessibility and lack of sustainable travel options).

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.29 Policy option B is to have no specific policy and rely on another, spatially non-specific Draft Local Plan policy. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a ‘do-nothing’ scenario.

Policy LPP 6: Business Parks

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.30 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Only use class B1 will be permitted in existing B1 employment locations identified on the Proposals Map. (Site WITC 424 has planning permission.)						
A: B1 uses acceptable on site together with essential and ancillary other uses which make up no more than 5% of the total floorspace. Policy also makes the following site-specific allocation which is separately assessed below.						
(i) B1 allocation to 8 Collingwood Road, Witham (site ID number WITC 424)						
(all policy elements above were preferred)						
B: To allow the same ancillary uses on B1 businesses sites as is set out in employment policy areas.						
C: To be more restrictive to B1 uses only and not ancillary uses.						
D: To be less restrictive and only have a policy for all employment areas.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	(i)	B	C	D
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA2: Housing	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA3: Health	0	0	+	0	0	0
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	+	0	0	0
SA8: Accessibility	+/-	+	++	+	+/-	0
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	-	0	0	0
SA11: Climate change mitigation	-	0	+	0	-	0
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA14: Air quality	-	0	0	0	-	0
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	0	+	0	0	0
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0	0	0

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.31 The Publication approach only permits use class B1 in existing B1 employment locations identified in the Proposals Map. Its purpose is to safeguard existing business parks.
- 6.32 A minor positive effect is identified in relation to SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes because the policy states that it will maintain the character of existing sites that fall within use class B1.

- 6.33 The Publication approach like Option C would result in minor positive effects in relation to SA objective 8: Accessibility for the same reasons as Option A. However, by preventing ancillary uses from being co-located with B1 businesses, it would increase the need for business park employees to travel to access these services, probably by car. This would have minor negative effects in relation to SA objective 8: Accessibility, SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation, and SA objective 14: Air quality.

SA findings for the preferred approach

- 6.34 The preferred policy restricts general industrial and distribution uses on employment areas which the Council has assessed as being unsuitable for these uses, for example because of poor access to the strategic road network or likely adverse effects on surrounding uses. As such, the preferred policy should help to avoid traffic congestion and direct general industrial and distribution uses to locations where they are accessible to the strategic road network, with minor positive effects on SA objective 8: Accessibility.
- 6.35 Additional, spatially specific effects were identified in relation to the individual employment allocation, as set out below, focussing on those which are significant.

Employment allocation	Site ID	SA findings
(i) 8 Collingwood Road, Witham	WITC 424	<p>Significant positive effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 8: Accessibility as the site is within the Main Town of Witham and also within walking distance of existing, frequent bus and rail services. Further positive effects relate to the absence of highway access issues for the site. <p>Minor positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 3: Health (no loss of open space); SA objective 7: Sustainable travel (within walking distance of several bus stops and train station); SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (avoidance of traffic emissions due to site accessibility); and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes (use of previously developed land).</p> <p>Minor negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 10: Historic environment as the site is located within a conservation area and there are several listed buildings in the vicinity. The Council's site assessment form indicates the potential to mitigate negative effects through use of sympathetic design, appropriate materials and retention of mature trees. It is recommended that these issues are addressed in site-specific policy wording for this allocation.</p>

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.36 Policy option B is similar to the preferred policy and is expected to have similar sustainability effects.
- 6.37 Option C would result in minor positive effects in relation to SA objective 8: Accessibility for the same reasons as Option A. However, by prevent ancillary uses from being co-located with B1 businesses, it would increase the need for business park employees to travel to access these services, probably by car. This would have minor negative effects in relation to SA objective 8: Accessibility, SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation, and SA objective 14: Air quality.
- 6.38 Policy option D is to have no specific policy and rely on the Employment Policy Areas policy for all employment areas. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

Policy LPP 7: Design and Layout of Employment Policy Areas and Business Uses

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.39 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Proposed policy is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with an additional criterion to encourage sustainable travel where parking does not meet standards.						
A: Specific criteria around the design of business parks to include the retention of suitable car parking and landscaping and that sites over 5ha may be required to have additional parking areas within them. (preferred)						
B: To not have a specific policy and rely on the generic design policies for all development.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	+/-	+/-	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	+	+	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	+/-	+/-	0			
SA8: Accessibility	++	++	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+/-	+/-	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	+/-	+/-	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.40 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies. The Publication approach suggests improvements to encourage sustainable travel, as well as or instead of overspill parking as a solution to poor parking provision. Whilst improvements to encourage sustainable travel would have a positive effect on SA objective 7: sustainable travel, this is given as an option either alongside or instead of overspill parking, therefore positive and negative effects remain.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.41 The policy states that new employment and business developments are expected to be designed to a high quality which includes suitable access for staff, delivery and service vehicles, pedestrians, public transport and cyclists, in a safe environment. A significant positive effect is therefore likely for SA objective 8: Accessibility.
- 6.42 This Policy is likely to encourage the uptake of more sustainable means of transport to access services and facilities which would have benefits on health as people engage in more active travel. The provision of additional overspill car parking would potentially lead to higher use of private cars for accessing services. This would potentially discourage the use of public transport or other sustainable modes (which would otherwise have a positive benefit on health) as access to a car would be more convenient, particularly where access to public transport is not considered to be reasonable. Mixed effects are therefore likely for SA objective 3: Health, SA objective 7: Sustainable travel, SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation, and SA objective 14: Air quality.
- 6.43 Appropriate layout, design and access of new business parks is important in attracting and retaining users on the site and creating a pleasant environment for people to work. A minor positive is therefore expected for SA objective 5: Economy as the policy will help attract employers and workers to the area. .
- 6.44 A minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes as the policy requires good design. Proposals will only be permitted where they do not result in a cramped or contrived appearance, out of keeping with the remainder of the employment area and where structural landscaping will not be undermined.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.45 Policy option B is to have no specific policy and rely on generic policies. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

Policy LPP 8: Rural Enterprise

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.46 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Proposed policy is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan)						
A: Criteria based policy for small scale commercial development outside of settlement boundaries in existing buildings where possible and then in well-designed new buildings. They should meet criteria on sustainability, impacts on the natural and historic environment and residential amenity. (preferred)						
B: To have a less restrictive policy on rural enterprise which allows development to take place in more circumstances.						
C: To not have a specific policy and rely on the generic design, transport and natural environment policies and the NPPF.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C		
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+	+	0		
SA2: Housing	0	0	0	0		
SA3: Health	0	0	0	0		
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0		
SA5: Economy	+	+	+	0		
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	+	+	-?	0		
SA7: Sustainable travel	+	+	-?	0		
SA8: Accessibility	+	+	-?	0		
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0		
SA10: Historic environment	+	+	-?	0		
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0		
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0		
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0		
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0	0		
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+	-?	0		
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0		

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.47 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.48 The policy supports the rural economy by providing greater flexibility to the employment land supply and improving access to rural employment services and facilities. This is likely to have minor positive effects in relation to SA objective 5: Economy and SA objective 8: Accessibility.
- 6.49 The policy states the proposals will be supported provided that 'the access and traffic generated by the development can be accommodated on the local road system without adverse impact on roads, residential amenity or the local character, or can be mitigated against'. In addition by providing more local job prospects for the District's rural community, it will aid rural inclusion and reduce the need to commute greater distances to find work. Therefore a minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion and SA objective 7: Sustainable travel.
- 6.50 The policy requires that there is no unacceptable impact on protected species, the historic environment or landscape character. Therefore there is a minor positive effect for SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity, SA objective 10: Historic environment and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.51 Policy option B is to have a less restrictive policy on rural enterprise which allows development to take place in more circumstances. With no specific criteria mentioned, there is no assurance that rural enterprise developments will be accessible or undamaging to the historic environment, the landscape or biodiversity. Therefore a negative uncertain effect is expected for SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity, SA objective 7: Sustainable travel, SA objective 8: Accessibility, SA objective 10: Historic environment and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes. The sustainability effects for SA objective 1: Community safety & cohesion and SA objective 5: Economy are expected to be similar to those in Policy option A.
- 6.52 Policy option C is to have no policy and rely on generic policies and the NPPF. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

Policy LPP 9: Tourist Development within the Countryside

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.53 In the Draft Local Plan (June 2016) this policy was named 'Tourist Development'.
- 6.54 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Proposed policy is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with added reference to heritage assets and long-term viability of the development.						
A: Criteria based policy on which new tourist facilities and accommodation should be considered against outside of rural areas includes the demand for the facility, accessibility, landscaping, agricultural land and water and waste storage and distribution systems. The occupation of land or buildings would also be restricted to tourist use only. (preferred)						
B: To be less restrictive on the location of tourist facilities in rural areas and relying on generic policies for the impacts of development to judge applications.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	++	++	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	+	+	0			
SA8: Accessibility	+	+	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	+	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	+	+	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+	0			
SA16: Soil	+	+	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.55 The Publication approach similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies, with the following exception.
- 6.56 Positive effects are expected for SA objective 10: Historic environment, as criterion c now states that heritage assets and their settings should be well screened, thus aiming to retain the significance of setting of such assets.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.57 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 5: Economy as the policy will enhance the District's potential for tourism. Tourism contributes in an important way to the rural economy particularly in Braintree District where the district is predominantly rural with a high quality built and historic environment.
- 6.58 The policy seeks to achieve a balance between supporting the rural economy and protecting the countryside. The policy is therefore expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes by ensuring proposals do not materially adversely affect the character and appearance of the surrounding area and SA objective 16: Soil by ensuring they would not use the best and most versatile agricultural land.
- 6.59 Minor positive effects are expected for SA objective 7: Sustainable travel by ensuring facilities are located at a site that are well connected to defined settlements in the area and are accessible to adequate transport, cycling and walking links, and SA objective 8: Accessibility, by ensuring appropriate, convenient and safe vehicular access can be gained to and from the public highway and appropriate parking is also provided. A minor positive effect is also expected for SA objective 12: Water environment as the policy seeks to ensure that the developments will be served by adequate water, sewerage and waste storage and disposal systems.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.60 Policy option B is to have no specific policy and rely on generic policies. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

Shops and Services

- 6.61 The section of the Publication Draft Local Plan sets out policies in relation to retailing and regeneration, primary shopping areas, district centres, Freeport Outlet Centre, leisure and entertainment, retail warehouse development, retail site allocations, Newlands precinct and Rickstones neighbourhood centre.

Policy LPP 10: Retailing and Regeneration

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.62 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
<p>Pre -Submission: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but with updated floorspace requirements, with locations listed for regeneration for retailing, community facilities and services and other main town centre uses, and the addition of a floorspace threshold for Impact Assessment for Sudbury. The reference to town centre boundaries, primary shopping areas and primary and secondary retail frontages on the proposals map has been removed.</p> <p>A: The policy would have to set out the vision of town centres, retailing and regeneration in the area, it would need to set out the likely retail growth requirements to meet all the identified need over the plan period. It would also need to set out a retail hierarchy, possible areas for retail growth and other existing retail attractions. A policy would have to set out what impact assessment thresholds would be applied in which location, based on evidence. This would be in order to protect and safeguard the vitality and viability of each of the centres. (preferred)</p> <p>B: No policy and reliance on national guidance.</p>						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	++	++	0			
SA5: Economy	++	++	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	+?	+	0			
SA8: Accessibility	+++?	+	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	?	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+	0			
SA16: Soil	+	+	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.63 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but with updated floorspace requirements, with locations listed for regeneration for retailing, community facilities and services and other main town centre uses, and the addition of a floorspace threshold for Impact Assessment for Sudbury. The reference to town centre

boundaries, primary shopping areas and primary and secondary retail frontages on the proposals map has been removed. The assessment of option A below applies with the following exceptions.

- 6.64 There is uncertainty associated with the positive effects for SA objectives 7: sustainable travel and 8: accessibility as the land identified for regeneration at Manor Street / Victoria Street, Braintree coincides with part of the bus park, which is a hub for sustainable transport in the town. There are other bus stops nearby that are served by high frequency bus services and all areas identified are within 800m of a train station, but the capacity of the bus park may be reduced by this policy, leading to a significant effect with uncertainty with regards to SA objective 8: accessibility.
- 6.65 All locations identified for regeneration in this policy lie within a conservation area and within proximity of listed buildings. The effects of this policy with regards to SA objective 10: historic environment remain uncertain as the effects of regeneration on the settings of these features and character of the conservation area are uncertain.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.66 This policy is expected to have significant positive effects in relation to SA objective 4: Service centre vitality and SA objective 5: Economy. The policy seeks to enhance the attractiveness of local centres and increase competition across the District, which would help to encourage new businesses and workforce to the District, leading to significant positive effects in relation to SA objective 5: Economy. The policy protects and enhances the viability of existing town centres by implementing a retail hierarchy. The town centres are the primary location for main town centre uses and are the most sequentially preferable location for retail development. Therefore a significant positive effect is likely for SA objective 4: Service centre vitality.
- 6.67 As the retail hierarchy seeks to concentrate development in town centres where access via sustainable transport is greatest, a minor positive effect is likely for SA objective 8: Accessibility and SA objective 7: Sustainable transport.
- 6.68 A minor positive effect is likely for SA objective 15 and SA objective 16. The policy seeks to keep development within town, district and local centres thereby prioritising development in existing centres as opposed to Greenfield land or high quality agricultural land. The policy also requires the scale of development to be consistent with the hierarchy keeping large scale developments focused on town centres.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.69 Policy option B is to have no policy and rely on national guidance. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

Policy LPP 11: Primary Shopping Areas

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.70 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre-Submission: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan). The sentence permitting residential development provided that it is not on the ground floor has been removed.						
A: The policy sets out primary shopping areas and how the policy would maintain and enhance retail uses in those locations. It would need to identify primary and secondary frontages, and plan for other uses in town centres. (preferred)						
B: To not have a policy and rely on national guidance.						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	++	++	0			
SA5: Economy	+	+	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.71 The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan). The sentence permitting residential development provided it is not on the ground floor has been removed, although the policy would still only permit residential proposals where they create more than two residential flats above ground floor level. As such, the assessment for Option A below still applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.72 This policy is expected to have a significant positive effect for SA objective 4: Service centre vitality. The policy would prevent the loss of retail development within the district centre.

Proposals for use classes A2- A5 and D1 - D2 would be permitted provided that it would not result in less than 75% of units A1 uses.

- 6.73 These measures are likely to support economic growth, regenerating existing town centres. Therefore a minor positive effect is likely for SA objective 5: Economy. These measures will also help to ensure that the character of the town centre is protected therefore a minor positive effect is also likely for SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.74 Policy option B is to have no policy and rely on national guidance. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

Policy LPP 12: District Centre

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.75 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan). The sentence permitting residential development provided it is not on the ground floor has been removed.						
A: This policy would need to set out how it would protect and enhance the existing district centres, and what level different uses would be appropriate. (preferred)						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0				
SA2: Housing	0	0				
SA3: Health	0	0				
SA4: Service centre vitality	++	++				
SA5: Economy	+	+				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0				
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0				
SA8: Accessibility	0	0				
SA9: Education and skills	0	0				
SA10: Historic environment	0	0				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0				
SA12: Water environment	0	0				
SA13: Flood risk	0	0				
SA14: Air quality	0	0				
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+				
SA16: Soil	0	0				

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.76 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan). The sentence permitting residential development provided it is not on the ground floor has been removed, although the policy would still only permit residential proposals where they would create more than two residential flats above ground floor level. As such, the assessment for Option A below still applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.77 A significant positive effect is likely for SA objective 4: Service centre vitality. The policy would prevent the loss of retail proposals for use classes A2- A5 and D1- D2 where proposals would be permitted provided that it would not result in less than 75% of units being A1 uses.
- 6.78 These measures are likely to support economic growth, regenerating existing district centres. Therefore a minor positive effect is likely for SA objective 5. These measures will also help to ensure that the character of the town centre is protected therefore a minor positive effect is also likely for SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.79 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 13: Freeport Outlet Centre

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.80 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan). (Site BCBG 146 has planning permission.)						
A: The area defined on the proposals map as a Factory Outlet Centre shall be maintained for the purpose of a discount shopping outlet centre. Policy also makes the following site-specific allocation which is separately assessed below.						
(i) Retail allocation to car park and land north of Freeport, Braintree (site ID number BCBG 146)						
(both policy elements above were preferred at Draft Plan stage)						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	(i)			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	+			
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	+	+			
SA5: Economy	+	+	++			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	-			
SA7: Sustainable travel	-	-	+			
SA8: Accessibility	+/-	+/-	++			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	?			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	+			

SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+	-			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.81 The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.82 This policy states that the Factory Outlet Centre shall be maintained for the purpose of a discount shopping outlet centre. A minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 4: service centre vitality and SA objective 5: Economy as this will help retain employment opportunities and ensure the vitality of the area.
- 6.83 This policy will help conserve the diverse landscape of the District, by curtailing the sprawl of these shopping areas and any associated adverse effects on the surrounding areas. A minor positive effect is therefore likely in relation to SA Objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.
- 6.84 A mixed effect is expected for SA objective 8: Accessibility. Parking at the outlet will be protected, keeping it accessible for those that travel by private car; however there is no mention of enhancing sustainable travel in relation to the outlet centre. As such a minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 7: Sustainable travel.
- 6.85 Additional, spatially specific effects were identified in relation to the allocation for new retail development, as set out below, focussing on those which are significant.

Employment allocation	Site ID	SA findings
(i) Retail allocation to car park and land north of Freeport, Braintree	BCBG 146	<p>Significant positive effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 5: Economy, as high speed broadband is available at the site. - SA objective 8: Accessibility, as the site is within the Main Town of Braintree and within walking distance of frequent bus and rail services. Further positive effects were identified from the absence of highway access issues to the site. <p>Minor positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 3: Health (no loss of public open space); SA objective 4: Service centre vitality (increase of retail provision); SA objective 7: Sustainable travel (proximity to bus stops and train station); SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (avoidance of traffic emissions due to site accessibility);</p> <p>Uncertain effects were identified in relation to SA objective 10: Historic Environment as there are several listed buildings within 1 km of the site and the effect on the significance of these is unknown.</p> <p>Minor negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity (significant proportion of site is undesignated greenfield land); SA15: Landscapes and townscapes (significant proportion of site on greenfield land);</p>

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.86 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 14: Leisure and Entertainment

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.87 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A. The area identified on the proposals map for Leisure and Entertainment shall be retained for leisure and entertainment related uses. (preferred)						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+				
SA2: Housing	0	0				
SA3: Health	0	0				
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	+				
SA5: Economy	+	+				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0				
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0				
SA8: Accessibility	+	+				
SA9: Education and skills	0	0				
SA10: Historic environment	0	0				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0				
SA12: Water environment	0	0				
SA13: Flood risk	0	0				
SA14: Air quality	0	0				
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0				
SA16: Soil	0	0				

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.88 The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.89 This policy will have a positive impact on the economy as leisure and entertainment facilities provide local employment opportunities and ensure the vitality of the area. A minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 4: Service centre vitality and SA objective 5: Economy. Retaining the areas identified on the proposals map for Leisure and Entertainment will improve the supply and access to these type of facilities, resulting in a minor positive effect for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion and SA objective 8: Accessibility.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

6.90 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 15: Retail Warehouse Development

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

6.91 In the Draft Local Plan (June 2016) this policy was LPP 12.

6.92 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Proposed policy wording is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but allocated sites for retail warehousing on the Proposals Map have now been confirmed as follows:						
(i) Land North of Freeport (BRE31RW)						
(ii) Land South of Millennium Way (CRESS 202)						
(iii) Land at Braintree Retail Park						
(iv) Maltings, Witham (WIS9RW)						
The Council have confirmed that (iii) and (iv) above have extant planning permission and therefore these have not been assessed through the SA process. Sites (i) and (ii) have been assessed individually below.						
A: Retail warehouse development will be permitted within or immediately adjoining town centres. If no such sites are available, then the sequential approach will be applied, together with an impact assessment, if applicable under policy ADM26 – Impact Assessments. Bulky retail proposals outside of town centres will be required to satisfy criteria. (preferred)						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	(i)	(ii)	A		
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	-	0		
SA2: Housing	0	0	0	0		
SA3: Health	0	?	+	0		
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	0	0	+		
SA5: Economy	+	++	0	+		
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	-	-	0		
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	+	+	0		
SA8: Accessibility	0	++?	++?	0		
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0		
SA10: Historic environment	0	?	0	0		
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	+	+	0		
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0		
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0		
SA14: Air quality	0	0	--?	0		
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	-	+/-	0		
SA16: Soil	0	0	--	0		

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.93 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but allocated sites for retail warehousing on the Proposals Map have now been confirmed. The assessment for Option A below applies to the non-spatial aspects of the policy.
- 6.94 Additional, spatially specific effects were identified in relation to the allocations for new retail warehousing development, as set out below, focussing on those which are significant. Note that as these sites are non-housing sites, allocated for retail warehousing only, a number of SA objectives and criteria relating to residential development do not apply.

Employment allocation	Site ID	SA findings
(i) Land North of Freeport	BRE31RW	<p>Significant positive effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 5: Economy, as high speed broadband is available at the site. - SA objective 8: Accessibility, as the site is within the Main Town of Braintree and within walking distance of frequent bus and rail services. <p>Minor positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 7: Sustainable travel (proximity to bus stops and train station) and SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (avoidance of traffic emissions due to site accessibility).</p> <p>Uncertain effects were identified in relation to SA objective 3: health, as the loss or provision of publically accessible open space has not been identified via BDC site visits. Uncertain effects were also identified in relation to SA objective 8: accessibility as highways access has not been assessed via BDC site visits and SA objective 10: Historic Environment as there are a small number of listed buildings within 1 km of the site and the effect on the significance of these is unknown.</p> <p>Minor negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity as a significant proportion of site is located on undesignated greenfield land and SA objective 15: landscapes and townscapes, as the site consists of greenfield land.</p>
(ii) Land South of Millennium Way	CRESS 202	<p>Significant positive effects were identified in relation to Accessibility, as the site is within the Main Town of Braintree and within walking distance of frequent bus and rail services. This is accompanied by some uncertainty as access depends on the layout of development (as per BDC site assessment form).</p> <p>Significant negative effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 14: air quality, as the northern part of the site lies within 200m of the A120, although there is uncertainty as to whether these effects can be mitigated. - SA objective 16: soil, as the site consists of Grades 1 or 2 agricultural land. <p>Minor positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 3: health, as development of this site would not lead to loss of publically accessible open space; SA objective 7: Sustainable travel (proximity to bus stops and train station) and SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (avoidance of traffic emissions due to site accessibility).</p> <p>Mixed effects were identified in relation to SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes, as the site is located within an area of low sensitivity to change, but consists of greenfield land.</p> <p>Minor negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 1: community safety and cohesion as the site is within 250m of a waste site and therefore workers may be exposed to issues such as noise, odour dust and pests. Minor negative effects were also identified in relation to SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity as a significant proportion of site is located on undesignated greenfield land.</p>

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.95 This policy supports retail warehouse development within or immediately adjoining town centres. As such a minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 5: Economy as it may provide employment opportunities. If no such sites are available, then the sequential approach will be

applied, together with an impact assessment. This will safeguard the viability and vitality of the centres and so a significant positive effect is likely for SA objective 4: Service centre vitality.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

6.96 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 16: Retail Site Allocations

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.97 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan) but Land at George Yard has been removed as a site for retailing and other main town centre uses. (Site BCBG 146 has planning permission.)						
A. The policy lists the sites that are identified in the town centres for retailing and other main town centre uses. These are assessed together below.						
In addition, policy allocates two out of centre retail sites: (i) Land off Millennium Way (site ID CRESS 202) – see assessment below. (ii) Land north of Freeport (site ID BCBG 146) – see assessment under Policy LPP10; (all policy elements above were preferred at Draft Plan stage)						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	(i)			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	+			
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	+	+			
SA5: Economy	+	+	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	-			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	+			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	++			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	?			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	+			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	--?			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	+/-			
SA16: Soil	0	0	--			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.98 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but Land at George Yard has been removed as a site for retailing and other town centre uses. The assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach

- 6.99 The policy identifies sites in the town centres for retailing and other main town centre uses. The effects of these are assessed together below. In addition, the policy allocates two out of centre retail sites and the spatially-specific effects of these are separately assessed: allocation of land

north of Freeport (site ID BCBG 146) is assessed under Policy LPP10; allocation of Land off Millennium Way (site ID CRESS 202) is described under this policy.

- 6.100 The NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of town centre developments needed in town centres. The allocation of these sites will contribute to service centre vitality and will have benefits for the economy. Therefore a minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 4: Service centre vitality and SA objective 5: Economy.
- 6.101 Additional, spatially specific effects were identified in relation to the out of centre retail allocation set out below, focussing on those which are significant.

Employment allocation	Site ID	SA findings
(i) Land off Millennium Way, Braintree	CRESS 202	<p>Significant positive effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 8: Accessibility, reflecting the location of the site directly adjacent to the Main Town of Braintree as well as the availability of regular bus and rail services within walking distance. Further positive effects relate to the fact that vehicle access can be gained to the site with appropriate layout of access. <p>Significant negative effects were identified in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SA objective 14: Air quality as the site is within 200m of northern part of the site lies within 200m of the A120, although there is uncertainty as to whether these effects can be mitigated. - SA objective 16: Soil, reflecting the fact that the site is located entirely on grade 1 or grade 2 agricultural land. <p>Minor positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 3: Health (no loss of public open space); SA objective 4: Service centre vitality (new retail provision); SA objective 7: Sustainable travel (proximity to bus stops and Braintree Freeport rail station); SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (accessibility of site by sustainable modes).</p> <p>Uncertain effects were identified in relation to SA objective 10: Historic environment, reflecting the presence of several listed buildings within 1 km of the site but potential effects on the historic significance of these were unknown.</p> <p>Minor negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity (undesignated greenfield land);</p> <p>Mixed minor positive and minor negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes (positive - low landscape sensitivity to change; negative - greenfield location).</p>

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.102 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Homes

- 6.103 The section of the Publication Draft Local Plan sets out policies in relation to housing allocations, strategic growth locations, comprehensive redevelopment areas, affordable housing rural exception sites, specialist housing and care homes, gypsy and traveller and travelling showpeople accommodation, housing mix and density, extensions, alterations and outbuildings, rural workers' dwellings and hamlets.

Policy LPP 17: Housing Provision and Delivery

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.104 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:			
<p>Publication: Proposed policy is the similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but the housing number has been adjusted to 14,320. The minimum number of homes to be provided at East of Great Notley has been lowered to 1750 and at and at Feering has been lowered to 750. South West Witham and North East Witham have been removed as Strategic Growth Locations.</p>			
<p>A: The Council will plan, monitor and manage the delivery of a minimum of 14,365 new homes between 2016 and 2033. These homes will be located primarily in the Towns and Service Villages and in strategic growth locations. (preferred) Alternative options are summarised in the table below and describe in more detail below.</p>			
Summary of alternatives			
	Scenario	Annualised Target	Fifteen Year Target
AG01	EoE Plan RSS	300	5,000
AG02	SNPP 2012	686	10,290
AG03	EPOA Jobs-led (2012 SNPP)	845	12,675
AG04	EPOA Jobs-led (2014 SNPP)	712	10,680
<p>B: EoE Plan RSS Scenario: The East of England Plan (2008) RSS was adopted to cover the period 2001 to 2021 and was rescinded by the Secretary of State in January 2013. The core strategy estimated that this would be continued at 385 dwellings from 2021 onwards. This level of growth could largely be accommodated within extant permissions, mostly in Braintree, Witham and Halstead, with the balance made up of windfalls expected to come forward within development boundaries.</p>			
<p>C: SNPP 2012: Government guidance indicates that the starting point for the Full Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) is the latest national household projections. At the time of initially carrying out the housing assessment the relevant figures for Braintree District were contained in the Office for National Statistics publication 'Subnational Population Projections for England: 2012-based' (SNPP 2012). This projection was based on 2008 trends which reflected a buoyant economic period into the scenario. Using the spatial strategy of concentrating development along the A12 and A120 corridor the strategic allocations at Braintree, Witham and Halstead were favoured. This scenario could be accommodated with the elimination of allocations at Feering and Great Notley.</p>			

D: EPOA Jobs-led (2012 SNPP): This scenario represents the combination of population trends from the 2012 SNPP and a jobs-led scenario. It is a combination of higher population trends and a population component to provide the workforce needed to meet economic Objectively Assessed Need (OAN). It is the highest of the four scenarios explored and one of the highest noted in the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). This scenario was adopted by Council as the Full OAN for the Local Plan.

E: EPOA Jobs-led (2014 SNPP): The level of housing in this scenario is similar to that for option C, SNPP 2012. The EPOA Jobs-led scenario is based on the SHMA 2014. EPOA jobs-led was chosen because full OAN for housing and employment needs are incorporated. The starting point for this study was SNPP 2014 which reflects more recent demographic trends and economic forecasts and is lower than SNPP 2012. The spatial strategy to deliver this option would likely be the same as that for Option C (i.e. focus on A12 and A120 corridor).

SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C	D	E
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA2: Housing	++	++	--	+	++	+
SA3: Health	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA5: Economy	+	+	-	+	+	+
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA8: Accessibility	+++?	+++?	+++?	+++?	+++?	+++?
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA11: Climate change mitigation	--	--	--?	--	--	--
SA12: Water environment	-?	-?	0	-?	-?	-?
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA14: Air quality	?	?	?	?	?	?
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0	0	0	0
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0	0	0

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.105 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but the housing number has been adjusted to 14,320. The minimum number of homes to be provided at East of Great Notley has been lowered to 1,750 and at and at Feering has been lowered to 750. South West Witham and North East Witham have been removed as Strategic Growth Locations.
- 6.106 The Strategic Plan for North Essex has progressed since the Draft Local Plan and indicates that 716 new homes are required per year during 2016-2033 in Braintree. However, the Publication Draft Local Plan states that a minimum of 14,320 homes will be delivered, which takes account of

a current deficit and a buffer to guard against future fluctuations in need. The policy is therefore judged to have significant positive effects on SA objective 2: Housing.

- 6.107 As the assessment for Option A below is restricted to the broad effects of delivering a large number of new homes, primarily to in the Towns, Service Villages and Strategic Growth Locations, rather than assessing site-specific allocations, the assessment for Option A still applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach

- 6.108 The assessment of this policy is restricted to the broad effects of delivering a large number of new homes, primarily to in the Towns, Service Villages and named Strategic Growth Locations. The effects of the Draft Local Plan as a whole, including the extent to which the potential negative effects of individual policies are likely to be mitigated by other policies and mechanisms, are discussed in the cumulative assessment in Chapter 11.
- 6.109 The Council's evidence base, jointly assembled with the other local authorities within its housing market area, indicates that 845 new homes are required per year during 2016-2033. This equates to a total of 14,365 new homes the plan period - an amount which this policy provides for in full. The policy is therefore judged to have significant positive effects on SA objective 2: Housing.
- 6.110 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 8: Accessibility as the policy seeks to locate new homes primarily in the towns, service villages and strategic growth locations. This effect is uncertain as it depends on the particular locations for development and is examined further in assessments of other policies and sites, as noted above.
- 6.111 Addressing housing need should also generate jobs in construction and related industries, make it easier for those working in the District's to also live there, help to attract higher skilled and professional workers to live in the District, and increase the local customer base of the District's businesses. The policy is therefore also expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA objective 5: Economy.
- 6.112 Although the policy seeks to locate housing primarily in towns, service villages and strategic growth locations, the provision of such a large number of homes (increasing the number of homes in the District by around 20%) could have significant adverse environmental effects. The potential for such effects is strongly dependent on the location for development and they are therefore addressed by the assessments of more spatially specific policies and allocations.
- 6.113 Notwithstanding mitigation provided by sustainable design policies, by the requirements of the Building Regulations and by a spatial strategy which directs most development to locations which are or can be made accessible to public transport, the large quantum of housing provided under this policy is highly likely to result in a significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions with significant adverse effects on SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation. It is not possible to determine whether there will be a similar effect on air quality, because larger developments can offer the opportunity to deliver a greater provision and range of services and facilities as part of development proposals, including employment opportunities, or increase the viability of public transport services, reducing the need to travel by car. This has resulted in uncertain effects with regards to SA Objective 14.
- 6.114 The Water Cycle Study¹⁵ (WCS) indicates that four Water Recycling Centres (WRCs) (Bocking, Braintree, Coggeshall and White Notley) do not have sufficient capacity to serve proposed future development across the District. Without further action, increased wastewater resulting from development could exceed environmental permits and have negative impacts on the quality of watercourses and negative effects on SA Objective 12. However, uncertainty remains as the WCS concludes that it would be feasible to upgrade these four WRCs to ensure that watercourses are not significantly harmed.

¹⁵ AECOM (2017) Braintree District Council Water Cycle Study

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.115 All options will contribute to housing delivery in Braintree, therefore going some way to meet housing need. However, only option AG03 would meet the full OAN adopted for the Local Plan, therefore this is the only alternative that would have significant positive effects for SA objective 2: Housing. Options AG02 and AG04 are identified as having minor positive effects with regards to SA objective 2, as these would meet the majority of the housing need for the district. Option AG01 is assessed as having significant negative effects, as it would meet less than half of the district's housing need, resulting in a shortage in housing.
- 6.116 As per the preferred option, addressing housing need should also generate jobs in construction and related industries, make it easier for those working in the District's to also live there, help to attract higher skilled and professional workers to live in the District, and increase the local customer base of the District's businesses. Options AG02, AG03 and AG04 are therefore expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA objective 5: Economy. Option AG01 may force people to move away from the District, due to a shortage in housing. This may lead to a reduced workforce as those who move away may seek employment elsewhere, which in turn may make the district less attractive for economic investment. This has resulted in negative effects against option AG01 with regards to SA objective 5.
- 6.117 As per the preferred option, significant positive effects are expected for SA objective 8: Accessibility for all alternatives. This is because these options seek to locate new homes primarily in the towns of Braintree, Witham and Halstead. There is some uncertainty associated with such effects, as accessibility depends on the particular locations for development. With regards to option AG01, a much lower level of housing provision could also limit opportunities to invest in new and improved infrastructure.
- 6.118 For all options, the provision of such a large number of homes could have significant adverse environmental effects and, as a general rule of thumb, the higher the level of housing the more likely it is that significant environmental effects will result. However, it is not possible to be definitive for each growth option as the potential for such effects is strongly dependent on the location for development and has therefore been assessed in the separate assessments of the Strategic Growth Location policies LPP17-LPP23 and the Comprehensive Redevelopment Area policies LPP22-LPP23 that follow. It is worth noting, however, that option AG01 may minimise any adverse effects associated with the chosen spatial distribution of development, due to the much smaller amount of housing proposed than the other three options.
- 6.119 The Water Cycle Study¹⁶ (WCS) indicates that four Water Recycling Centres (WRCs) (Bocking, Braintree, Coggeshall and White Notley) do not have sufficient capacity to serve proposed future development across the District. Without further action, options AG02, AG03 and AG04 are likely to result in increased wastewater to a level that could exceed environmental permits and have negative impacts on the quality of watercourses and negative effects on SA Objective 12. However, the WCS concludes that it would be feasible to upgrade these four WRCs to ensure that watercourses are not significantly harmed. As option AG01 could largely be accommodated within extant permissions, it is expected that this option would not require revised environmental permitting or infrastructure upgrades, therefore a negligible effect on SA Objective 12 is expected.
- 6.120 Notwithstanding mitigation provided by sustainable design policies, by the requirements of the Building Regulations and by a spatial strategy which directs most development to locations which are or can be made accessible to public transport, the large quantum of housing provided under options AG02, AG03 and AG04 is highly likely to result in a significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions associated with electricity, heating and transport. This is likely to result in significant adverse effects on SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation. Option AG01 is likely to lead to some increase in greenhouse gas emissions, but due to the smaller quantum of development, it is uncertain whether or not this will be significant. It is not possible to determine whether there will be a similar effect on air quality for the four options, because larger developments can offer the opportunity to deliver a greater provision and range of services and facilities as part of

¹⁶ AECOM (2017) Braintree District Council Water Cycle Study

development proposals, including employment opportunities, or increase the viability of public transport services, reducing the need to travel by car. This has resulted in uncertain effects with regards to SA Objective 14.

Policy LPP 18: Strategic Growth Location - Land East of Great Notley, south of Braintree
Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

6.121 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with a change of criteria regarding the contribution to, or the provision of, secondary education facilities, and a minimum of 3 new 56 place early years and childcare facilities. Whilst the policy still allocates Group A, BLAN 117 is now considered as part of BLAN 114 and a new area, BLAN 633 has also been allocated as part of Group A.						
A: A Strategic Growth Location has been identified at land east of Great Notley, south of Braintree, delivering up to 2,000 new homes, appropriate employment uses to support a major new community, primary and secondary education facilities, community facilities including a contribution to or location for NHS facilities, local retail and food outlets, public open space, and informal and formal recreation and provision of a Gypsy and Traveller site. (preferred)						
(Policy allocates site ID numbers BLAN 110, BLAN 114, BLAN 116, BLAN 117, assessed together as a single allocation designated as 'Group A')						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+				
SA2: Housing	++	++				
SA3: Health	+/-	+/-				
SA4: Service centre vitality	+?	+				
SA5: Economy	++	++				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-	-				
SA7: Sustainable travel	++	++				
SA8: Accessibility	++	++				
SA9: Education and skills	++	++				
SA10: Historic environment	?	?				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+	+				
SA12: Water environment	--	?				
SA13: Flood risk	0	0				
SA14: Air quality	0	0				
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	-	-				
SA16: Soil	--	--				

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.122 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but the configuration of Group A has changed. BLAN 117 is now considered as part of BLAN 114 and a new area, BLAN 633 has also been allocated as part of Group A. Excluding extant planning permissions, this policy allocates 1903 dwellings. The updated 'raw' site assessment for Group A is included in Appendix 7. Although the provision of early years and childcare facilities is positive; it does not change the overall score. The assessment for Option A below applies with the following exceptions.
- 6.123 Whilst positive effects are still recorded against SA objective 4: service centre vitality, there is now uncertainty associated with this, as site BLAN 633 currently contains a petrol station, car wash and convenience store that may be lost to development.
- 6.124 Although not all parts of this site were assessed by the BDC water cycle study, BLAN 114 (which covers a large proportion of the site) scored red in the wastewater network RAG assessment. This indicates that there is limited capacity in the network, hence a solution is required to prevent further CSO discharges or sewer flooding. As such, significant negative effects have been recorded with regards to SA objective 14: water environment.

SA findings for the preferred approach

- 6.125 Spatial effects for this policy allocation relate to site ID numbers BLAN 110, BLAN 114, BLAN 116, BLAN 117, which were assessed together as 'Group A'.
- 6.126 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 2: Housing as an allocation of 2,000 dwellings will significantly contribute to the delivery of affordable housing.
- 6.127 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 5: Economy, due to high speed broadband availability at the location. In addition, new dwellings, employment opportunities, services and facilities will accommodate new members of the local workforce, increasing demand for local goods and services and the site will provide housing within easy walking distance of existing employment area, with further positive effects on the local economy.
- 6.128 The site is expected to incorporate the provision of a new bus stop resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 7: Sustainable travel.
- 6.129 The site is a Main Town allocation and is within 400 m of a bus stop served by a frequent service. A housing capacity of 2,000 dwellings is also assumed to incorporate a new bus stop. Potential vehicular access issues identified for small parts of the site are addressed via the policy's provisions on access. Therefore a significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 8: Accessibility.
- 6.130 A housing capacity of 2,000 is expected to incorporate a new primary school and this is confirmed in the site specific policy provisions. A secondary school is within 2.4km of the site and the policy provides for new secondary education facilities on site, resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 9: Education and skills.
- 6.131 A significant negative is expected for SA objective 16: Soil, due to a significant proportion of the site being on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land.
- 6.132 Minor positive effects have been identified in relation to SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion, SA objective 4: Service centre vitality (proximity to Great Notley town centre), and SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (reduced greenhouse gas emissions due to sustainable travel).
- 6.133 Mixed positive and negative minor effects are identified in relation to SA objective 3: Health (positive for proximity to primary healthcare and no loss of open space; negative for access to natural greenspace).
- 6.134 An uncertain effect is expected for SA objective 10: Historic environment as several listed buildings are present within the vicinity of the site but impacts on these are unknown. A minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 6: Biodiversity, due to the site being located on greenfield land. An uncertain effect is identified in relation to SA objective 12: Water environment

due to lack of information about capacity of the local sewerage network. A minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes due to a significant proportion of the site being in an area of moderate sensitivity to change and on account of the site being located on greenfield land.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

6.135 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 19: Strategic Growth Location - Land East of Broad Road, Braintree

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.136 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with a change in criteria whereby up to 2 new 56 place early years and childcare facilities will be provided.						
A: A Strategic Growth Location has been identified at Land East of Broad Road and will be expected to provide for up to 1,000 new homes, employment development, a new primary school, local retail facilities and contributions to other community facilities as appropriate, including local health facilities, public open space, formal and informal recreation, which would include improvements to the River Walk to the south of the site and pedestrian and cycle way links to the town centre, provision of a Gypsy and Traveller site. (preferred)						
(Policy allocates site ID numbers BOCN 123, BOCN 127, BOCN 132, assessed together as 'Group J')						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+				
SA2: Housing	++	++				
SA3: Health	+	+				
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	+				
SA5: Economy	++/--	++/--				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-	-				
SA7: Sustainable travel	++	++				
SA8: Accessibility	++	++				
SA9: Education and skills	++	++				
SA10: Historic environment	?	?				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+	+				
SA12: Water environment	0	0				
SA13: Flood risk	0	0				
SA14: Air quality	0	0				
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	-	-				
SA16: Soil	--?	--?				

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.137 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies. Although the provision of early years and childcare facilities is positive; it does not change the overall score. Upon request from the Council, the assessment of 'Group J' has now been assessed as consisting of BOCN 123 and BOCN 132 only, whereas BOCN 127 has been assessed separately (see Appendix 7).

SA findings for the preferred approach

- 6.138 Spatial effects for this policy allocation relate to site ID numbers BOCN 123, BOCN 127, BOCN 132, which were assessed together as 'Group J'.
- 6.139 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 2: Housing as an allocation of 1,000 dwellings will significantly contribute to the delivery of affordable housing.
- 6.140 Prior to consideration of the site-specific policy provisions, the site allocation scores a significant negative for SA objective 5: Economy due to its location on a minerals safeguarding area, a significant positive due to high speed broadband availability at the location, and a minor negative due to being more than 800 m from any existing employment area. The policy's provisions for a mix of new dwellings, employment opportunities, services and facilities will accommodate new members of the local workforce, increasing demand for local goods, having further positive effects on the local economy generally. Overall, effects on SA objective 5: Economy are therefore judged to be a mix of significant positive and significant negative.
- 6.141 The site is expected to incorporate the provision of a new bus stop resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 7: Sustainable travel; it is also within 400 m of several existing bus stops.
- 6.142 The site is a Main Town allocation and is within 400m of several bus stops served by a frequent service. A housing capacity of 1,000 dwellings will also be assumed to incorporate a new bus stop. Potential vehicular access issues identified by BDC's site assessment form are addressed via the policy's provisions on access. Therefore a significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 8: Accessibility.
- 6.143 A housing capacity of 1,000 will also be expected to incorporate a new primary school and this is confirmed by a specific provision within the site-specific policy text. There is also an existing secondary school within 2.4 km of the site resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 9: Education and skills.
- 6.144 A significant negative is expected for SA objective 16: Soil, due to a significant proportion of the site being on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. In addition, uncertain effects are identified in relation to potential contaminated land issues for this site.
- 6.145 Minor positive effects have been identified in relation to SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion (provision of new community facilities), and SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (reduced greenhouse gas emissions due to sustainable travel). SA objective 3: Health scored negatively when assessing the site in isolation due to the nearest NHS GP surgery or hospital being than 800m from the site and due to the site only meeting one criterion in relation to publicly accessible natural greenspace. However, the site-specific policy requires the strategic growth location to provide local health facilities therefore changing this score to a minor positive effect. SA objective 4: Service centre vitality scored negatively when assessing the site in isolation as the site is more than 800m from a primary shopping area. By achieving the mix of uses proposed in this policy the effect for SA objective 4: Service centre will change to minor positive.
- 6.146 An uncertain effect is expected for SA objective 10 Historic environment as there is a conservation area and several listed buildings within the vicinity of the site but impacts on these are unknown. An uncertain effect is identified in relation to SA objective 12: Water environment due to lack of information about capacity of the local sewerage network.
- 6.147 A minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 6: biodiversity due to the site being located on greenfield land. A minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes due to a significant proportion of the site being in an area of moderate sensitivity to change and the site being located on greenfield land.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.148 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 20: Strategic Growth Location - Former Towerlands Park Site

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.149 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with a change of criteria requiring a contribution towards new primary school provision, and a 56 place early years and childcare facility.						
A: A Strategic growth location has been identified at Former Towerlands Park Site and will be expected to provide up to 600 new homes, affordable housing, primary school, community facilities, including contributions to local NHS facilities, local retail facilities, public open space and recreation including landscaping to the rural edge. (preferred)						
(policy allocates site ID number BOCN 137)						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+				
SA2: Housing	++	++				
SA3: Health	+	+				
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	+				
SA5: Economy	++	++				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-	-				
SA7: Sustainable travel	+	+				
SA8: Accessibility	++	++				
SA9: Education and skills	++	++				
SA10: Historic environment	?	?				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+	+				
SA12: Water environment	-?	-?				
SA13: Flood risk	0	0				
SA14: Air quality	0	0				
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0				
SA16: Soil	--	--				

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.150 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies. Although the provision of early years and childcare facilities is positive; it does not change the overall score.

SA findings for the preferred approach

- 6.151 Spatial effects for this policy allocation relate to site ID 'BOCN 137'.
- 6.152 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 2: Housing as an allocation of 600 dwellings will significantly contribute to the delivery of affordable housing.

- 6.153 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 5: Economy, due to high speed broadband availability at the location. Further positive effects are expected because new dwellings, employment opportunities, services and facilities will accommodate new members of the local workforce, increasing demand for local goods and services and the site will provide housing within easy walking distance of existing employment areas.
- 6.154 Prior to consideration of site-specific policy text, the site allocation scored a significant negative effect in relation to SA objective 8: Accessibility because of its location in the open countryside and a significant positive effect because it is within 400m of several bus stops served by a frequent service. The provision of the services and facilities listed in this policy and the proximity of this allocation to a major allocation for employment land at Springwood Drive Industrial Area immediately to the south (Policy LPP1) will improve access to services and facilities, giving an overall significant positive effect for this objective.
- 6.155 Prior to consideration of site-specific policy text, the site scored a minor negative for SA objective 9: Education and skills due to the site being more than 800m from an existing primary school. The site is within 2.4km of an existing secondary school and so received a positive effect for this. The policy makes provision for a new primary school changing the overall score to a significant positive effect.
- 6.156 A significant negative is expected for SA objective 16: Soil, due to a significant proportion of the site being on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land.
- 6.157 Prior to consideration of site-specific policy wording this allocation scored a negligible effect in relation to SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion and there would be no loss of existing community facilities. However, due to the provision of services and facilities listed in the policy which will improve quality of life and community cohesion, this score has been changed to a minor positive effect. Prior to consideration of site-specific policy text, the site allocation scored minor negative effects for SA objective 3: Health due to the site being more than 800m from a NHS GP surgery or hospital and failing to meet any criteria for access to natural greenspace. Minor positive effects were identified as there would be no loss of existing open space. However, as the policy makes provision for contributions to local health facilities and provides for public open space, an overall minor positive effect is identified for SA objective 3. Minor positive effects have been identified in relation to SA objective 4: Service centre vitality (provision of new retail facilities and proximity to NW Braintree Growth Location), SA objective 7: Sustainable travel (proximity to existing bus stops), and SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (reduced greenhouse gas emissions due to sustainable travel).
- 6.158 An uncertain effect is expected for SA objective 10: Historic environment as there is a conservation area and several listed buildings within the vicinity of the site but impacts on these are unknown.
- 6.159 A minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 6: biodiversity due to the site being located on greenfield land. A minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 12: Water environment as the site falls within SPZ2; effects in relation to capacity in the sewerage network remain uncertain. The site has been assessed in isolation as being in an area of moderate sensitivity to change which scores a minor negative effect. The policy, however, requires landscaping to the rural edge resulting in an adjusted negligible effect SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.
- SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered*
- 6.160 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 21: Strategic Growth Location – North West Braintree

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.161 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: This Strategic Growth Location has been identified at land north west of Braintree and will be expected to provide up to 600 new homes, 10ha of employment development, a site for a new primary school and contributions to existing educational facilities, early years and childcare facilities potentially co-located with any new primary school, a local centre including retail and other appropriate uses, public open space, formal and informal recreation, contributions to other community facilities including sports facilities, public rights of way suitable for all users linking to the existing rights of way network and a spine road connecting Springwood Drive to Panfield Lane.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP					
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+/-					
SA2: Housing	++					
SA3: Health	++					
SA4: Service centre vitality	+					
SA5: Economy	++					
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-					
SA7: Sustainable travel	+					
SA8: Accessibility	++					
SA9: Education and skills	++					
SA10: Historic environment	?					
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0					
SA12: Water environment	--					
SA13: Flood risk	0					
SA14: Air quality	0					
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	-					
SA16: Soil	-					

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.162 Prior to consideration of site-specific policy text the allocation was assessed as having an uncertain effect in relation to SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion (specifically in relation to the provision or enhancement of community facilities) but due to the provision of facilities listed in the policy which promotes inclusion, this score has changed to mixed positive and negative minor effects (positive for provision of community facilities and negative as the site is located within 250m of a Waste Plant).
- 6.163 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 2: Housing as an allocation of 600 dwellings will significantly contribute to the delivery of affordable housing.
- 6.164 Mixed minor positive and minor negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 3: Health prior to the consideration of site-specific policy text, but as the text requires provision of open space this addresses the potential negative effects resulting in a significant positive

effect. Further positive effects are expected due to the site being located within 800m of two NHS hospitals.

- 6.165 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 5: Economy, due to the availability or planned instalment of fibre or wireless broadband at the location. Further positive effects are expected because the policy will provide a number of new jobs, which will attract workers to the area. New residents and workers will increase demand for goods and services. The policy provides for employment uses on-site and the site is close to an existing employment area.
- 6.166 The site also scored a significant positive in terms of SA objective 8: Accessibility, due to the site being located at the main town of Braintree/Bocking and within 400m of a number of bus stops with a frequent service.
- 6.167 The site is within 400 m of an existing primary school and will provide a site for a new primary school. It is also within 2.4km of two secondary schools. Overall, a significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 9: Education and skills.
- 6.168 A significant negative effect is expected for SA objective 12: Water environment, due to limited capacity in the sewage network serving the site, according to the WCS. A solution will be required to prevent Combined Sewer Overflow discharges or sewer flooding.
- 6.169 Minor positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 4: Service centre vitality, due to retail provision on-site and proximity by road to a local centre. Minor positive effects were also identified in relation to SA objective 7: Sustainable travel, due to the site being within 400m of a number of bus stops. (retail provision on-site according to site-specific policy text; proximity by road to a local centre), and SA objective 7: Sustainable travel (proximity to existing bus stops).
- 6.170 An uncertain effect is identified for SA objective 10: Historic environment as there are several listed buildings within the vicinity of the site. However, a BDC site visit was not carried out. As a result, the effects on these are unknown..
- 6.171 A minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity, due to the site being located on greenfield land and within 100m of ancient woodland and a Local Wildlife Site. A minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes, due to a significant proportion of the site being in an area of moderate sensitivity to change and on account of the site being located on greenfield land. A minor negative effect is also expected for SA objective 16: Soil because a significant proportion (>25%) of the site is on grade 3 agricultural land.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 22: Strategic Growth Location - Land at Feering

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.172 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre-Submission: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but with additional requirements for early years and childcare facilities, an 'all directions' A12 junction at Feering, and a requirement to protect heritage assets including scheduled monuments and conservation areas.						
A: Strategic Growth Location has been identified at land south east of Feering and will be expected to provide up to 1,000 new homes, appropriate employment uses to support the new community, location for a new primary school or community centre, community facilities including a contribution to or location for new NHS facilities, public open space, and informal and formal recreation including a new country park, safe cycle and pedestrian access between all parts of the development and the village, provision for a Gypsy and Traveller site. (preferred)						
(Policy allocates sites ID numbers FEER 230, FEER 232, FEER 233, assessed together as 'Group L')						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+				
SA2: Housing	++	++				
SA3: Health	+	+				
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	+				
SA5: Economy	++	++				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-	-				
SA7: Sustainable travel	++	++				
SA8: Accessibility	++	++				
SA9: Education and skills	++	++				
SA10: Historic environment	+	?				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+	+				
SA12: Water environment	--	--				
SA13: Flood risk	0	0				
SA14: Air quality	--?	--?				
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	-	-				
SA16: Soil	--	--				

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.173 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but with additional requirements for early years and childcare facilities, an all directions A12 junction at Feering and a requirement to protect heritage assets including scheduled monuments and conservation areas. The assessment for Option A below applies with the following exception.

6.174 As the policy now states that development must ensure no substantial harm to conservation areas, scheduled monuments and other heritage assets, positive effects have been recorded with regards to SA objective 10: historic environment.

SA findings for the preferred approach

- 6.175 Spatial effects for this policy allocation relate to site ID numbers FEER 230, FEER 232, FEER 233, which were assessed together as 'Group L'.
- 6.176 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 2: Housing as an allocation of 1,000 dwellings will significantly contribute to the delivery of affordable housing.
- 6.177 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 5: Economy, due to high speed broadband availability at the location. Further positive effects are expected because new dwellings, employment opportunities, services and facilities will accommodate new members of the local workforce, increasing demand for local goods and services, the policy provides for appropriate local employment uses on-site and the site is close to an existing employment area.
- 6.178 The site is expected to incorporate the provision of a new bus stop resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 7: Sustainable travel. Further positive effects are expected because the site is in proximity to several existing bus stops and the policy provides for safe cycle and pedestrian access between the development and the village of Feering.
- 6.179 The site also scored a significant positive in terms of SA objective 8: Accessibility due to the site being within 800 m of a railway station and 400 m of several bus stops with a frequent service, as well as the assumed provision of a new bus stop.
- 6.180 The site is within 400 m of an existing primary school and its allocation of 1,000 dwellings was assumed to incorporate a new primary school; this was confirmed by the site-specific policy text, resulting in an overall significant positive effect for SA objective 9: Education and skills.
- 6.181 A significant negative uncertain effect is expected for SA objective 14: Air quality due to a significant proportion of the site being located within 200 m of the A12.
- 6.182 A significant negative is expected for SA objective 16: Soil, due to a significant proportion of the site being on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land.
- 6.183 Minor positive effects have been identified in relation to SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion (provision of new community facilities). Prior to consideration of site-specific policy text the site allocation was assessed as having minor negative effects in relation to SA objective 3: Health on account of the site being more than 800 m from a NHS GP surgery or hospital and due to the site meeting zero criteria in relation to publicly accessible natural greenspace, although a minor positive effect was identified as no public open space would be lost. The site-specific policy makes provision for public open space and for contributions to health facilities and so an adjusted minor positive effect is expected overall in relation to this objective. Minor positive effects were also identified in relation to SA objective 4: Service centre vitality (proximity by road to a local centre; retail provision on-site), and SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (reduced greenhouse gas emissions due to sustainable travel).
- 6.184 An uncertain effect is identified for SA objective 10: Historic environment as several listed buildings within the vicinity of the site but impacts on these are unknown.
- 6.185 Significant negative effects have been recorded in relation to SA objective 12: water environment, as there are major constraints to provision of foul sewerage infrastructure to serve growth at this Strategic Growth Location. In addition, development would be served by Feering WRC, which would require upgrades to serve the proposed growth.
- 6.186 A minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 6: biodiversity due to the site being located on greenfield land. A minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes due to a significant proportion of the site being in an area of moderate sensitivity to change and on account of the site being located on greenfield land.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

6.187 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 23: Strategic Growth Location - Wood End Farm, Witham

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.188 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with a change of criteria regarding the contribution towards a new primary school, a site for a 30 place early years facility and secondary education.						
A: Strategic Growth Location has been identified at Wood End Farm, Witham and will be expected to provide up to 450 new homes, open space, play space and allotments including an appropriate countryside edge to the development and buffering to the railway line, a site for or contributions to a new primary school and contributions to early years and secondary education, contributions to other community facilities including health provision as required by the NHS, appropriate vehicular access and improvements as necessary, contributions and a route for a cycle path / footpath between the site and Hatfield Peverel railway station. (preferred)						
(Policy allocates site ID numbers HATF 315, HATF 316, assessed together as 'Group M')						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+				
SA2: Housing	++	++				
SA3: Health	+	+				
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	+				
SA5: Economy	++	++				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-	-				
SA7: Sustainable travel	+	+				
SA8: Accessibility	++	++				
SA9: Education and skills	++	++				
SA10: Historic environment	?	?				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+	+				
SA12: Water environment	?	?				
SA13: Flood risk	0	0				
SA14: Air quality	--?	--?				
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0				
SA16: Soil	--	--				

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.189 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach

- 6.190 Spatial effects for this policy relate to allocation of site ID numbers HATF 315 and HATF 316 which were assessed together as 'Group M'.

- 6.191 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 2: Housing as an allocation of 450 dwellings will significantly contribute to the delivery of affordable housing.
- 6.192 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 5: Economy, due to high speed broadband availability at the location. In addition, new dwellings, employment opportunities, services and facilities will accommodate new members of the local workforce, increasing demand for local goods and services with further positive effects on the local economy generally.
- 6.193 The site is a Main Town allocation and is within 400m of several bus stops served by a frequent service resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 8: Accessibility. Further positive effects were identified as no vehicular access issues to the site were identified.
- 6.194 The site is within 2.4km of an existing secondary school but is more than 800m from an existing primary school resulting in a significant positive effect and a minor negative effect respectively for SA objective 9: Education and skills. The policy makes provision for a new primary school and contributions to early years and secondary education, overall giving a significant positive effect for SA objective 9: Education and skills.
- 6.195 A significant negative uncertain effect is expected for SA objective 14: Air quality due to a significant proportion of the site being located within 200m of the A12.
- 6.196 A significant negative is expected for SA objective 16: Soil, due to a significant proportion of the site being on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land.
- 6.197 Prior to consideration of site-specific policy text, this allocation was assessed as having a negligible effect in relation to SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion, however due to the provision of services and facilities listed in the policy which promotes inclusion, this score has been changed to a minor positive effect. Results in relation to SA objective 3: Health were a mix of minor positive and minor negative prior to consideration of site-specific policy text on account of the site being more than 800m from a NHS GP surgery or hospital, meeting zero criteria in relation to publicly accessible natural greenspace, and not resulting in loss of open space. However, the policy makes provision for public open space and contributions to health facilities and so a minor positive is expected in relation to this objective. Minor positive effects have been identified in relation to SA objective 4: Service centre vitality (accessibility to a local centre by car), SA objective 7: Sustainable travel (proximity to existing bus stops; site-specific policy provision for contributions to a cycle path / footpath to Hatfield Peverel railway station), and SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (reduced greenhouse gas emissions due to sustainable travel).
- 6.198 An uncertain effect is expected for SA objective 10: Historic environment as several listed buildings within the vicinity of the site but impacts on these are unknown. Effects in relation to SA objective 12: Water environment are also uncertain due to a lack of information about capacity in the local sewerage network.
- 6.199 A minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 6: biodiversity due to the site being located on greenfield land. Prior to consideration of site-specific policy text the allocation was assessed as having a minor negative effect in relation to SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes due to a significant proportion of the site being in an area of moderate sensitivity to change and the site being located on greenfield land; this was adjusted to a negligible effect due to site-specific policy provisions for an appropriate countryside edge to the development and buffering to the railway line.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.200 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 24: Comprehensive Redevelopment Area - Land East of Halstead High Street
Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

6.201 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A: Land east of Halstead High Street between The Centre and Factory Terrace is allocated as a Comprehensive Redevelopment Area which could include new homes, retail and commercial space, open space and community uses. (preferred)						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+				
SA2: Housing	++	++				
SA3: Health	+	+				
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	+				
SA5: Economy	++	++				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0				
SA7: Sustainable travel	+	+				
SA8: Accessibility	++	++				
SA9: Education and skills	++	++				
SA10: Historic environment	0	0				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+	+				
SA12: Water environment	-?	-?				
SA13: Flood risk	0	0				
SA14: Air quality	0	0				
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+				
SA16: Soil	0	0				

SA findings for the Publication approach

6.202 The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach

6.203 Spatial effects for this policy allocation relate to site ID 'HASA 287'.

6.204 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 2: Housing as an allocation of approximately 50 dwellings will significantly contribute to the delivery of affordable housing.

6.205 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 5: Economy, due to high speed broadband availability at the location. In addition, the allocation will provide housing in proximity to an

existing employment area to accommodate new members of the local workforce and will increase local demand for goods and services with further positive effects on the local economy.

- 6.206 The site is a Main Town allocation and is within 400 m of several bus stops served by a frequent service resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 8: Accessibility. Additional positive effects relate to the absence of any vehicular access issues for the site.
- 6.207 Although the policy makes no provision for education facilities, the site is already within 400 m of an existing primary school and within 2.4 km of an existing secondary school resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 9: Education and skills.
- 6.208 Prior to consideration of site-specific policy text the allocation was assessed as having a negligible effect in relation to SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion but due to the provision of services and facilities listed in the policy which promotes inclusion, this score has been changed to a minor positive effect. Mixed minor positive and minor negative effects were identified in relation to SA objective 3: Health from the allocation alone but site-specific policy text provision for open space addresses the potential negative effects resulting in an adjusted minor positive score. Minor positive effects are identified in relation to SA objective 4: Service centre vitality (proximity to an existing primary shopping area; on-site provision of new retail space), SA objective 7: Sustainable travel (proximity to existing bus stops), and SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (reduced greenhouse gas emissions due to sustainable travel). The policy also seeks to address the protection of important views into the site and from across the valley resulting in minor positive SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes, particularly as this is a brownfield site. The site allocation in isolation had a minor negative effect for SA objective: 6 Biodiversity, however due to the site-specific policy text requiring retention of protected trees and habitat for protected species this score changes to a negligible effect. When considered in isolation, the site allocation scored a minor negative effect for SA objective 10: Historic environment due to the site being located within a conservation area with BDC's site assessment identifying the potential for development to lead to a more crowded appearance, with negative effects, recognising that mitigation may be possible through care with height and layout, and the retention of trees. The policy specifically seeks to address the protection of the setting of listed buildings and enhancement of the Conservation Area, changing the score for SA objective 10: Historic environment to a negligible effect. A minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 12: Water environment as the site falls within SPZ1; uncertain effects are identified in relation to capacity in the sewerage network.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.209 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 25: Specialist Housing, Mount Hill Halstead

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.210 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre-Submission: Allocate HATR 309 for 16 units of specialist housing for people with physical impairments and learning disabilities, together with the minimum number of ancillary open market housing necessary to ensure their viability.						
As this policy was not included in the Draft Local Plan and has been added to the Publication version of the plan, the policy was not previously assessed.						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.					
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0					
SA2: Housing	?					
SA3: Health	+/-					
SA4: Service centre vitality	+					
SA5: Economy	++					
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-					
SA7: Sustainable travel	+					
SA8: Accessibility	++					
SA9: Education and skills	++?					
SA10: Historic environment	0					
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0					
SA12: Water environment	-					
SA13: Flood risk	0					
SA14: Air quality	0					
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	-					
SA16: Soil	-					

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.211 Development at this site would deliver 16 specialist houses plus the minimum amount of market housing required to make this viable. It is therefore uncertain whether any affordable housing would be provided and uncertain effects have been recorded against SA objective 2: housing.
- 6.212 This site is not within 800m of a GP surgery or hospital and does not meet any of the ANG criteria. However, development will not lead to loss of any publically accessible open space, leading to minor mixed effects with regards to SA objective 3: health.
- 6.213 As this site is located in Halstead, a main town, minor positive effects are expected with regards to SA objective 4: service centre vitality.
- 6.214 The site is within 800m of an existing employment area and wireless or fibre broadband is available or planned by 2019 in almost all surrounding properties. Whilst residents of the specialist housing are unlikely to be seeking employment, employment will be accessible to

residents of any market housing provided on site. In addition, the provision of specialist housing is expected to generate a low number of jobs as care staff, cleaners and so on may be needed. As such, significant positive effects are recorded with regards to SA objective 5: economy.

- 6.215 This site consists entirely of greenfield land, therefore having minor negative effects on SA objective 6: biodiversity and geodiversity.
- 6.216 The site is within 400m of a number of bus stops, therefore minor positive effects are recorded with regards to SA objective 7: sustainable transport.
- 6.217 This site is an allocation to a main town and the nearby bus stops are served by frequent services. As such the site is likely to have good accessibility and significant positive effects are recorded against SA objective 8: accessibility.
- 6.218 This site is located within 800m of a primary school and within 2.4km of a secondary school. As this site is allocated for specialist housing for people with physical impairments and learning disabilities, residents may not attend the closest schools. Nevertheless, the nearby schools may serve any market housing provided on the site, therefore significant positive impacts with uncertainty are expected for SA objective 9: education and skills.
- 6.219 There is a Grade II listed building (Blamsters) to the north of the site. The BDC site assessment form states that the site provides the setting of this heritage asset, which could be harmed by development. However, careful layout and design could mitigate these impacts. The policy states that development must address impacts on this nearby listed buildings, therefore negligible effects are expected with regards to SA objective 10: historic environment.
- 6.220 This site was not assessed through the WCS, however it lies within close proximity to site GGHR 307, therefore the results for HATR 309 are likely to be similar to those for GGHR 307. This site is likely to be served by Halstead WRC, which has headroom for growth. However, the foul sewerage network pipe size or lack of infrastructure may restrict growth. As such, negative effects are expected with regards to SA objective 12: water environment.
- 6.221 This site is not within Flood Zones 2 or 3 and is not within 200m of the A12 or A120, therefore negligible effects are expected with regards to SA objectives 13: flood risk and 14: air quality.
- 6.222 This site lies within an area of moderate landscape sensitivity and consists entirely of greenfield land, therefore negative effects are expected with regards to SA objective 15: landscapes and townscapes.
- 6.223 Negative effects are expected with regards to SA objective 16: soil, as a significant proportion of this site (more than 25%) consists of Grade 3 agricultural land.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.224 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 26: Comprehensive Redevelopment Area - Factory Lane West/Kings Road
Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

6.225 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Proposed policy is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan) with an additional criterion: Retention of the boiler house. In addition, site HATR 298 has been removed as an allocation.						
A: Land at Halstead Business Centre, Factory Lane West, and Harrison Works, Kings Road is allocated as a mixed use re-development. The following uses will be supported; Employment B1 and B8; Small scale retail proposals which do not materially impact on Halstead Town Centre; Residential uses which are not located on the ground floor; Parking. (preferred)						
(Policy allocates site ID numbers HATR 298, HATR 299, assessed together as 'Group O')						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0				
SA2: Housing	0	++				
SA3: Health	+/-	+/-				
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	+				
SA5: Economy	++	++				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0				
SA7: Sustainable travel	+	+				
SA8: Accessibility	++	++				
SA9: Education and skills	++	++				
SA10: Historic environment	?	?				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+	+				
SA12: Water environment	-	-?				
SA13: Flood risk	--	-				
SA14: Air quality	0	0				
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+				
SA16: Soil	?	?				

SA findings for the proposed submission approach

6.226 The proposed submission approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but site HATR 298 has been removed as an allocation and additional text states that the boiler house should be retained.

6.227 The Council have confirmed that site HATR 299 will provide for approximately 10 dwellings, which will make no provision to affordable housing in Halstead. As such, negligible effects have been recorded against SA objective 2: housing.

- 6.228 The uncertainty relating to SA objective 12: water environment has been removed as the updated WCS demonstrates that pumping station or sewer pipe size may restrict growth.
- 6.229 Significant negative effects have been identified in relation to SA objective 13: flood risk, as 73.28% of the site is located within Flood Zone 3.

SA findings for the preferred approach

- 6.230 Spatial effects for this policy relate to allocation of site ID numbers HATR 298 and HATR 299 which were assessed together as 'Group O'.
- 6.231 The Council does not know what level of housing may come forward at this location but an estimate of this is required to allow application of the SA framework therefore LUC has agreed an assumption with the Council that approximately 35 dwellings would be provided. An allocation of approximately 35 dwellings would significantly contribute to the delivery of affordable housing resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 2: Housing.
- 6.232 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 5: Economy, due to planned high speed broadband availability at the location. In addition, the allocation will provide housing in proximity to an existing employment area to accommodate new members of the local workforce and will increase local demand for goods and services with further positive effects on the local economy.
- 6.233 The site is a Main Town allocation and is within 400m of several bus stops served by a frequent service resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 8: Accessibility. Further positive effects arise as no vehicle access issues were identified for the site.
- 6.234 Although the policy makes no provision for education facilities, the site is already within 400 m of an existing primary school and within 2.4 km of an existing secondary school resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 9: Education and skills.
- 6.235 Minor positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 3: health due to proximity to NHS services and the fact that no open space would be lost by development of this site; minor negative effects were identified as the site does not meet any accessibility criteria to natural greenspace. Minor positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 4: Service centre vitality (proximity to a primary shopping area); SA objective 7: Sustainable travel (proximity to existing bus stops); SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (reduced greenhouse gas emissions due to sustainable travel); and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes (development on previously developed land where existing uses have become unattractive and with some vacant uses).
- 6.236 The Council's site assessment stated that the site forms part of the setting of a conservation area and several listed buildings and that good design and layout in development of this brownfield site offered the potential to improve this setting and open up river views. Prior to consideration of any site-specific policy text this led to a conclusion of a potential minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 10 Historic Environment. However, the site-specific policy does not set out any requirements in this regard, making it uncertain whether such benefits will be realised and the effect has therefore been adjusted to uncertain. It is **recommended** that the Council confirms the impact of this site on the significance of heritage assets and adds a policy requirement to conserve and enhance this significance.
- 6.237 A minor negative effect has been identified for SA objective 12: Water Environment as the site falls within SPZ1; uncertain effects were also identified due to lack of information about capacity in the local sewerage network. Prior to consideration of site-specific policy text, the site was assessed as having a significant negative effect in relation SA objective 13: Flood risk as a significant proportion of the site is flood zone 3. However, mitigation is provided by the policy requirement for development in this area to be accompanied by a flood risk assessment and for first floor dwellings only, resulting in an adjusted minor negative score.
- 6.238 An uncertain effect is identified for SA objective 16: Soil as the site is located on contaminated land however it is unknown whether remediation will be required. It is **recommended** that the Council confirms this through further investigation, if necessary, and that any contamination issues are recognised in the policy text.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

6.239 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 27: Comprehensive Redevelopment Area - Former Dutch Nursery, West Street Coggeshall

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

6.240 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Land of the former Dutch Nursery, West Street Coggeshall is allocated as a Comprehensive Redevelopment Area for mixed-use development, where a combination of residential, employment and retail uses will be supported.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP					
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+					
SA2: Housing	++					
SA3: Health	+/-					
SA4: Service centre vitality	+					
SA5: Economy	-					
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	--?					
SA7: Sustainable travel	+					
SA8: Accessibility	++/--					
SA9: Education and skills	++/-					
SA10: Historic environment	?					
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0					
SA12: Water environment	-					
SA13: Flood risk	-					
SA14: Air quality	0					
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	-					
SA16: Soil	-					

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.241 The site is within 2.4km of an existing secondary school but is more than 800m from an existing primary school resulting in mixed significant positive effects and a minor negative effect for SA objective 9: Education and skills.
- 6.242 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 2: Housing. This is because the allocation of 30 dwellings will make a significant contribution to the delivery of affordable housing.
- 6.243 A significant negative effect is expected for SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity due to a small proportion of the site being located in Blackwater Plantation Local Wildlife Site.

- 6.244 Prior to consideration of the site-specific policy provisions, the site allocation scored a significant negative for SA objective 8: Accessibility due to its location in the open countryside, a significant positive due to being within close proximity to a number of bus stops which are served by a frequent service, and a minor positive for there being no highways access issues. The provision of employment uses will also improve residents' accessibility to the job market. Overall, effects on SA objective 8: Accessibility are therefore judged to be a mix of significant positive and significant negative.
- 6.245 Prior to consideration of site-specific policy text the allocation was assessed as having a negligible effect on SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion but due to the provision of community uses as mentioned in the policy, this score has been changed to a minor positive effect.
- 6.246 minor positive effects were identified in relation to SA objective 4: Service centre vitality due to retail provision on-site and proximity by road to a local centre. Minor positive effects were also identified in relation to SA objective 7: Sustainable travel, due to the site being within 400m of two bus stops.
- 6.247 An uncertain effect is identified for SA objective 10: Historic environment as there are several listed buildings within the vicinity of the site but the effects on these were not assessed by the BDC assessment form.
- 6.248 A minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 5: Economy due to the site being located more than 800m from an existing employment site. A minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 12: Water environment because, according to the Water Cycle Study, the pumping station or sewer pipe size may restrict growth. A minor negative effect is also expected for SA objective 13: Flood risk due to a small area of the site being located within flood zone 3. A minor negative effect is also expected for SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes, and SA objective 16: Soil, because the majority of the site is located within an area of moderate sensitivity to change, and located entirely on grade 3 agricultural land.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.249 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 28: Comprehensive Redevelopment Area – Kings Chase

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.250 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Land at Kings Chase, Newland Street, Witham is allocated as a Comprehensive Redevelopment Area for mixed-use redevelopment, where a combination of retail and residential uses will be supported.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP					
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0					
SA2: Housing	0					
SA3: Health	+/-					
SA4: Service centre vitality	+					
SA5: Economy	++					
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0					
SA7: Sustainable travel	+					
SA8: Accessibility	++					
SA9: Education and skills	++					
SA10: Historic environment	+					
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+					
SA12: Water environment	-					
SA13: Flood risk	0					
SA14: Air quality	0					
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+					
SA16: Soil	0					

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.251 The site is located within a local centre, and will help promote and enhance the viability of that centre by focusing development within it. Therefore, a significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 4: Service centre vitality.
- 6.252 A significant positive effect is also expected for SA objective 5: Economy, due to the availability or planned instalment of fibre or wireless broadband in the surrounding area, which will benefit residents living within the C3 residential use, as well as retail uses.
- 6.253 The site is located within the main town of Witham, and is within easy walking distance of a number of bus stops served by a frequent service. Furthermore, access to the site is gained via a single carriageway. Therefore, a significant positive effect is also expected for SA objective 8: Accessibility.
- 6.254 The site is within 400 m of an existing primary school. It is also within close proximity to two secondary schools. Furthermore, the site-specific policy text makes provision for a walking and

cycling link between the town centre and Maldon Road Park. Overall, a significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 9: Education and skills.

- 6.255 The site is within 400m of a number of bus stops, therefore residents and retail workers at this site would have good access to sustainable transport, leading to minor positive effects on SA objective 7: sustainable travel.
- 6.256 Redevelopment of this site will bring degraded buildings back into use, whilst the policy text states that the redevelopment will protect and enhance the character of the conservation area. A minor positive effect is therefore expected for SA objective 10: Historic environment.
- 6.257 A minor positive effect is also expected for SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation, due to the fact that residents and workers at this site will have access to sustainable travel, and a walking and cycling link between the town centre and Maldon Road Park. A minor positive effect is also expected for SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes, due to the site being located on previously developed land.
- 6.258 A minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 12: Water environment, due to the site being located within an area where the pumping station or sewer pipe size restricts growth, or where the area lacks infrastructure and is non-sewered.
- 6.259 Results in relation to SA objective 3: Health were a mix of minor positive and minor negative on account of the site being within 800m of three GP surgeries but meeting none of the criteria in relation to publicly accessible natural greenspace.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.260 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 29: Newlands Precinct

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.261 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with inclusion of medical provision and an additional paragraph on the Critical Drainage Area that the site is within. Any development at the site is required address the drainage infrastructure deficit. An updated site boundary for site WCH14CD has been provided by the Council.						
A: Land at Newlands Precinct, Newlands Drive Car Park, Lockram Lane and Coachhouse Way is allocated as a Comprehensive Development Area for mixed-use development, where a combination of retail, employment, leisure, community facilities, car parking and residential uses will be allowed. (preferred)						
(policy relates to site ID number WCH14CD)						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+				
SA2: Housing	0	++				
SA3: Health	+?	?				
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	+				
SA5: Economy	++	++				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0				
SA7: Sustainable travel	+	+				
SA8: Accessibility	++	++				
SA9: Education and skills	++	++/-				
SA10: Historic environment	+	+				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+	+				
SA12: Water environment	0	0				
SA13: Flood risk	+	0				
SA14: Air quality	0	0				
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+				
SA16: Soil	0	0				

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.262 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan). Therefore, the assessment for Option A below applies, with the following exceptions.
- 6.263 The Council have now confirmed that 10 dwellings will be delivered on this site. As the site is within Witham, a main town, this is not expected to contribute to affordable housing. As such, the policy is now assessed as having negligible effects with regards to SA objective 2: housing.
- 6.264 'Medical provision' has been added to the list of uses to be included within the Comprehensive Redevelopment Area. As such, a minor positive effect has been identified against SA objective 3:

Health. This effect is uncertain as the effect on public space has not been assessed, although the development will provide leisure facilities.

- 6.265 The policy states that any development within the site should address the drainage infrastructure deficit. Therefore, any development within the site should help reduce the risk of flooding. A minor positive effect is therefore likely for SA objective 13: Flood risk.
- 6.266 The change in site boundary now means that a small part of the site is within 800m of Chipping Hill primary school. This has resulted in removal of the negative effect with regards to SA objective 9: Education and skills.

SA findings for the preferred approach

- 6.267 Spatial effects for this policy allocation relate to site ID 'WCH14'. A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 2: Housing as an allocation of 15 dwellings will significantly contribute to the delivery of affordable housing. A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 5: Economy, due to high speed broadband availability at the location. In addition, new dwellings, employment opportunities, services and facilities will accommodate new members of the local workforce, increasing demand for local goods and services with further positive effects on the local economy generally. The site is a Main Town allocation and is within 800m of a railway station, resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 8: Accessibility. The site is within 2.4km of an existing secondary school resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 9: Education and skills, although a minor negative effect is recorded due to its distance from existing primary schools and lack of new provision.
- 6.268 Minor positive effects have been identified in relation to SA objective 4: Service centre vitality (proximity to shops and services), SA objective 7: Sustainable travel (proximity to rail and bus services), and SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (reduced greenhouse gas emissions due to sustainable travel).
- 6.269 Suitability for provision of community facilities was not assessed in the BDC site assessment, resulting in an uncertain effect being recorded for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion when assessing the site in isolation against the site assessment framework. However, due to the provision of services and facilities listed in the policy which promotes inclusion, this score has been changed to a minor positive effect.
- 6.270 An uncertain effect is expected for SA objective 3: Health. The site scores a minor positive because it is within 800m of a NHS GP surgery or hospital, a minor negative because it meets zero criteria regarding publicly accessible natural greenspace, and an uncertain effect because the effect on public space has not been assessed. Furthermore the policy makes no reference to health facilities. A development brief will be required for the whole site prior to any redevelopment. This should address the frontage to Newland Street, the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings resulting in a minor positive effect for SA objective 10: Historic environment. This aspect of the policy is in line with the site assessment where the Braintree site visit conclusions indicated that the site is currently a detractor from the heritage assets in the vicinity and appropriate redevelopment may enhance the heritage assets.
- 6.271 The policy requires that the development brief must provide public realm improvements on this brownfield site, which will result in a minor positive effect for SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.272 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 30: Rickstones Neighbourhood Centre

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.273 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Proposed policy is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan)						
A: Land at Rickstones Neighbourhood Centre, Dorothy Sayers Drive, Witham is allocated as a Comprehensive Development Area for a mixed use development where a combination of retail, community uses, public house, pavilion, and residential development and car parking will be supported. (preferred)						
(Policy allocates site ID number WITN 429)						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+				
SA2: Housing	0	0				
SA3: Health	-	-				
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	+				
SA5: Economy	++	++				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0				
SA7: Sustainable travel	+	+				
SA8: Accessibility	++	++				
SA9: Education and skills	++	++				
SA10: Historic environment	?	?				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+	+				
SA12: Water environment	0	0				
SA13: Flood risk	0	0				
SA14: Air quality	0	0				
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+				
SA16: Soil	0	0				

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.274 The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach

- 6.275 Spatial effects for this policy allocation relate to site ID 'WITN 429'.
- 6.276 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 5: Economy, due to high speed broadband availability at the location. In addition, new dwellings, employment opportunities, services and facilities will accommodate new members of the local workforce, increasing demand for local

goods and services and the site will provide housing within easy walking distance of existing employment area with further positive effects on the local economy.

- 6.277 The site is a Main Town allocation and is within 400m of several bus stops served by a frequent service resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 8: Accessibility. Although the policy makes no provision for education facilities, the site is already within 400m of an existing primary school and 2.4km of an existing secondary school resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 9: Education and skills.
- 6.278 Minor positive effects have been identified in relation to SA objective 7: Sustainable travel and SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (reduced greenhouse gas emissions due to sustainable travel) and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes. A negative effect has been identified for SA objective 3: Health (lack of proximity to primary healthcare and to publicly accessible greenspace).
- 6.279 The effect on SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion was not assessed by the site assessment resulting in an uncertain effect for the allocation when considered in isolation, however due to the provision of services and facilities listed in the policy which promotes inclusion, this score has been changed to a minor positive effect.
- 6.280 The policy makes provision for residential development but the sustainability effects of the total quantum of housing provision and its broad distribution across the district are assessed elsewhere. An allocation of 13 dwellings in Witham will make no contribution to the delivery of affordable housing, resulting in a negligible effect for SA objective 2: Housing.
- 6.281 The site allocation scored negatively for SA objective 4: Service centre vitality when assessing the allocation in isolation as the site is more than 800m from a primary shopping area or local centre. However, provisions in the site-specific policy will deliver a mix of local retail uses, modifying the score to a minor positive effect. An uncertain effect is identified for SA objective 10 Historic environment as there is a conservation area and several listed buildings within the vicinity of the site but impacts on these are unknown.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.282 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 31: Comprehensive Redevelopment Area – Land between A12 and GEML, Hatfield Peveler

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.283 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Allocate land between A12 and GEML as a comprehensive redevelopment area, where the following development is supported: Mixed use development of up to 200 dwellings on former Arla Dairy site; Up to 45 dwellings on Sorrells Field; Up to 20 dwellings on Bury Farm; Up to 20 dwellings to the rear of Station Road; Access and capacity improvements to Station Road car park.						
As this policy was not included in the Draft Local Plan and has been added to the Publication version of the plan, the policy was not previously assessed.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP					
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+					
SA2: Housing	++					
SA3: Health	+/-					
SA4: Service centre vitality	+					

SA5: Economy	+++					
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-					
SA7: Sustainable travel	+					
SA8: Accessibility	++					
SA9: Education and skills	+/-					
SA10: Historic environment	-?					
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0					
SA12: Water environment	-					
SA13: Flood risk	0					
SA14: Air quality	--?					
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	-					
SA16: Soil	--					

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.284 This area coincides with sites HATF 608, HATF 630 and HATF 313, which were considered as part of the SA of the Draft Local Plan. This assessment reviews these previous assessments in light of allocating the combination of these as a 'comprehensive redevelopment area' and the additional policy text. Note that at the time of assessing reasonable alternatives, the Arla Dairy (which coincides with site HATF 608) was operational, however this site is now disused.
- 6.285 The policy expects development at this location to provide provision or contribution to an early years and childcare facility, primary and secondary education facilities and contributions to other community facilities, including healthcare. This is likely to lead to minor positive effects on SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion, as this is likely to ensure residents have adequate access to services and facilities with capacity, but may not lead to provision of new facilities. Mixed effects are recorded with regards to SA objective 3: health, as the policy requires contribution to health provision and is within 800m of a GP surgery but the site does not meet any of the ANG criteria. With regards to SA objective 9: Education, mixed effects are likely as whilst the policy requires contribution to education facilities and there is a secondary school within 4.8 km of the site, there is no primary school within 800m and the policy requires contributions towards education facilities rather than on site provision.
- 6.286 This policy provides for an additional 285 dwellings, resulting in significant positive effects on SA objective 2: Housing.
- 6.287 The comprehensive redevelopment area lies within 8km of Hatfield Peverel centre, thus having positive effects of SA objective 4: service centre vitality. The site is further than 800m from an existing employment site, but fibre or wireless broadband is available, or planned, at the site, therefore resulting in significant positive effects with uncertainty on SA objective 5: Economy.
- 6.288 The BDC site assessments state that both HATF 608 and HATF 630 consist of previously developed land, whereas site HATF 313 consists of greenfield land. It is estimated that over 25% of this site consists of greenfield land, leading to minor negative effects on SA objective 6. The fact that the site is over 25% greenfield and that more than 25% of the site lies within an area of moderate landscape sensitivity has resulted in negative effects on SA objective 15: landscapes and townscapes.
- 6.289 The site is within 400m of a bus stop and within 800m of a railway station, therefore residents at this site would have good access to sustainable transport, leading to positive effects on SA objective 7: sustainable travel.

- 6.290 The bus stop within 400m of the site is served by frequent services, there is a railway station within 800m and the site is located within Hatfield Peverel, which is a key service village, resulting in significant positive effects on SA objective 8: accessibility. In addition, the BDC site assessment forms state that vehicular access can be gained to the site and the policy requires that development contributes towards highways enhancements on Bury Lane to include safer access from the A12.
- 6.291 The BDC site assessment forms state that the site is not within the vicinity of a heritage asset, although there is an archaeological site adjacent to HATF 313 (ref. 6110). Development at this site may result in negative effects with regards to SA objective 10: historic environment, but this depends on the exact layout and design of development.
- 6.292 As this site is not within any SPZs . The WCS states that site HATF 313 would be served by Witham water resource centre, therefore it has been assumed that the whole of the development proposed in this policy would be served by Witham, which has capacity for growth according to the WCS. However, the foul sewerage network capacity may be limited, leading to an overall negative effect for SA objective 12: water environment. As this site lies entirely within Flood Zone 1, it is at low risk of flooding, therefore having negligible effects against SA objective 13.
- 6.293 Development at this site is expected to have a significant negative effect with uncertainty with regards to SA objective 14: air quality, as a large part of the site lies within 200m of the A12. This site consists of grades 1 and/or 2 agricultural land, meaning development is likely to lead to loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, resulting in significant negative effects on SA objective 16: soil.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 32: Residential Allocation – Gimsons, Witham

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.294 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Support development of 40 new homes at Gimsons subject to development management criteria.						
As this policy was not included in the Draft Local Plan and has been added to the Publication version of the plan, the policy was not previously assessed.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP					
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	-?					
SA2: Housing	++					
SA3: Health	+					
SA4: Service centre vitality	+					
SA5: Economy	++					
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-?					
SA7: Sustainable travel	+					
SA8: Accessibility	++					
SA9: Education and skills	++					
SA10: Historic environment	-?					
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0					
SA12: Water environment	-					
SA13: Flood risk	0					
SA14: Air quality	0					
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	--?					
SA16: Soil	?					

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.295 This area coincides with WITC 421, which was assessed as part of the SA of the Braintree Draft Local Plan. This section revises this previous assessment, based on the additional information contained in the policy.
- 6.296 Negative effects have been recorded against SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion, as there is a household waste recycling centre on Perry Road, which is within 250m of the site to the east. This effect is uncertain as the recycling centre is only within 250m of a small proportion of the site, which is expected to be used for access.
- 6.297 The provision of 40 new homes is likely to have significant positive effects with regards to SA objective 2: housing.
- 6.298 This site is within 800m of three GP surgeries and although it does not meet any of the ANG criteria, the policy wording requires provision of formal and informal public open space. As such, the policy is expected to have overall positive effects with regards to SA objective 3: health, with

some uncertainty as to whether the provision of public open space required by the policy will mitigate current the distance of the site to ANG locations.

- 6.299 This area is within Witham town and within 800m of a primary shopping area, therefore having positive effects with regards to SA objective 4: service centre vitality.
- 6.300 This policy is expected to have significant positive effects with regards to SA objective 5: economy, as fibre broadband is available at the site and it is within 800m of Freebournes/Perry Road Industrial Estate employment site.
- 6.301 Some 1.15% of Riverview Meadows Local Wildlife Site lies within the allocated site, which could be lost or degraded by development on the site. There is potential for significant negative effects with regards to SA objective 6, but as the policy states that local wildlife sites must be 'adequately' protected, a minor negative effect has been recorded against SA objective 6. As 'adequate' protection is not well defined, this score is uncertain as it is not known whether this policy wording will completely mitigate any negative effects on SA objective 6: biodiversity and geodiversity.
- 6.302 The site is within 400m of several bus stops, resulting in positive effects on SA objective 7: sustainable transport.
- 6.303 Significant positive effects are expected with regards to SA objective 8, as the site is located within a main town and is within 400m of several bus stops served by a frequent service. The BDC site assessment form states that it is uncertain whether vehicular access can be gained to the site and that this may require additional land. However, the policy states that development will only be permitted subject to provision of vehicular access from River View and safe, direct pedestrian and cycle access from Kings Chase through to River Walk, therefore uncertainty related to access has been removed from the assessment.
- 6.304 The site is within 800m of an infant school, junior school and primary school and within 2.4km of Maltings Academy and partially within 2.4km of New Rickstones Academy, resulting in significant positive effects on SA objective 9: education and skills.
- 6.305 The BDC site assessment form states that this site is partially within a conservation area, there are Grade II and Grade II* buildings within the vicinity of the site on Newland Street and archaeological site 8179 lies within the site. The BDC site assessment form states that the site is well-screened from Newland Street, but may detract from the setting of the conservation area, for example because it is visible from Witham Park, however mitigation is feasible in terms of sympathetic design, density and screening. As such, a negative effect has been recorded with regards to SA objective 10: historic environment.
- 6.306 The WCS states that this site would be served by Witham water resource centre, which has capacity for growth. However, the foul sewerage network capacity may be limited, leading to an overall negative effect for SA objective 12: water environment.
- 6.307 There is also potential for development to have significant negative impacts on SA objective 15: landscapes and townscapes, as the site lies within an area of high landscape sensitivity and consists partially of a Visually Important Space. In addition, the site consists almost entirely of greenfield land. These effects remain uncertain, as the requirements of the policy to contribute to public realm improvements, retain the visual integrity and character of the area and enhance the parkland setting of Gimsons, which may contribute to minimising and mitigating negative effects.
- 6.308 A small area of the site is contaminated, although it is not known whether remediation will be required, resulting in uncertain effects on SA objective 16: soil.

Policy LPP 33: Affordable housing

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.309 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre-Submission: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but with an additional requirement for 10% homes on individual sites to be affordable home ownership products.						
A: Different thresholds and targets for affordable housing in urban vs. rural areas. (preferred)						
B: Set a single threshold and target for affordable housing across the District.						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	++	++	++?			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.310 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but with an additional requirement for 10% homes on individual sites to be affordable home ownership products. The assessment for Option A below still applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.311 The supporting text to this policy states that affordable housing need in the District is approximately 25% of total objectively assessed need. By setting a target requirement for affordable housing provision that exceeds this percentage for all but the smallest developments, the policy should result in newly arising affordable needs being met and may also make a contribution to any backlog with significant positive effects in relation to the achievement of SA

objective 2: Housing. The preferred policy also provides for a higher level of affordable housing delivery in rural areas, reflecting the higher affordable need in these areas. The Council's viability study provides comfort that these levels of affordable housing should be achievable without threatening housing delivery.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.312 Option B would not differentiate between urban and rural areas but would set a single threshold and target for both. This would still be likely to have significant positive effects in relation to SA objective 2: Housing but these would be uncertain; if the requirement for the whole District was based on the 15 dwelling threshold and 30% target identified for urban areas, this might fail to fully meet higher levels of affordable need in rural areas but if the requirement was five dwellings and 40% affordable housing across the District, this could reduce viability and threaten total housing delivery.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 34: Affordable housing in the Countryside

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.313 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre-Submission: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A: To have a criteria based policy on affordable housing development outside but adjacent to development boundaries to meet an identified local need. Market housing should be provided on these sites at no more than 30%. (preferred)						
B: To not have a policy on rural exception sites and leave allocations of this nature to community or neighbourhood plans.						
C: To allow a greater or smaller percentage of open market housing on affordable housing exception sites.						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	B	C		
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0		
SA2: Housing	++	++	0	++?		
SA3: Health	0	0	0	0		
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0		
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0		
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0		
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0		
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0	0		
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0		
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0	0		
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0		
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0		
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0		
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0	0		
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0	0		
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0		

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.314 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below still applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.315 The policy seeks to provide affordable housing in rural areas. Criteria are set out to take account of scheme viability. The policy is based on the 15 dwelling threshold and 30% target in order to support viability of housing delivery. A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 2: Housing.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.316 Policy option B is to have a policy on rural exception sites and leave allocations of this nature to community or neighbourhood plans. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.
- 6.317 Policy option C would still be likely to have significant positive effects in relation to SA objective 2: Housing but these would be uncertain. A smaller percentage might fail to fully meet higher levels of affordable housing need in rural areas but a higher percentage could reduce viability and threaten total housing delivery.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 35: Specialist Housing

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

6.318 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
<p>Publication: Proposed policy wording is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan). This policy now allocates site KELV 332 for specialist housing instead of KELV 331. In addition, site SIB 2CH is now allocated by this policy. Site HATR 309 is also allocated for specialist housing as part of Policy LPP 27.</p> <p>Sites SIB 2CH and BOCN 134 have not been assessed individually as they have planning permission. Detailed site assessments for KELV 332 and HATR 309</p> <p>A: To have a criteria based policy on proposals for specialist accommodation inside and outside development boundaries. Reflecting that within the countryside only minor extensions to existing facilities will be allowed due to issues on sustainability grounds. (preferred)</p> <p>(Policy allocates site ID number BOCN 134 for specialist housing – C3 use – as well as sites HATR 309 and KELV 331 for C2 use, e.g. residential care homes)</p> <p>B: To not have a policy on specialist housing and for it to be considered under the general policies around housing and generic design policies.</p> <p>C: To only allow proposals for specialist housing on specifically designated sites both inside and outside development boundaries.</p>						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C		
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+	0	+		
SA2: Housing	++	++	0	++		
SA3: Health	+	+	0	+		
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0		
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0		
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0		
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0		
SA8: Accessibility	+	+	0	?		
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0		
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0	0		
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0		
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0		
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0		
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0	0		
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+	0	?		
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0		

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.319 The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.320 The only significant effects identified for the policy 16 are in relation to local housing need, SA objective 2: Housing. The policy would ensure a range of housing types to meet specialist needs, leading to a significant positive effect.
- 6.321 The policy defines specialist housing 'as accommodation which has been specifically designed and built to meet the needs of the elderly, disabled, young or vulnerable adults, and may include some elements of care and support for everyone who lives there'. The delivery of specialist housing will contribute to more mixed, inclusive communities resulting in a minor positive effect for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion.
- 6.322 The policy states that everyday services that users would expect to access, such as shops should be available on site or located close by and be accessible by a range of transport modes. This will result in a minor positive effect for SA objective 8: Accessibility. The policy also requires that health services should be available on site or in close proximity and have capacity to accommodate the additional services required from residents. Therefore a minor positive effect is also expected for SA objective 3: Health.
- 6.323 New specialist housing on unallocated sites in the countryside will not be supported, resulting in minor positive effects on the SA objective 15: Landscape and townscape.
- 6.324 Note that spatially specific effects relating to the individual sites allocated under this policy - site BOCN 134 for specialist housing (C3 use) and sites HATR 309 and KELV 331 for residential care homes (C3 use) are shown in the summary score table for all preferred housing sites with individual site assessment forms contained in **Error! Reference source not found..**

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.325 Policy option B is to not have a specific policy and rely on generic housing policies. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.
- 6.326 Policy option C to only allow proposals for specialist housing on specifically designated sites both inside and outside development boundaries. This option would still contribute to the range of housing in the District, helping meeting the needs of the vulnerable resulting in a significant positive for SA objective 2: Housing and a minor positive for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion and SA objective 3: Health. However as the location of the specialist housing is unknown an uncertain effect is expected for SA objective.

Policy LPP 36: Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople' Accommodation

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

6.327 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but requirement numbers have been updated and the policy now refers to meeting the need through strategic growth locations and garden communities.						
A: A criteria based policy around the location of additional sites to accommodate gypsy and traveller and travelling showpeople, including being well related to existing communities, reasonable distance to services and various impacts on the road and landscape and ensuring that the plot is appropriate for the use and that plots for travelling show persons must be large enough for the safe storage and maintenance of rides and equipment. (preferred)						
B: To not have a specific policy and rely on generic policies in relation to housing sites and landscape and highways.						
C: To allocate a specific transit site						
D: To allocate a specific Travelling Showpeople plot						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	B	C	D	
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+	0	+	+	
SA2: Housing	++	++	0	++	++	
SA3: Health	0	0	0	0	0	
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0	0	
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0	0	
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0	0	
SA8: Accessibility	+	+	0	+	+	
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0	0	
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0	0	0	
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0	0	
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0	0	
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0	0	
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0	0	0	
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0	0	0	
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0	0	

SA findings for the Publication approach

6.328 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but updated requirement figures. The policy now plans up to 30 pitches for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation (previously 40) and six plots for travelling showpersons. These figures still meet the identified need of gypsies and travellers and travelling showpersons. The Publication approach also requires these pitches to be delivered through strategic growth locations, garden

communities or the planning application process or, for traveling showpersons plots, through intensification of existing sites. The assessment for Option A below still applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.329 This policy seeks to ensure that travelling communities have a sufficient number of sites to meet their needs. A significant positive effect is therefore likely for SA objective 2: Housing.
- 6.330 The delivery of land to meet the housing needs of travelling communities, would improve social inclusion, accessibility to facilities and services, as well as improve accessibility to employment opportunities. Therefore a minor positive effect is likely for SA objective 1: Community safety & cohesion and SA objective 8: Accessibility.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.331 Policy option B is to have no specific policy and rely on generic housing policies. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.
- 6.332 Policy option C and policy option D would also have a significant positive effect for housing as the policies would allocate specific transit sites and specific travelling showpeople plots. This would also improve social inclusion and accessibility, resulting in a minor positive effect for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion and SA objective 8: Accessibility. However as the exact location of the sites and plots are not known the effect is uncertain for SA objective 8: Accessibility.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 37: Housing Type and Density

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.333 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with a requirement for housing mix (rather than housing size) to be in line with local needs set out in the SHMA and an additional two sentences concerning affordable homes and Building Regulations.						
A: A policy setting out that appropriate density on a site should be related to a number of factors including character, road capacity, vegetation etc. Housing mix should be based on the evidence in the SHMA 2015 (or its successor) to reflect local need and the sizes should meet with the national technical housing standards. Where appropriate 10% of housing should meet the higher category building regulations. (preferred)						
B: An alternative option would be to set a minimum or maximum density standard for all development. This would ensure that land was used efficiently but it would not respect the character of the local area or be able to respond to local circumstances.						
C: A further option would be to rely on national guidance set out in the NPPF. This does provide some detail in relation to mix of housing etc. but asks that Local Authority set out their own approach to housing density which is done in this policy.						
D: To set a higher or lower % of homes to meet the higher category of building regulations. To set a specific minimum and/or maximum density on all development in the District. To have no policy on density and housing type and judge each application on other generic policies within the Plan.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C	D	
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+	+	0	0	
SA2: Housing	++	++	++?	0	0	
SA3: Health	+	0	0	0	0	
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0	0	
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0	0	
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0	0	
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0	0	0	
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0	0	
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0	0	0	
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0	0	
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0	0	
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0	0	
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0	0	0	
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0	0	0	
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0	0	

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.334 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies with the following exception.
- 6.335 In requiring a 10% new market homes on sites of 10 or more dwellings, 10% new affordable homes and 5% of all affordable units in main towns to meet category 2 or 3 of the housing requirements, more housing in the district is likely to be wheelchair accessible and/or adaptable. This is likely to have positive effects with regards to providing a range of housing, including for an ageing population and improving community cohesion and integration. Whilst this has positive effects for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion and SA objective 2: Housing, this is not of a magnitude to alter the scores from the SA of the Draft Local Plan. Increasing the number of accessible and adaptable houses will lead to greater opportunities for independent living, which is likely to increase mental health and wellbeing, having positive effects on SA objective 3: Health.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.336 Policy 18 is expected to have a significant positive effect for SA objective 2: Housing. The policy seeks to ensure that all proposals for housing provide an appropriate mix of housing type and size to meet the specific needs of households in the district which should contribute significantly positively to this objective.
- 6.337 New housing developments can help secure a good social mix, by avoiding the creation of large areas of similar housing. The policy could result in minor positive effects on social inclusion by requiring applicants to provide a range of housing types to meet need. Therefore a minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.338 Policy Option B would set a higher or lower % of homes to meet the higher category of building regulations. A higher percentage would ensure a greater number of new homes are accessible and adaptable for the districts population. However this would likely increase cost of homes making delivery less viable. A lower percentage might fail to fully meet the needs of the districts population. This would still be likely to have significant positive effects in relation to SA objective 2: Housing but this would be uncertain. A minor positive uncertain effect is also expected for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion as the percentage mix of housing is unknown.
- 6.339 Policy Option C considered by the Council would have been to set a minimum or maximum density standard for all development. This would ensure that land was used efficiently but it would not respect the character of the local area or be able to respond to local circumstances. In an area with such a diverse pattern of development as Braintree District, the Council did not consider this option appropriate; it therefore does not represent a reasonable alternative and has not been subject to SA.
- 6.340 Policy option D is to have no policy and let each application be considered on its own merits. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

Policy LPP 38: Residential Alterations, Extensions and Outbuildings

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.341 This policy is a combination of two policies presented in the Draft Local Plan (June 2016); 'Residential Alterations, Extensions and Outbuildings within Development Boundaries' and 'Residential Alterations, Extensions and Outbuildings in the Countryside'.
- 6.342 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Options A and C (the preferred options for the two policies mentioned above that were presented in the Draft Local Plan), with changes to the wording and criteria, including a requirement to avoid unacceptable adverse impacts on heritage assets and the relationship between new outbuildings and existing development.						
A: Criteria based policy setting out when development will be acceptable such as overdevelopment, and street scene. (preferred)						
B: To have no policy and rely on the General Permitted Development Order and NPPF.						
C: Criteria based policy setting out when development would be acceptable in the countryside through being in harmony with the countryside setting, compatibility with the original dwelling and impact on amenity and that outbuildings should be related to existing developments. (preferred)						
D: No policy and rely on the General Permitted Development Order and NPPF						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C	D	
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0	0	
SA2: Housing	0	0	0	0	0	
SA3: Health	0	0	0	0	0	
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0	0	
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0	0	
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0	0	
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0	0	0	
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0	0	
SA10: Historic environment	+	0	0	0	0	
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0	0	
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0	0	
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0	0	
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0	0	0	
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++	0	++	0	
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0	0	

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.343 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Options A and C (the preferred options from the Draft Local Plan). Therefore the assessments for Options A and C apply, with the following exception.
- 6.344 Positive effects are expected for SA objective 10: Historic environment, as the policy states that there should be no unacceptable adverse impact on any heritage asset or their setting.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Options A and C)

- 6.345 Policy options A and C are both expected to have a significant positive effect for SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes. The policies seek to ensure that in all cases proposals should respect the character of the locality and of the nearby dwellings.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.346 Policy options B and D are to have no policy and rely on the General Permitted Development Order and NPPF. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

Policy LPP 39: Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.347 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with changes to the wording, including a requirement for the new dwelling to not have a more harmful impact on the setting of heritage assets and the need for innovative designs to be assessed by a design review panel.						
A: Criteria based policy setting out when development will be acceptable such as overdevelopment, and street scene. (preferred)						
B: To have no policy and rely on the General Permitted Development Order and NPPF.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C	D	
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0	0	
SA2: Housing	0	0	0	0	0	
SA3: Health	0	0	0	0	0	
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0	0	
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0	0	
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0	0	
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0	0	0	
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0	0	
SA10: Historic environment	+	0	0	0	0	
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0	0	

SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0	0	
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0	0	
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0	0	0	
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++	++	++?	++	
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0	0	

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.348 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan). Therefore the assessment for Option A below applies, with the following exception.
- 6.349 Positive effects are expected for SA objective 10: Historic environment, as the policy includes a requirement for any new dwelling and outbuildings to not have a more harmful impact on the setting of heritage assets.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.350 As significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 15: Landscape and townscapes. A criterion of the policy states that proposals would be acceptable provided that the replacement dwelling and any outbuildings, would not have a more harmful impact, or be more intrusive in the landscape, or countryside setting, than the original dwelling.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.351 Policy option B seeks to be more prescriptive in terms of the size of the replacement dwelling that would be permitted, by specifying a maximum increase in volume or footprint that would be permitted. This would offer further protection to the landscape and countryside and so a significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 15: Landscape and townscape.
- 6.352 Policy option C seeks to be less restrictive and allow replacement dwellings of a greater size within the countryside more generally. Whilst no specific volume increase is specified here, the amount acceptable will need to be compatible with the size and shape of the original dwelling and the plot upon which it stands. A significant positive effect is still expected for SA objective 15: Landscape and townscape, however this would be uncertain.
- 6.353 Policy option D seeks to be more restrictive and not allow exceptions to other criteria for exceptional buildings. This would also have a significant positive effect for SA objective 15: Landscape and townscape.

Policy LPP 40: Rural Workers Dwellings in the Countryside

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.354 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Proposed policy is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan)						
A: Criteria based policy which sets out when a home for a rural worker may be acceptable in the countryside. This includes establishing a functional need which cannot be met in existing buildings, that the house should be of a size commensurate to the building and that the business is in profit. There are also additional criteria relating to temporary dwellings which may be granted for a three year period. (preferred)						
B: Rely on the NPPF and not have a policy on rural workers dwellings and for each application to be considered on its merits.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	++	++	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	++	++	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.355 The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.356 Option A is expected to have a significant positive effect for SA objective 2: Housing as the policy will increase the range of housing available in the District.

- 6.357 Option A is expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 5: Economy. Rural workers are normally those involved in the agricultural or forestry industries. There will be some cases where the nature and demand of work in agriculture, forestry or other rural industries makes it essential for some rural workers to live at, or very close to, the site of their work in order to deal quickly with emergencies, particularly in relation to livestock and crops. Therefore a significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 5: Economy as rural workers dwellings is essential for the economic viability of rural industry.
- 6.358 The criterion that sets out when a rural worker's home is acceptable requires there to be an established functional need and requires dwellings to be well-related to existing buildings. This will help be keep within the scale and density of the local landscape resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.359 Policy option B is to have no policy and let each application be considered on its own merits. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 41: Infill development in hamlets

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.360 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A: Identification that gaps within the existing built up development of a hamlet (a collection of 10 plus dwellings which does not have a development boundary) may be suitable for infill by a single development. (preferred)						
B: To not allow any infill development within the countryside and focus all development to development boundaries						
C: To identify all the hamlets in the District where infill development of a hamlet (a collection of 10 plus dwellings which does not have a development boundary) may be suitable for infill by a single development.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C		
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0		
SA2: Housing	++	++	0	++		
SA3: Health	0	0	0	0		
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0		
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0		
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0		
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0		
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0	0		
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0		
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0	0		
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0		
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0		
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0		
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0	0		
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++	++	++		
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0		

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.361 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.362 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 2: Housing and SA objective 15: Townscapes and landscapes. The policy will help increase the range of housing in the District while also preventing sporadic development which could adversely affect the character and appearance of the area.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.363 Policy option B is to not allow any infill development within the countryside and focus all development to development boundaries. This would have no effect on the provision of housing, however it would help ensure the protection of the landscape and countryside.
- 6.364 Policy option C is to identify all the hamlets in the District where infill development of a hamlet (a collection of 10 plus dwellings which does not have a development boundary) may be suitable for infill by a single development. Such a change to the policy would not alter the sustainability performance of the policy option relative to the preferred policy.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 42: Residential Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.365 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with added reference to wildlife surveys.						
A: Criteria based policy for the conversion of permanent rural buildings to new homes providing that they are located in sustainable locations and there is no unacceptable impact on residential amenity, character and they are served by a suitable access. (preferred)						
B: To be more restrictive and not allow the conversion of rural buildings outside that which is permitted development due to their position outside of development boundaries						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	-	-	0			
SA2: Housing	++	++	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	-	-	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	+	+	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	-	-	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	+	+	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.366 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.367 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 2: Housing as policy 25 encourages conversion of permanent rural buildings to new homes, thereby offering a greater range of homes.
- 6.368 Whilst supporting text to this policy discusses the need to demonstrate that rural buildings to be converted to residential use there is no mention of this in the policy itself. This creates the possibility that the change of use could result in loss of commercial uses that are important to the rural economy, resulting in negative effects in relation to SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion, SA objective 5: Economy and SA objective 8: Accessibility. It is **recommended** that the supporting text designed to resist loss of viable commercial uses in the countryside be incorporated in the policy itself.
- 6.369 The criteria of the policy require that there is no unacceptable impact on protected species, the historic environment or the character of the site or the surrounding countryside and its landscape value. Therefore a minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 6: Biodiversity, SA objective 10: Historic environment and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.370 Policy option B is to be more restrictive and not allow the conversion of rural buildings outside that which is permitted development. This represents reliance on other existing or proposed policies and will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

Policy LPP 43: Garden Extensions

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.371 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with added reference to heritage assets.						
A: To have a criteria based policy against which garden extensions outside and inside of settlement boundaries should be considered. Criteria relating to the size, location and impact of the garden extension. (preferred)						
B: To have no policy in relation to garden extensions and deal with it under general policies.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	++	++	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	+	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.372 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies with the following exception.
- 6.373 The updated of this policy now states that extension of a garden will only be permitted where there is no material adverse impact on the character and appearance of any heritage asset and their setting, leading to minor positive effects for SA objective 10: historic environment.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.374 Uncontrolled garden extensions, can have a serious impact on the landscape due to the domestic garden paraphernalia such as garden furniture, sheds and children's play equipment extending out into undeveloped areas, as well as changes to the way in which the land is used and looked after with mown grass, flower beds etc. The policy states that a garden extension will only be permitted where *'there would be no loss of protected natural features or areas of high wildlife value'* and where *'there is no material adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside or street scene'*. A significant positive effect is therefore expected for SA objective 6: Biodiversity and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.375 Policy option B is to have no policy and rely on general policies. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

DRAFT

Transport & Infrastructure

- 6.376 The section of the Publication Draft Local Plan sets out policies in relation to sustainable access, parking provision, road schemes, and broadband internet connectivity.

Policy LPP 44: Sustainable Transport

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.377 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A: A policy setting out the Council's position in relation to transport to ensure that all new developments make appropriate provision for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport, community transport and emergency vehicles. The policy also sets out when travel plans and contributions may be sought from development. (preferred)						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C		
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0		
SA2: Housing	0	0	0	0		
SA3: Health	+	+	+	0		
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0		
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0		
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0		
SA7: Sustainable travel	++	++	++	0		
SA8: Accessibility	++	++	++	0		
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0		
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0	0		
SA11: Climate change mitigation	++	++	++	0		
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0		
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0		
SA14: Air quality	++	++	++	0		
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0	0		
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0		

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.378 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.379 Policy 27 is likely to have significant positive effects in relation to SA objective 3: Health, SA objective 5: Economy, SA objective 7: Sustainable travel, SA objective 8: Accessibility, SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 14: Air Quality.
- 6.380 Policy 27 ensures that all new developments make appropriate provision for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport, community transport and low emission vehicles leading to significant positive effects in relation to promoting sustainable travel (SA objective 7: Sustainable travel) and accessibility (SA objective 8: Accessibility), reducing greenhouse gas emissions (SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation) and air pollution (SA objective 14: Air quality).
- 6.381 Policy 27 could have a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 3: Health, as it is likely to promote a modal shift to sustainable transport modes, including walking and cycling, which could help encourage communities and visitors to lead a more active lifestyle. In addition, the policy encourages modal shift away from private car, which could reduce congestion and improve air quality therefore having a positive effect on people's health.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.382 Policy option B is to have an alternative that defines the scale and type of 'development proposals' to which the policy applies. Whilst this could provide the developer with more certainty regarding the type of development proposal permitted, this type of detailed information can readily be provided in separate guidance or during pre-application discussions; its inclusion within policy could be inflexible, stifling design innovation and could quickly become out of date. None of these considerations is judged to alter the sustainability performance of the policy options relative to the preferred policy.
- 6.383 Policy option C is to have no specific policy and rely on the NPPF. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

Policy LPP 45: Parking Provision

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

6.384 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but with the addition of a list of key car parks and an allocation for commuter parking.						
A: Policy requires parking provision as per the Essex County Council Parking standards and notes that key car parks across the District will be protected for that use. (preferred)						
B: To have no policy.						
C: To have a criteria based policy on the provision and retention of a car parking provision which is judged on a case by case basis.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C		
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0		
SA2: Housing	0	0	0	0		
SA3: Health	+/-	+/-	0	-		
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0		
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0		
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-?	0	0	0		
SA7: Sustainable travel	+/-	+/-	0	-		
SA8: Accessibility	++	++	0	+/-		
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0		
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0	0		
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+/-	+/-	0	-		
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0		
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0		
SA14: Air quality	+/-	+/-	0	-		
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0	0		
SA16: Soil	-?	0	0	0		

SA findings for the Publication approach

6.385 The Publication approach similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies, with the following exceptions arising from allocation of Freeport West for commuter parking.

- 6.386 Freeport West currently consists of unallocated greenfield land, which would be lost if developed for parking, leading to a minor negative effect on SA objective 6: biodiversity and geodiversity. As the site is within an urban context and between a road and a railway line, there is uncertainty regarding the biodiversity value of the site.
- 6.387 Freeport West consists of Grade 3 agricultural land, resulting in negative effects on SA objective 16: Soil. There is uncertainty regarding this effect as due to the location of the site between a road and shopping village and railway line, it is unlikely that this land would ever be used for agriculture.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.388 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 8: Accessibility. The geography of the District is predominantly rural and therefore people travel substantial distances to reach some of the main service centres, often by private vehicle. Car parking will therefore be a key issue in terms of accessibility. The policy also ensures that new proposals provide parking for bicycles increasing accessibility to services and facilities via sustainable transport.
- 6.389 This policy will safeguard parking at a number of rail stations (Braintree, Bures, Hatfield Peverel, Kelvedon and Witham), which may encourage train travel as an alternative to car travel for longer journeys and thereby promote use of sustainable transport. This would have positive effects on SA objective 7: Sustainable transport. However, provision of parking for new residential development could discourage the use of public transport, leading to mixed effects on SA objective 7.
- 6.390 This policy seeks to ensure that new proposals provide parking for bicycles which is likely to encourage the uptake of more sustainable means of transport to access services and facilities which would have benefits on health as people engage in more active travel. On the other hand, the provision of vehicular parking for new residential developments would potentially lead to higher ownership of private cars. This would potentially discourage the use of public transport or other sustainable modes (which would otherwise have a positive benefit on health) as access to a car would be more convenient, particularly where access to public transport is not considered to be reasonable. A mixed effect is therefore likely for SA objective 3: Health, SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation, and SA objective 14: Air Quality.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.391 Policy option B is to have no policy. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.
- 6.392 Policy option B would encourage the provision and retention of vehicular parking, meaning there is likely to be an on-going high ownership and use of private cars for commuting and accessing services which would have a negative effect on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The policy makes no reference to providing parking for bicycles or other sustainable modes of transport. Therefore a minor negative effect is expected for SA objective 3: Health, SA objective 7: Sustainable travel, SA objective: 11 Climate change mitigation, and SA objective 14: Air quality. A mixed effect is expected for SA objective 8: Accessibility as the alternative option only seeks to provide parking for cars.

Policy LPP 46: Protected Lanes

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.393 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A: A policy proposing no proposals should materially impact of physical appearance of protected lanes or generate inappropriate traffic movements on them. (preferred)						
B: To have no policy on protected lanes and put in appropriate measures on a case by case basis.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	++	++	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.394 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.395 Policy 30 would have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes. Protected lanes are often enclosed by a mix of deciduous hedges and raised verges. Any proposals that would adversely

affect the physical appearance of these protected lanes, or generate an inappropriate type of amount of traffic would not be permitted thereby having a positive effect on the traditional landscape and nature conservation.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.396 Policy option B is to have no specific policy and put in appropriate measures on a case by case basis. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

Policy LPP 47: Transport-Related Policy Areas

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.397 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), although additional acceptable use classes in these areas have been added.						
A: Transport Related Policy Areas are gateways into Braintree and therefore the quality of design is important. Measures to improve the sustainability of these areas will be sought. Strict control will be exercised over development in these areas, and they will be restricted to certain categories of use. (preferred)						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0				
SA2: Housing	0	0				
SA3: Health	0	0				
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	+				
SA5: Economy	+	+				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0				
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0				
SA8: Accessibility	+	+				
SA9: Education and skills	0	0				
SA10: Historic environment	0	0				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0				
SA12: Water environment	0	0				
SA13: Flood risk	0	0				
SA14: Air quality	0	0				
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++				
SA16: Soil	0	0				

SA findings for the Publication approach

6.398 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but allows additional use classes in Transport-Related Policy Areas including other sui generis uses and a nursery (D1). The assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach

6.399 The policy requires control of development to limit the type and extent of development. The supporting text states that this is in order to prevent the coalescence of settlements. Quality of design and substantial landscaping is also sought. Therefore a significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 15: Landscape and townscape.

6.400 The policy will seek better connectivity to nearby settlements for cyclists and pedestrians, therefore having a minor positive for SA objective 8: Accessibility. Greater accessibility to settlements and the prevention of the coalescence of settlements would also result in a minor positive effect for SA objective 4: Service centre vitality and SA objective 5: Economy.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

6.401 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 48: New Road Infrastructure

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

6.402 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
pPublication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A: The policy lists a number of schemes that are proposed in the District and will be safeguarded from development. (preferred)						
SA Objective	Pub. LP.	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0				
SA2: Housing	0	0				
SA3: Health	+/-	+/-				
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0				
SA5: Economy	+	+				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-?	-?				
SA7: Sustainable travel	+/-	+/-				
SA8: Accessibility	+	+				
SA9: Education and skills	0	0				
SA10: Historic environment	-?	-?				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+/-	+/-				
SA12: Water environment	0	0				
SA13: Flood risk	0	0				
SA14: Air quality	+/-	+/-				

SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	-?	-?				
SA16: Soil	0	0				

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.403 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below still applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.404 The road infrastructure improvements should improve access to services and facilities by car, with congestion eased, and this could also be of benefit for public transport. Therefore a minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 8: Accessibility.
- 6.405 The road infrastructure improvements will help to address traffic congestion, particularly at peak times, and also to accommodate the additional traffic generated by the additional housing and employment development in the Draft Local Plan. This should help to support economic growth, resulting in a minor positive effect for SA objective 5: Economy.
- 6.406 The policy is likely to alleviate congestion and support proposed development in the Draft Local Plan. Improved road infrastructure could also be of benefit for public transport. Conversely, this could make the road network more attractive for car journeys that otherwise would not have taken place, offsetting some of these benefits. Therefore a mixed effect is expected for SA objective 7: Sustainable travel.
- 6.407 Reductions in congestion are likely to facilitate free-flowing movement of traffic, addressing in particular congestion at peak times, which should help to reduce greenhouse emissions, which should help to alleviate air pollution and in turn its effects on the health of residents and workers. Conversely, this could make the road network more attractive for car journeys, offsetting some of these benefits, and also encouraging residents to use a car rather than cycle or walk. Therefore a mixed effect is likely for SA objective 3: Health, SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 14: Air Quality
- 6.408 The policy has the potential to result in negative effects on the landscape, historic environment and biodiversity, due to the urbanisation effect in more rural and sensitive landscapes from both the built structure and related increases in noise from traffic. The significance of the effect is uncertain as it will depend upon the precise routing and design of the road infrastructure. Therefore a minor negative uncertain effect is expected for SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity, SA objective 10: Historic environment and SA objective 15: Landscape and townscape.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.409 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 49: Broadband

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 6.410 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but references to 'high-speed' and 'super-fast', and thresholds to which the policy applies have been removed.						
A: Require new developments to be connected to the best available high speed broadband connection or where this is not available provide an appropriate contribution to other measures, where viable to do so. (preferred)						
B: Have no policy on broadband and adopt a market led approach.						
C: Require all properties to be served to the door by super high speed broadband.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C		
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0		
SA2: Housing	0	0	0	-		
SA3: Health	0	0	0	0		
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0		
SA5: Economy	+	+	0	+/-		
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0		
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0		
SA8: Accessibility	+	+	0	++?		
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0		
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0	0		
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+	+	0	++?		
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0		
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0		
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0	0		
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0	0		
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0		

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 6.411 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 6.412 In the absence of this policy, telecommunications companies would provide broadband internet services to new developments in any case. However, this policy should help to ensure that the design and layout of new developments facilitates this and that where provision is not currently

practical or economically viable, developer contributions are collected to enable greater access in the future. The policy is therefore expected to have minor positive effects in relation to SA objective 5: Economy (by supporting businesses and home-workers), SA objective 8: Accessibility (recognising that services are increasingly delivered online), and SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation (reflecting the fact that high speed internet access facilitates video conferencing and other services which might otherwise require travel).

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 6.413 Policy option B is to have no policy and rely on market forces. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.
- 6.414 By requiring all new developments to be connected to high speed internet, regardless of their distance from existing infrastructure or the costs involved in providing new infrastructure, policy option C could have more significant positive effects in relation to SA objective 8: Accessibility and SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation than the preferred policy but these additional benefits are uncertain because viability issues could prevent them being delivered. Benefits would still be expected in relation to SA objective 5: Economy but these could be offset by negative effects due to development of employment space, especially in more remote locations, being stifled by the additional cost burden of high speed internet provision at any cost. Housing delivery in more remote locations could also be hampered for similar reasons, with negative effects on SA objective 2: Housing.

DRAFT

7 SA findings for the 'Creating Better Places' policies and reasonable alternatives

- 7.1 This chapter of the SA Report describes the findings of the SA on the effects of the preferred policies and reasonable alternatives in relation to health and activity, high quality spaces, conservation areas, heritage assets, demolition of listed buildings, enabling development, sites of archaeological importance, and community facilities. The policies are appraised below in the order in which they appear in the Draft Local Plan document.
- 7.2 A summary of the likely effects of the preferred approaches set out in the Draft Local Plan as a whole, by SA objective, can be found in Chapter 11.

Policy LPP 50: Built and Historic Environment

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.3 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with the addition of encouraging local groups to formulate Local Lists.						
A: This policy should set out the overall vision for the built and historic environment for the district, including how development will complement the existing towns and villages, and how it will meet the needs of all residents. (preferred)						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+				
SA2: Housing	0	0				
SA3: Health	0	0				
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0				
SA5: Economy	+	+				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0				
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0				
SA8: Accessibility	+	+				
SA9: Education and skills	0	0				
SA10: Historic environment	++	++				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0				
SA12: Water environment	0	0				
SA13: Flood risk	0	0				
SA14: Air quality	0	0				

SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++				
SA16: Soil	0	0				

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.4 In general, the Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies. The amendment to the policy regarding encouraging local groups to formulate Local Lists is likely to further strengthen conservation and enhancement of the historic environment (SA objective 10) and also likely to have positive effects in relation to SA objective 1, as it will give local people a sense of ownership and pride in the historic environment. The Publication approach also lists additional specific historic features for additional clarity.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 7.5 Policy 35 seeks to secure the highest possible standards of design and layout in all new development, and to the protection and enhancement of the historic environment resulting in a significant positive effect for SA objective 10: Historic environment and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.
- 7.6 However there are many other values of the historic built environment, many of which lie in defining and enhancing that connection of people to a place. A high quality built and historic environment can help create areas which are safe and accessible to everyone, and which will contribute towards the quality of life in all towns and villages resulting in minor positive effects for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion and SA objective 8: Accessibility. Similarly the promotion of historical assets can contribute towards driving economic development, tourism and leisure provision in the District resulting in a minor positive for SA objective 5: Economy.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 7.7 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 51: An Inclusive environment

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.8 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Inclusive design in all new developments so as to meet the needs of all users.						
As this policy was not included in the Draft Local Plan and has been added to the Publication version of the plan, the policy was not previously assessed.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP					
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	++					
SA2: Housing	+					
SA3: Health	+					
SA4: Service centre vitality	0					
SA5: Economy	0					
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0					
SA7: Sustainable travel	0					

SA8: Accessibility	+					
SA9: Education and skills	0					
SA10: Historic environment	0					
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0					
SA12: Water environment	0					
SA13: Flood risk	0					
SA14: Air quality	0					
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0					
SA16: Soil	0					

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.9 Policy 45 is likely to improve the quality of life for a number of people, regardless of disability, age, gender, ethnicity or economic circumstances by responding to their different needs through inclusive design. This helps reduce inequality, encouraging greater community cohesion. A significant positive effect is therefore likely for SA objective 1: Community safety & cohesion. This is also likely to increase accessibility of housing, leading to minor positive effects on SA objective 2: Housing.
- 7.10 The policy states that development will contain no disabling barriers. This will improve access to amenities such as health facilities whilst also contributing positively to reduce social exclusion by ensuring better access to jobs and shopping services for all. Minor positive effects are therefore likely for SA objective 3: Health and SA objective 8: Accessibility.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 7.11 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

A healthy and active district

- 7.12 The section of the Draft Local Plan sets out policies in relation to health and wellbeing impact assessment, provision for open space, sport and recreation and equestrian facilities.

Policy LPP 52: Health and Wellbeing Impact Assessment

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.13 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A: Development proposals will be required to assess their impact upon health and well-being, upon the capacity of existing health services and facilities, the environmental impact and the promotion of health improvement activities. (preferred)						
B: No policy						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	++	++	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	+	+	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.14 The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 7.15 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 3: Health as the policy requires development proposals to assess their impact upon health and well-being, upon the capacity of existing health services and facilities, and the environmental impact and the promotion of health improvement activities.
- 7.16 Policy 33 requires health impact assessments will assess the capacity of existing health services and facilities thereby having a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion and SA objective 8: Accessibility.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 7.17 Policy option B is to have no policy. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 53: Provision for Open Space, Sport and Recreation

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.18 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre-Submission: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but with reference to other areas that may be of particular quality and removal of space requirements for open space, built sports and recreation facilities and playing pitches and outdoor sports.						
A: Open space and sports and recreational facilities that are of high quality, or of particular value to a local community, will be recognised and given protection by the Council. The Council will look to remedy deficiencies in the provision of open space, sports or recreational facilities where possible. Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land shall not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space or the buildings and land to be surplus to requirements. (preferred)						
B: No policy - sports provision provided as opportunities for development arise. Reliance on national policy.						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	+	++	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	+	+	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	++?	++?	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	++?	++?	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+	+	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.19 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but with reference to other areas that may be of particular quality, the consideration of opportunities for off-site provision and removal of local provision standards and space requirements for open space, and built sports and recreation facilities and playing pitches and outdoor sports. The assessment for Option A below applies with the following exceptions.

- 7.20 The policy no longer sets out the required provision for amenity and natural greenspace and instead focuses on requiring developers to replace types of recreational facility in surplus with those in deficit. The removal of requirements for provision of new open space, sports and recreation facilities has led to an assessment of minor positive effects against SA objectives 3: health and 8: accessibility, rather than the positive effect at Draft Local Plan stage.
- 7.21 The policy now states that the Council shall consider applications with the intention of 'mitigating' the impact on biodiversity, rather than 'considering'. The policy would be stronger if it emphasised the mitigation hierarchy and an intent to avoid negative impacts on biodiversity before considering mitigation. Nevertheless, the policy still recognises that areas of open space can benefit biodiversity, leading to minor positive impacts (with uncertainty) on SA objective 6: biodiversity and geodiversity.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 7.22 Significant positive effects are identified for the policy options on green open spaces in relation to SA objective 3: Health, SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity, and SA objective 8: Accessibility.
- 7.23 Open spaces and sports and recreation facilities are used for a diverse range of activities, the vast majority of which are likely to contribute to improving the physical and mental health of District's residents, with significant positive effects against SA objective: 3 Health. The policy serves to protect, expand and enhance these important local facilities, improving their general extent and quality where appropriate, with significant positive effects against SA objective 8: Accessibility. However limited public transport services in some rural parts of the District can reduce access to open space and leisure and recreational facilities, resulting in an uncertain effect. Areas of open space can benefit wildlife and biodiversity if appropriately designed. The policy states that in considering planning applications within or adjoining open space, the impact of development on biodiversity and nature conservation will be considered. It also sets a provision standard for different types of open space, including, 'amenity and natural greenspace'. A significant positive effect is therefore expected for Objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity although uncertainty exists in this effect because the provision standard could theoretically be met by providing amenity greenspace that is not natural and therefore does not have a high biodiversity potential. It is **recommended** that consideration be given to policy wording that explicitly encourages open space additions and enhancements that increase the multi-functionality of the open space network, for example being designed to provide a venue for informal recreation, high value habitat for wildlife, and flood storage or runoff attenuation.
- 7.24 A minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion. The policy highlights the need to retain community facilities for their uses and encourage enhancement as they positively contribute to the wellbeing and social cohesion of local communities. A minor positive effect is also expected for SA objective 11: Climate Change Mitigation as the policy would help to reduce carbon emissions through maintaining/increasing green space in the District.
- 7.25 A minor positive effect is also expected for SA objective 5: Economy. The policy will contribute towards improving the local character of the District's landscapes and townscapes (having a minor positive effect on SA objective 15: landscapes and townscapes), increase biodiversity, connectivity and resilience to the effects of climate change, all of which are likely to improve the local environment for the District's workforce, attracting new business and enhancing the districts potential for tourism.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 7.26 Policy option B is to have no policy. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

Policy LPP 54: Equestrian Facilities

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.27 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with removal of reference to floodlighting and an additional requirement to avoid significant effects on settings of heritage assets.						
A: A criteria based policy for the development of new riding schools, stable buildings or other equestrian facilities, or extensions to such facilities. (preferred)						
B: To have no policy on equestrian facilities and rely on other policies including commercial development in the countryside.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	+	+	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	+	+	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	+	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.28 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies, with the following exception.
- 7.29 The inclusion of a criterion to ensure no significant effects on the settings of heritage assets has led to assessment of a positive effect for SA Objective 10: Historic Environment.
- 7.30 Whilst the criteria to prevent use of floodlighting has been removed, the requirement to ensure no significant effects on important landscape or nature conservation interests or adjacent residential areas is expected to remove the likelihood of any adverse effects from floodlighting.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 7.31 This policy states that new equestrian facilities will only be permitted where there is no significant effect on important landscape or nature conservation interests, therefore minor positive effects are expected with regards to SA objectives 6: biodiversity and geodiversity and 15: landscapes and townscapes.
- 7.32 The policy will permit proposals for new or extended residential accommodation if a submitted business plan demonstrates that there is a convincing case for residential accommodating, and provided the proposal accords with certain criteria. The policy will increase the range of housing available in the District. Therefore a minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 2: Housing.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 7.33 Policy option B is to have no policy and rely on other policies including commercial development in the countryside. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

DRAFT

Creating high quality spaces

- 7.34 The section of the Draft Local Plan sets out policies in relation to the layout and design of development.

Policy LPP 55: Layout and Design of Development

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.35 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with the addition of criteria regarding architectural quality and single aspect dwellings. Criteria regarding vulnerability to climate change and external alterations have been removed.						
A: The Council will seek a high standard of layout and design in all developments, in the District, and encourages innovative design where appropriate. Planning permission will only be granted where certain requirements are met. (preferred)						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A				
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+	+				
SA2: Housing	+/-	+/-				
SA3: Health	+	+				
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0				
SA5: Economy	0	0				
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	+	+				
SA7: Sustainable travel	+	+				
SA8: Accessibility	+	+				
SA9: Education and skills	0	0				
SA10: Historic environment	+	+				
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	+				
SA12: Water environment	+	+				
SA13: Flood risk	+	+				
SA14: Air quality	+	+				

SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+				
SA16: Soil	0	0				

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.36 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies, with the following exceptions.
- 7.37 The removal of the criterion requiring development to minimise vulnerability to climate change has resulted in negligible, rather than a positive effects on SA objective 12: climate change mitigation. Whilst this criterion had implications for SA objectives 2 and 3 as well, positive effects on these objectives remain due to the influence of other design requirements in the policy, such as the requirement for buildings to incorporate measures for environmental sustainability and promoting a safe and secure environment.
- 7.38 The additional criterion relating to architectural quality is likely to have positive implications for SA objective 15: landscapes and townscapes, although this will not be of a magnitude to increase the significance of the effect from a minor positive.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 7.39 A minor positive is expected for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion as the policy requires that design layouts 'shall promote a safe and secure environment, crime reduction and prevention, and shall encourage the related objective of enhancing personal safety; with the maximum amount of natural surveillance of roads, paths and all other open areas and all open spaces incorporated into schemes'.
- 7.40 A minor positive is expected for SA objective 10: Historic environment and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes as the policy requires design to be sensitive to the need to conserve local features of architectural, historic and landscape importance. A criterion of this policy is also to promote the enhancement of biodiversity assets. A minor positive effect is therefore likely for SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity.
- 7.41 The policy requires that 'both the overall planning and detailed design shall incorporate measures for environmental sustainability throughout the construction, occupation and demolition of the development, in relation to energy conservation, water efficiency, waste separation (internal and external), climate change, flood resilience and resistant construction, and the use of materials with low overall energy requirements'. Development will also be required to minimise vulnerability to climate change impacts, therefore minor positive effects are expected for SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation, SA objective 12: Water environment, SA objective 13: Flood risk and SA objective 14: Air quality.
- 7.42 The use of sustainable modes of transport will be promoted in the design and layout of new development resulting in a minor positive effect for SA objective 7: Sustainable travel. The policy also requires that developments should be accessible to all and create or contribute to a coherent sense of place. In addition they should be permeable, well connected to walking and cycling networks, open spaces and facilities. Therefore a minor positive is also expected for SA objective 8: Accessibility.
- 7.43 The inclusion of environmentally sustainable design measures, sustainable transport and the promotion of a safe and secure environment and crime reduction and prevention, will result in a minor positive effect for SA objective 3: Health.
- 7.44 This policy seeks the incorporation of good design into all development proposals in the District, including housing. This may result in dwellings within Braintree District being of a higher standard in terms of climate change adaption, safety etc. leading to the provision of decent homes and a minor positive effect in relation to SA objective 2: Housing. However the policy could potentially have a minor negative effect on this objective whereby design criteria cannot be met or where high quality design criteria requirements render housing developments less viable. A mixed effect is therefore likely in relation to SA objective 2: Housing.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

7.45 No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.

DRAFT

Conservation areas

- 7.46 The section of the Draft Local Plan sets out policies in relation to preservation and enhancement of conservation areas and demolition within conservation areas, shop fronts fascias and signs in conservation areas and illuminated signs in conservation areas.

Policy LPP 56: Conservation Areas

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.47 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below. Note that this policy consists of part of Policy 47 in the Draft Local Plan. As Policy 47 has now been split into policies 56 and 57, the assessment of the Draft Plan preferred option and alternatives focus on the parts of Draft Plan Policy 47 that related to the content of this policy.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but this has now been split between two policies. This policy relates to managing development in conservation areas.						
A: policy which sets out the increased expectation form development taking place within conservation areas, in order to make sure it does not impact on the character and appearance of those areas. (preferred)						
B: Reliance on national guidance.						
C: Where the display of advertisements is within a designated Conservation Area, or affects its character or appearance, the Council will utilise the policies LPP 48 and LPP 49.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C		
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0		
SA2: Housing	0	0	0	0		
SA3: Health	0	0	0	0		
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0		
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0		
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0		
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0		
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0	0		
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0		
SA10: Historic environment	++	++	0	0		
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0		
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0		
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0		
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0	0		
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++	0	0		
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0		

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.48 This policy is equivalent to the first part of the preferred Policy LPP 47 of the Draft Local Plan (Option A below), focusing on management of development in conservation areas. Nevertheless, the assessment is the same as that for Option A below.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 7.49 This policy is expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 10: Historic environment and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes by requiring proposals within or adjacent to a conservation area to not detract from the character, appearance and essential features of the Conservation Area, by retaining details of existing buildings that make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area and by ensuring that building materials are authentic and complementary to the character of buildings.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 7.50 Policy option B is to have no specific policy and rely on national guidance. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.
- 7.51 Policy option C is to rely on other policies within the Draft Local Plan. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

DRAFT

Policy 57: Demolition in Conservation Areas

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.52 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below. Note that this policy consists of part of Policy 47 in the Draft Local Plan. As Policy 47 has now been split into policies 56 and 57, the assessment of the Draft Plan preferred option and alternatives focus on the parts of Draft Plan Policy 47 that related to demolition in conservation areas.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but this has now been split between two policies. This policy relates to demolition in conservation areas.						
A: policy which sets out the increased expectation form development taking place within conservation areas, in order to make sure it does not impact on the character and appearance of those areas. (preferred)						
B: Reliance on national guidance.						
C: Where the display of advertisements is within a designated Conservation Area, or affects its character or appearance, the Council will utilise the policies LPP 48 and LPP 49.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C		
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0		
SA2: Housing	0	0	0	0		
SA3: Health	0	0	0	0		
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0		
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0		
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0		
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0		
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0	0		
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0		
SA10: Historic environment	+	++	0	0		
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0		
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0		
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0		
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0	0		
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	++	0	0		
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0		

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.53 This policy is equivalent to the second part of the preferred Policy LPP 47 of the Draft Local Plan (Option A below), focusing on demolition in conservation areas. The Publication approach is also expected to have positive implications for SA objectives 10 and 15, as demolition will

only be permitted in exceptional cases, where the historic environment and landscape are not harmed and may be enhanced.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 7.54 This policy is expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 10: Historic environment and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes by requiring that demolition of an unlisted building or structure in a conservation area would not have a negative impact on the street scene, the structure makes a negative contribution to the conservation area, demolition would benefit the local environment or infrastructure or it is part of redevelopment scheme that would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area. SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered
- 7.55 Policy option B is to have no specific policy and rely on national guidance. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.
- 7.56 Policy option C is to rely on other policies within the Draft Local Plan. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 58: Shop Fronts, Fascias and Signs in Conservation Areas

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.57 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A: A policy which helps to encourage good design, appropriate materials, and minimises the proliferation of advertisements in order to protect and enhance the character of conservation areas. (preferred)						
B: Reliance on national guidance, reliance on general design policy.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	++	++	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.58 The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 7.59 The policy states that shop fronts, fascias and signs in conservation areas should be of high quality and have regard to the character of an area. This policy is likely to make a positive contribution to conserving and enhancing townscapes and the historic environment, and so a significant positive effect is likely for Objective 10: Historic Environment and SA Objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 7.60 Policy option B is to have no specific policy and rely on national guidance. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

Policy LPP 59: Illuminated Signs in Conservation Areas

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.61 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A: A policy which ensures that illuminated signs do not impact on the overall character and appearance of conservation areas. (preferred)						
B: Reliance on national guidance, reliance on general design policy.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	++	++	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.62 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 7.63 Policy 38 requires well designed and proportioned fascia signs and any illumination necessary shall take the form of discreet external down lighting. This policy is likely to have a significant positive effect for SA objective 10: Historic environment and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes as it seeks to make a positive contribution to conserving and enhancing townscapes and the historic environment.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 7.64 Policy option B is to have no specific policy and rely on national guidance and general policies. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

DRAFT

Heritage assets

- 7.65 The section of the Draft Local Plan sets out a policy in relation to alterations, extensions and changes of uses to heritage assets and their settings.

Policy LPP 60: Heritage Assets and their Settings

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.66 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A: A policy which seeks to protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings by allow works only is they do not harm the heritage asset significance, through appropriate design, materials, and finishes. (preferred)						
B: Reliance on national guidance.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	+	+	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	++	++	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.67 This policy is equivalent to the preferred option for Policy LLP 50: Alterations, Extensions and Changes of Use to Heritage Assets and their Settings in the Draft Local Plan. The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 7.68 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 10: Historic environment as development involving internal, or external alterations, or extensions, to a listed building, or listed structure and changes of use will only be permitted when the development meets the criteria set out in the policy.
- 7.69 A minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 4: Economy. The predominantly rural nature of the district and a high quality built and historic environment are important attractions for visitors. The preservation and enhancement of the historic environment will contribute to the tourism industry. The preservation and enhancement of historic assets will also have a minor positive effect for SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 7.70 Policy option B is to rely on national guidance. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

DRAFT

Demolition of listed buildings or structures

- 7.71 The section of the Draft Local Plan sets a policy in relation to demolition of listed buildings or structures.

Policy LPP 61: Demolition of Listed Buildings or Structures

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.72 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A: A policy which ensure that demolition of listed buildings or structures only take places when absolutely necessary, and when it does occur a record of the structure is taken. (preferred)						
B: Reliance on national guidance.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	+	+	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	++	++	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.73 The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 7.74 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 10: Historic environment as partial or total demolition of a listed building or structure will only be granted in the most exceptional circumstances where certain criteria are fully satisfied.
- 7.75 A minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 4: Economy. The predominantly rural nature of the district and a high quality built and historic environment are important attractions for visitors. The preservation and enhancement of the historic environment will contribute to the tourism industry. The preservation and enhancement of historic assets will also have a minor positive effect for SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 7.76 Policy option B is to rely on national guidance. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

DRAFT

Enabling development

7.77 The section of the Draft Local Plan sets out a policy in relation to enabling development.

Policy LPP 62: Enabling Development

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

7.78 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A: A policy which allows for development to take place in order to help preserve a heritage asset in the long term, without causing material harm to the heritage values. (preferred)						
B: Reliance on Historic England guidance.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	++	++	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

7.79 The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

7.80 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 10: Historic environment. The supporting text defines Enabling development as *'development within the vicinity of a heritage*

asset for the claimed purpose of assisting its repair, restoration or improvement'. This policy seeks to secure the future of heritage assets, based on the need to preserve the heritage asset, rather than the personal circumstances of its owner.

- 7.81 This policy seeks to ensure that heritage assets in the District are protected and this would have benefits on local character and townscape. As such a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 7.82 Policy option B is to have no policy and rely on Historic England guidance. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

DRAFT

Sites of archaeological importance

- 7.83 The section of the Draft Local Plan sets out a policy in relation to archaeological evaluation, excavation and recording.

Policy LPP 63: Archaeological Evaluation, Excavation and Recording

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.84 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with the added specification that permission will not be permitted if remains are of sufficient importance to be preserved in situ.						
A: A policy which ensures that we development takes place, its site is checked for archaeological potential, and if any found it is properly mitigated and recorded. (preferred)						
B: Reliance on national guidance.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	++	++	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.85 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but specifies that remains should be preserved in situ where they are of sufficient importance. The assessment for Option A below still applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 7.86 An archaeological evaluation of the site will need to be undertaken and submitted as part of the planning application where important archaeological remains are thought to be at risk from development, or if the development could impact on a scheduled ancient monument, or historic park and garden. This ensures the preservation of all remains of archaeological significance. Therefore a significant positive effect is likely for SA objective 10: Historic Environment.
- 7.87 This policy seeks to ensure that archaeological remains in the District are protected and this would have benefits on local character and townscape. As such a minor positive effect is expected in relation to SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 7.88 Policy option B is to have no policy and rely on national guidance. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

DRAFT

Community facilities

- 7.89 The section of the Draft Local Plan sets out policies in relation to educational establishments and retention of local community services and facilities.

Policy LPP 64: Educational Establishments

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.90 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but in addition it names two sites for new educational facilities.						
A: A criteria based policy for the release of educational sites which are no longer in use and support from appropriately located and designed new educational developments. (preferred)						
B: To provide a list of all the sites considered redundant and suitable for reuse and the locations where new educational facilities will be provided.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	++	++	++			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	+	+	+			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	+	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	++	++	++			
SA9: Education and skills	++	++	++			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	-	0	0			
SA16: Soil	--	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.91 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but identifies two specific sites for development of new educational facilities. One of these, Land at Ravens Avenue, Halstead, is located on the same site as site GGHR 284, which was previously assessed as a potential housing site. The other site is Lodge Farm, in the west of Witham. The allocation of these sites has led to the following amendments, relative to the assessment of Option A (below). Minor negative effects are expected with regards to SA objective 6: biodiversity, as both sites consist of undesignated greenfield land.
- 7.92 Both sites are partially within 400m of a bus stop, meaning that pupils will be able to access the school via public transport, which will have minor positive effects on SA objective 7: sustainable travel. These bus stops are served by frequent services and both sites are adjacent to main towns, therefore they have good levels of accessibility and a significant positive effect is expected with regards to SA objective 8: Accessibility.
- 7.93 A small part of Land at Ravens Avenue falls within SPZ2, but this is less than 25% of the site, therefore negligible effects are recorded with regards to SA objective 12: Water environment.
- 7.94 Both Land at Ravens Avenue and Lodge Farm are located within an area of moderate landscape sensitivity and both consist of greenfield land, therefore this policy is expected to have minor negative effects with regards to SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.
- 7.95 Land at Ravens Avenue consists partially of Grade 3 agricultural land and is partially not considered to be agricultural land. Lodge Farm consists entirely of Grades 1 and/or 2 agricultural land, resulting in significant negative effects on SA objective 16: Soil.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 7.96 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 9: Education and skills as the policy seeks to support the retention of existing educational facilities and the creation of more educational facilities. The policy recognises the differences in location. A rural based school application is expected to promote adequate and reliable public transport provision for its students. A significant positive effect is therefore likely for SA objective 8: Accessibility. This also promotes inclusion and so a significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion.
- 7.97 A minor positive is expected for SA objective 5: economy, as retained and new educational establishments provide local employment opportunities.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 7.98 Policy option B would provide details of specific sites that would be more suitable for educational establishments. This consideration is not judged to alter the sustainability performance of the policy options relative to the preferred policy.

Policy LPP 65: Local Community Services and Facilities

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.99 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but in addition it names two community assets and three sites for new or enhanced community facilities.						
A: Criteria based policy for the retention of existing community facilities and services within the District and the support for enhancement and extension of existing and new community facilities wherever possible. (preferred)						
B: To provide specific allocations for new community facilities						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+++	+	+			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	+++	++	+++			
SA4: Service centre vitality	+	+	+			
SA5: Economy	+	+	+			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	-?	0	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	+	+	+			
SA8: Accessibility	+++	++	+++			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	-?	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	-?	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	--?	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	--?	0	0			
SA16: Soil	--?	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.100 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but safeguards three specific sites for development of new or enhanced community facilities. As such the assessment for Option A below applies, with the following exceptions. There is some uncertainty associated with all effects of the assessed policy as it is limited to safeguarding land and it is unclear how community facilities will be provided at these sites within the plan period.

- 7.101 This policy is expected to have significant positive effects with regards to SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion, as it allocates new sites for community facilities and protects existing facilities.
- 7.102 Minor negative effects are expected for SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity, as Land Adjacent Nuns Walk (safeguarded in this policy) consists entirely of greenfield land.
- 7.103 The safeguarded sites at Butler Road, Halstead, and Land Adjacent Nuns Walk, are adjacent to a conservation area. Development at these sites may harm the setting of the conservation area, but this is likely to be able to be mitigated, having negative effects on SA objective 10: Historic environment. There is uncertainty surrounding this, as BDC officers have not assessed the potential for impacts on the historic environment through site visits.
- 7.104 All three safeguarded sites lie within SPZ2, therefore minor negative effects have been identified with regards to SA objective 12: water environment.
- 7.105 Over 25% of the safeguarded site at Butler Road, Halstead, lies within Flood Zone 3 and the remainder of the site lies within Flood Zone 2. This has resulted in significant negative effects for SA objective 13: flood risk.
- 7.106 The two safeguarded sites at Great Yeldham lie within an area of high landscape sensitivity, therefore significant negative effects are expected with regards to SA objective 15: landscapes and townscapes.
- 7.107 The majority of land at Butler Road is located on past contaminated land and it is not known if this has or will be remediated. Part of Land Adjacent Nuns Walk (over 25% of the site) consists of Grade 1 and/or 2 agricultural land. The remainder of this site and Land at Hunnable Industrial Estate consist of Grade 3 agricultural land. As such, this policy is assessed as having significant negative effects against SA objective 16: soil.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 7.108 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 3: Health and SA objective 8: Accessibility. A criterion of the policy states that '*proposals for the change of use of health care facilities to other uses will not be permitted unless proposals are consistent with the service providers strategy for infrastructure provision in the wider area and/or modernisation programme for delivery of that service or facility*'. The policy also states that new and enhanced facilities will be supported. Therefore a significant positive effect is expected for both these objectives.
- 7.109 The policy applies to all areas outside of the three main towns. The retention and creation of community facilities and services will meet local needs, create sustainable communities and reduce the need to travel. Therefore a minor positive effect is likely for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion, SA objective 4: Service centre vitality and SA objective 7: Sustainable travel. The preferred option will also have a minor positive impact in relation to SA objective 5: Economy as retained and new facilities provide local employment opportunities.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 7.110 Policy option B is expected to have same effects but with uncertainty. New and enhanced facilities would still be supported; however it is not clear where the new facilities would be located.

Policy LPP 66: Cemeteries and Churchyards

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 7.111 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Retain all existing cemeteries and churchyards, unless all other reasonable options for retaining the facility have been considered or a replacement facility of at least equivalent quality is provided. Allocate an extension to Bocking Cemetery and the churchyard at St Mary The Virgin, Great Bardfield.						
As this policy was not included in the Draft Local Plan and has been added to the Publication version of the plan, the policy was not previously assessed.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP					
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0					
SA2: Housing	0					
SA3: Health	0					
SA4: Service centre vitality	0					
SA5: Economy	0					
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0					
SA7: Sustainable travel	+					
SA8: Accessibility	+					
SA9: Education and skills	0					
SA10: Historic environment	0					
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0					
SA12: Water environment	?					
SA13: Flood risk	0					
SA14: Air quality	0					
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	?					
SA16: Soil	--					

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 7.112 St Mary the Virgin church is within 400m of a bus stop, which is served by infrequent services, ensuring that the cemetery extension would be reasonably accessible by public transport, although the cemetery is likely to primarily serve the local parish. This has resulted in minor positive effects for SA objective 7: Sustainable travel and SA objective 8: Accessibility.
- 7.113 The extension to St Mary the Virgin churchyard lies within a conservation area, but given its location to adjacent to the existing churchyard and to the back of Saint Mary the Virgin Church, the extension is not likely to impact the conservation area. The extension to Bocking Cemetery is also expected to have negligible effects with regards to SA objective 10: Historic environment.

- 7.114 The extension to St Mary the Virgin churchyard is wholly within SPZ3, and the extension to Bocking Cemetery lies primarily within SPZ 1c, which relates to sub-surface activity only, resulting in uncertain effects on SA objective 12: Water environment.
- 7.115 The extension to St Mary the Virgin churchyard lies wholly within an area of high landscape sensitivity and a Visually Important Space. Given that the site is allocated for extension of a churchyard it is unlikely that landscape character will be adversely affected. Whether or not the extension of this churchyard would adversely affect the Visually Important Space allocation remains uncertain with regards to SA objective 15: landscapes and townscapes. The extension to Bocking Cemetery lies in an area of unknown landscape sensitivity, adding to the uncertainty recorded against SA objective 15.
- 7.116 The extension to St Mary the Virgin churchyard consists mainly of Grades 1 and/or 2 agricultural land, although the northwest part of the site consists of Grade 2 land. The guidelines and criteria for grading agricultural land¹⁷ state that cemeteries have little potential for a return to agriculture, therefore the cemetery extension would lead to loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, leading to significant negative effects against SA objective 16: soil. The extension to Bocking Cemetery is not classified as agricultural land.

DRAFT

¹⁷ Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) (1988) Agricultural Land Classification of England and Wales, *Revised guidelines and criteria for grading the quality of agricultural land*

8 SA findings for the 'District's Natural Environment' policies and reasonable alternatives

- 8.1 This chapter of the SA Report describes the findings of the SA on the effects of the preferred policies and reasonable alternatives in relation to the natural environment, biodiversity, landscape character, and agriculture; land, water and air quality; climate change and energy; flood risk and surface water drainage; and external lighting. The policies are appraised below in the order in which they appear in the Draft Local Plan document.
- 8.2 A summary of the likely effects of the preferred approaches set out in the Draft Local Plan as a whole, by SA objective, can be found in Chapter 11.

DRAFT

Biodiversity, landscape character and agriculture

- 8.3 The section of the Draft Local Plan sets out policies in relation to protected species, enhancement, management, and monitoring of biodiversity and landscape characters and features.

Policy LPP 67: Natural Environment and Green Infrastructure

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 8.4 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: The Publication approach draws on Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but with greater emphasis on green infrastructure and removal of references to the excessive use of water and other resources and prioritisation of poorer quality agricultural land.						
A: Development proposals must take all available measures to ensure the protection, and where possible, the enhancement of the natural environment, habitats, biodiversity and geodiversity of the District. This will include, where appropriate, protection from all types of pollution and the excessive use of water and other resources. Development proposals should take account of the potential impacts of climate change in their design, and propose measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions where necessary. Where required, the Council will prioritise the development of poorer quality agricultural land. (preferred)						
B: Include a separate policy for considering climate change.						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	+	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	+	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	++	++	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	++	++	++			
SA12: Water environment	0	+	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	+	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++	0			
SA16: Soil	0	++	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 8.5 The Publication approach draws on Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but puts greater emphasis on green infrastructure. References to the excessive use of water and other resources and prioritisation of poorer quality agricultural land have been removed from the policy, leading to removal of the previously identified positive effects with regards to SA objective 12: water environment and SA objective 16: soil. Reducing excessive use of water is not addressed in other plan policies, but policies LPP 9 and LPP 76 require prioritisation of lower quality agricultural land with regards to tourism development in the countryside and renewable energy development respectively.
- 8.6 As with Option A below, the Publication approach requires proposals to protect and enhance the natural environment, leading to significant positive effects with regards to SA objective 6: biodiversity and geodiversity.
- 8.7 The natural environment, habitats, biodiversity and geodiversity contribute to local character and aesthetics. Along with the requirement for development proposals to contribute towards green infrastructure, this policy is expected to have significant positive effects on SA objective 15: landscape and townscape.
- 8.8 Green infrastructure is multi-functional green space and therefore has multiple benefits. Increasing and enhancing green infrastructure in the district is likely to provide attractive outdoor spaces, which could have positive impacts on the mental, social and physical wellbeing of residents and they may be encouraged to spend more time in these attractive environments. As such, minor positive effects are expected with regards to SA objective 3: health.
- 8.9 In addition, green infrastructure can boost the image of a town or district, which can help attract and retain workers and businesses, therefore having minor positive effects on SA objective 5: economy.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 8.10 The policy requires development proposals to take all available measures to ensure the protection, and where possible, the enhancement of the natural environment, habitats, biodiversity and geodiversity of the District. Therefore a significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes. Proposals should take account of the potential impacts of climate change in their design, and propose measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions where necessary. This would have a significant positive effect on SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation. In addition, a significant positive effect is also expected for SA objective 16: Soil as the council seeks to prioritise the development of poorer quality agricultural land where required
- 8.11 A minor positive effect is expected for SA objective 12: Water environment and SA objective 14: Air Quality. The policy seeks to ensure protection from all types of pollution and the excessive use of water and other resources. This will have benefits for air quality and the water environment.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 8.12 Policy option B would include a separate policy on climate change. This would have a significant positive effect on SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation.

Policy LPP 68: Protected Species, Priority Spaces and Priority Habitat

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 8.13 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: The Publication approach strengthens Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan) by focusing more on ensuring no net loss of priority species or habitats and a precautionary approach where uncertainty remains.						
A: Ecological assessment required where proposals may affect a protected species. Impacts on species/habitats will be assessed and mitigation conditions applied where appropriate. Where harmful impacts are evident without satisfactory mitigation, permission will be refused. (preferred)						
B: Include policy seeking to create a network of wildlife corridors and avoid fragmented and isolated pockets of habitat.						
C: Inclusion of a more specific policy requiring specialist design features in new development to provide habitat and thereby improve biodiversity.						
D: Inclusion in policy of measures to identify and protect species rich and local habitats of importance.						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	B	C	D	
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0	0	
SA2: Housing	0	0	0	0	0	
SA3: Health	0	0	0	0	0	
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0	0	
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0	0	
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	++	++	++	++	++	
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0	0	
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0	0	0	
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0	0	
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0	0	0	
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0	0	
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0	0	
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0	0	
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0	0	0	
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0	0	0	
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0	0	

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 8.14 The Publication approach strengthens the approach of Option A below by supporting proposals that result in a net gain in priority habitat and ensuring no net loss of priority habitat or

species. In addition, the Publication approach emphasises the mitigation hierarchy, by requiring adverse impacts on priority habitat to be avoided, requiring appropriate mitigation for adverse impacts on priority habitats and species and requiring any residual impacts to be compensated for. The policy also requires a precautionary approach where insufficient information about mitigation is provided. It also states that proposals leading to loss, deterioration or fragmentation of irreplaceable habitats will not normally be permitted. These factors are likely to result in significant positive effects for SA objective 6: biodiversity and geodiversity.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 8.15 The policy requires ecological assessments to be carried out where proposals may affect protected species. Impacts on species/habitats will be mitigated where appropriate and where mitigation cannot take place permission will be refused. A significant positive effect is therefore expected for SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 8.16 Policy options B, C and D would provide more detail within the policy on the biodiversity protection measures and specialist designs. Policy option B seeks to include a policy seeking to create a network of wildlife corridors and avoid fragmented and isolated pockets of habitat. Policy option C seeks the inclusion of specialist design features in new development, while policy option D seeks the inclusion of measures to identify and protect species rich and local habitats of importance. None of these considerations are judged to alter the sustainability performance of the policy options relative to the preferred policy. Therefore a significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity for all the reasonable alternatives considered.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 69: Tree Protection

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 8.17 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: The Publication approach states that prominent trees contributing to local character will be protected by tree preservation orders. Any works to trees or development on sites with existing trees or planned tree planting should be carried out in line with the relevant British Standards.						
As this policy was not included in the Draft Local Plan and has been added to the Publication version of the plan, the policy was not previously assessed.						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.					
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0					
SA2: Housing	0					
SA3: Health	+					
SA4: Service centre vitality	0					
SA5: Economy	0					
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	++					
SA7: Sustainable travel	0					
SA8: Accessibility	0					
SA9: Education and skills	0					
SA10: Historic environment	0					
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0					
SA12: Water environment	0					
SA13: Flood risk	0					
SA14: Air quality	0					
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++					
SA16: Soil	0					

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 8.18 The Publication approach will protect trees which contribute to the local landscape and offer significant amenity value, particularly those with a 'reasonable' life expectancy. This is expected to contribute to maintaining attractive places in Braintree, which will have significant positive effects for SA objective 15: landscape and townscape. In addition, attractive surroundings can have positive effects for mental health and wellbeing, therefore minor positive effects are expected for SA objective 3: health.
- 8.19 By promoting conservation of healthy trees, this policy is also likely to contribute to maintaining biodiversity, including trees themselves and those species that depend on them. This has led to an assessment of significant positive effects with regards to SA objective 6: biodiversity and geodiversity.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

8.20 No reasonable alternatives were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 70: Protection, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity
Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

8.21 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan) but with additional requirements relating to compliance with the Anglian River Basin Management Plan and the value of brownfield sites.						
A: Proposals should protect biodiversity and mitigate adverse impacts of development. Bio diversity enhancements should be included in all developments. Retention/improvement of the natural environment to be encouraged by maximising green infrastructure and creating green infrastructure networks to link urban areas to countryside and enhancing bio diversity. (preferred)						
B: Include policy/wording seeking to create a network of wildlife corridors and avoid fragmented and isolated pockets of habitat.						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	++	++	++			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	++	+	+			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

8.22 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but expands this by requiring development to comply with and contribute positively to the Anglian River Basin Management Plan. The Publication approach also requires

development on brownfield land to maintain and enhance important biodiversity features and states that planning permission will be refused where harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided, mitigated or compensated for. The assessment for Option A below applies, but with significant positive effects expected for SA objective 12, due to development having to contribute positively to the Anglian River Basin Management Plan.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 8.23 The primary focus of this policy option is to protect and enhance biodiversity and therefore a significant positive effect is predicted in relation to SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity.
- 8.24 A minor positive effect is also expected for SA objective 12: Water environment. The policy suggests that biodiversity enhancements could include watercourse improvements to benefit biodiversity and improve water quality, habitat creation, wildlife links and building design which creates wildlife habitat.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 8.25 Policy options B would provide more detail within the policy on how biodiversity may be protected and enhanced. The policy could provide the developer with more certainty on the type of enhancement desired. This consideration is judged not to alter the sustainability performance of the policy options relative to the preferred policy.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 71: Landscape Character and Features

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 8.26 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre-Submission: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan) but with added references to the National Character Area and the AONB.						
A: Landscape character/roles will be taken into account in decision making assisted by the Landscape character assessments. Proposals must include an assessment of their landscape impact. Should not be detrimental. Development should retain and not harm existing landscape features. Protect landscape character and roles through requiring sympathetic development. (preferred)						
B: Design policies specifically for areas in the Upper Stour Valley which accord with the Stour Valley Management Plan and promote its future inclusion within the inclusion of the Dedham Vale AONB.						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	++	++	++/ --			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++	++/ --			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 8.27 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan) but with added references to the South Suffolk and North Essex Clayland National Character Area and a requirement for proposals not to harm the setting of the AONB. The assessment for Option A below still applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 8.28 This policy requires that the Local Planning Authority will take into account the different roles and character of the various landscape areas in the District, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. This is in order to ensure that any development permitted is suitable for the local context. This will have a significant positive effect in relation to objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes. The policy also requires that the proposals should not be detrimental to the distinctive landscape features of the area such as trees, hedges, woodlands, grasslands, ponds and rivers, and that applicants should be required to provide an assessment of their impacts on the landscape. The restoration and enhancement of the natural environment will be encouraged through creating green infrastructure networks to link urban areas to the countryside, and creating and enhancing the biodiversity value of wildlife corridors. Therefore a significant positive effect is also expected for SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 8.29 Policy option B is likely to have significant positive effects for the areas in Upper Stour Valley as it seeks to promote its future inclusion within the inclusion of the Dedham Vale AONB. However policy option B does not refer to areas outside of the Upper Stour Valley within the district. As the policy leaves the landscape in these areas vulnerable to the effects of development, a mixed effect is therefore likely on this SA objective.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 72: Green Buffers

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 8.30 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan) but lists the specific areas identified as Green Buffers.						
A: Development proposals which require a countryside location, within Green Buffers as defined on the proposals map, will only be allowed under very special circumstances. Where development is necessary it will have regard to the local landscape character, and be of a design, density, and layout which minimises the coalescence between built areas. An assessment of the local landscape will be required demonstrating that the development is to be located on an area which has the least detrimental impact to the character of the countryside. (preferred)						
B: To have no policy and rely on the NPPF.						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	+	+	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 8.31 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan) but lists the specific areas identified as Green Buffers. The assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 8.32 The policy supports the use of green buffers to be used to prevent the main towns in the district coalescing with neighbouring villages. Where development is necessary it will have regard to the local landscape character, and be of a design and density to minimise the coalescence between built areas. Landscaping will be required in order to enhance the

countryside character of these areas. Therefore a significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 15: Landscape and townscape.

- 8.33 The protection of the countryside and the introduction of native species through landscaping would also have a minor positive effect for SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 8.34 Policy option B is to have no policy and rely on the NPPF. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

DRAFT

Land, water and air quality

- 8.35 The section of the Draft Local Plan sets out a policy in relation to protecting and enhancing natural resources, minimising pollution and safeguarding from hazards.

Policy LPP 73: Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 8.36 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with additional emphasis on avoiding unacceptable impacts on land and soil quality.						
A: Proposals should minimise polluting emissions without harming amenity or rural tranquillity land stability, land quality/condition. Proposals on or near possible land contamination or involving hazardous substances must submit an appropriate assessment of risks, remediation, implementation etc. with or before the planning application. These and monitoring may be secured by planning condition. (preferred)						
B: This policy might also consider also the need to protect soil quality during development to protect good quality land, protect the ability of soil to allow water penetration by avoiding compaction.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	+	+	+			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	+	+	+			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	++	++	++			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	++	++	++			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+	+	+			
SA16: Soil	+	0	++			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 8.37 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with additional emphasis on avoiding unacceptable impacts on land and soil quality and condition. The assessment for Option A below still applies, with the following exception.
- 8.38 Minor positive effects were identified against SA objective 16: Soil as the policy states that development will not be permitted where there are likely to be 'unacceptable impacts' on land and soil quality and condition.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 8.39 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 12: Water environment, and SA objective 14: Air quality, as the policy requires that proposals for all new developments should minimise all emissions and other forms of pollution and ensure no deterioration to either air or water quality. As such the policy is directly linked to these objectives.
- 8.40 The policy also specifies that all development proposals must not cause unacceptable impacts upon the health and safety of the public. A minor positive effect is therefore likely for SA objective 3: Health.
- 8.41 The policy requires that development proposals must be located and designed so as not to cause a significant adverse effect upon the environment by reason of pollution or as a result of any form of disturbance. This policy could be expected to therefore offer some protection to habitats within the District which support biodiversity. A minor positive effect is likely for SA objective 6: Biodiversity. As this will also help to conserve the natural and urban landscapes within the District a minor positive effect is likely on this SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 8.42 Policy option B might also consider the need to protect soil quality during development to protect good quality land, protect the ability of soil to allow water penetration by avoiding compaction. This would result in a significant positive effect for SA objective 16: Soil. Otherwise, the policy and the sustainability performance of the policy remain unchanged.

Climate change and air quality

- 8.43 The section of the Draft Local Plan sets out policies in relation to energy efficiency, renewable energy schemes and renewable energy within new development.

Policy LPP 74: Climate Change

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 8.44 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and require developments to demonstrate that the principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation have been embedded into design. Encourage and support the provision of renewable and low carbon technologies, subject to their impacts on landscape, amenity, pollution, heritage, biodiversity, soils and highways.						
As this policy was not included in the Draft Local Plan and has been added to the Publication version of the plan, the policy was not previously assessed.						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.					
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0					
SA2: Housing	0					
SA3: Health	+					
SA4: Service centre vitality	0					
SA5: Economy	+					
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	+					
SA7: Sustainable travel	+					
SA8: Accessibility	0					
SA9: Education and skills	0					
SA10: Historic environment	+					
SA11: Climate change mitigation	++					
SA12: Water environment	0					
SA13: Flood risk	+?					
SA14: Air quality	+					
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	+					
SA16: Soil	+					

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 8.45 The Publication approach aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and requires development proposals to demonstrate how developmental design has considered climate change mitigation and adaptation. In requiring reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, this policy will have significant positive effects with regards to SA objective 11: climate change mitigation. More specific requirements on energy efficiency in new development are set out in policy LPP 75.

- 8.46 This policy is likely to have a number of positive secondary effects. Ensuring that development is built to both limit greenhouse gas emissions and withstand the unavoidable effects of climate change is likely to have minor positive implications for SA objective 3: health, as residents and workers will be at reduced risk of injury or ill health from climate change issues, such as overheating, flooding and other extreme weather events. This may also help to increase resilience of local businesses to climate change and promote the green economy, leading to minor positive effects on SA objective 5: economy.
- 8.47 As specified in the supporting text to this policy, it is expected that promoting sustainable modes of transport will be a key factor in minimising greenhouse gas emissions, leading to minor positive effects on SA objective 7: sustainable travel.
- 8.48 One of the key effects of climate change that the district is likely to have to adapt to is increased risk of flooding. As such, minor positive effects are recorded against SA objective 13: flood risk, although such effects remain uncertain as the policy does not explicitly refer to minimising flood risk.
- 8.49 The policy supports provision of renewable and low carbon technologies, but specifies that this is subject to their impacts on landscape and visual amenity, residential amenity, pollution, heritage assets, biodiversity, soils and highways. This is assessed as having minor positive effects with regards to SA objectives 6: biodiversity and geodiversity, 10: historic environment, 14: air quality, 15: landscapes and townscapes and 16: soil. More specific requirements for the development of renewable energy facilities is provided by the separate Local Plan policies LPP 76 and LPP 77.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 8.50 No reasonable alternatives were considered by the Council.

Policy LPP 75: Energy Efficiency

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 8.51 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A: Energy efficiency, through layout and design, and decentralised energy networks will be encouraged where they conform to other Draft Local Plan policies. (preferred)						
B: Energy efficiency is mainly considered through the building regulations and the measure contained in this policy might be included in the development design policies.						
C: Exception sites outside the settlement boundaries for energy efficient development to a recognised high technical standard. The number of exception sites might be limited.						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	B	C		
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0		
SA2: Housing	+/-?	+/-?	+/-?	+/--?		
SA3: Health	0	0	0	0		
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0		
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0		
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0		
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0		
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0	0		
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0		
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0	0		
SA11: Climate change mitigation	++	++	++	+		
SA12: Water environment	++?	++?	++?	+?		
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0		
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0	0		
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0	0		
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0		

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 8.52 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 8.53 The primary purpose of this policy is to encourage greater energy efficiency and so a significant positive is expected for SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation. Energy efficiency measures suggested by the policy include reducing water consumption and increasing water recycling, which would also result in a significant positive effect for SA

objective 12: Water environment, although this effect is uncertain as other energy efficiency measures might be chosen by the developer.

- 8.54 The policy requires energy efficiency measures in all developments including homes, providing a greater opportunity for everyone to live in a decent home. Therefore, a minor positive effect is likely for SA objective 2: Housing as the quality standards of dwellings will improve. This could potentially make new residential developments less financially viable and so a potential minor negative effect is also identified.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 8.55 Policy option B is to set out the same measures within a more general development design policy and is therefore expected to have the same sustainability effects as the preferred policy.
- 8.56 Policy option C is to apply higher energy efficiency standards to rural exception sites, although the rationale for such an option is unclear. It is judged that this would have smaller energy efficiency benefits than the preferred policy since it would only apply to a small proportion of new housing, resulting in minor positive effects where the preferred option delivers significant positive effects in relation to SA objectives 2, 11 and 12. In addition, since the affordability of housing in rural areas of the District is already an issue, the potential negative effects of this energy efficiency requirement on for SA objective 2: Housing are judged to be significant.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 76: Renewable Energy Schemes

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 8.57 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but with a statement that the benefits of low carbon energy generating potential should be taken into consideration.						
A: Renewable energy proposals will be encouraged where they do not result in harmful environmental, highways, defence and heritage impacts. The Council will consider the energy generating potential of the scheme. Solar farm proposals should include a sequential assessment which considers using brownfield and lower quality agricultural land and should show how it allows for agricultural use and bio diversity. A planning condition requiring remediation may be applied. Proposals for wind turbines are only acceptable if included in a Neighbourhood plan and if accompanied by a consultation exercise showing that planning impacts have been addressed and therefore has community backing. (preferred)						
B: This policy might be split into several policies covering specific technologies e.g. solar power, wind turbines, ground and water source heat pumps etc. Geographical areas could be designated as being more suitable for specific forms of renewable energy generation and where permissions might be more likely to be successful.						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	++	++	++			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	++	++	++			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++	++			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 8.58 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), but with a statement that the benefits of low carbon energy generating potential should be taken into consideration. The assessment for Option A below still applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 8.59 Policy 50 is expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation. This policy is directly related to this objective as it would result in increased renewable generation of power which in turn would reduce greenhouse gases associated with a reliance on fossil fuels.
- 8.60 The policy also states that proposals for renewable energy schemes will be encouraged where they do not result in serious harm landscape character and nature conservation. As such, significant positive effects are expected for SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity and SA objective 15: Landscapes and townscapes.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 8.61 Policy options B would provide more detail as the policy would be split into the specific technologies. Geographical areas that would be more suitable for renewable developments could also be designated. This policy provides more certainty regarding the development of renewable energy schemes, and is therefore not judged to alter the sustainability performance of the policy options relative to the preferred policy.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 77: Renewable energy within new developments

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 8.62 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Pre -Submission: The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A: Major applications shall include renewable energy technology to provide at least 20% of the projected energy requirements of the development and 10% for minor development, unless viability evidence demonstrates otherwise. A financial contribution (for use in renewable seedcorn community renewable projects) can be considered instead. (preferred)						
B: Exclusion of the percentage figures as a target.						
C: One or a number of exception sites outside of a settlement boundary for development meeting strictly the criteria of a specified and nationally recognised energy efficient standard.						
D: The Council has not identified areas as suitable for wind energy development in the Draft Local Plan however areas could be identified in Neighbourhood Plans made during the plan period.						
SA Objective	Pre-Sub.	A	B	C	D	
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0	0	
SA2: Housing	0	0	0	0	0	
SA3: Health	0	0	0	0	0	
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0	0	
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0	0	
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0	0	
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0	0	0	
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0	0	
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0	0	0	
SA11: Climate change mitigation	++	++	++?	+	0	
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0	0	
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0	0	0	
SA14: Air quality	++	++	++?	+	0	
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0	0	0	
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0	0	

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 8.63 The Publication approach is the same as Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan) therefore the assessment for Option A below still applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 8.64 The preferred policy seeks to encourage the deployment of renewable energy and low carbon schemes where they would not threaten financial viability, or a contribution to other community renewable projects in lieu of this. This policy is directly related to SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 14: Air quality as it would result in increased renewable generation of power which in turn would reduce greenhouse gases associated with a reliance on fossil fuels. A significant positive effect is therefore likely for these objectives.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 8.65 Policy option B would still seek to encourage the deployment of renewable energy and low carbon schemes. However without a target figure the policy might fail to fully meet its potential to deploy such schemes and so a significant positive uncertain effect is expected.
- 8.66 Policy option C is somewhat unclear but appears to apply higher energy efficiency standards to rural exception sites. It is judged that this would have only minor positive effects on SA objective 11: Climate change mitigation and SA objective 14: Air quality since it would only apply to a small proportion of new housing. It is assumed that the financial viability test of the preferred policy would also be included in this option so potential negative effects on SA objective 2: Housing are avoided.
- 8.67 Policy option D appears to repeat the section of Policy LPP 76 Renewable Energy Schemes which states that areas suitable for wind energy development could be identified in Neighbourhood Plans made during the plan period. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because it would repeat another Draft Local Plan policy.

DRAFT

Flood risk and surface water drainage

- 8.68 The section of the Draft Local Plan sets out policies in relation to the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP), Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), and run-off rates.

Policy 78: Flooding Risk and Surface Water Drainage

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 8.69 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Development should take place in areas at lowest risk of flooding and any development elsewhere must detailed criteria for developments in Flood Zones 2 and 3.						
A: More high level general wording which refers to national policy could be adopted to slim down the policies. Policies for run off rates, EA licences and fluvial flood risk would be as in the NPPF/NPPG and other material considerations.						
B: Developments on previously developed land of more than one dwelling or commercial building or development of a site greater than 0.1 hectare are required to reduce post development run off rates for events up to and including the 1 in 100 year return period event, with an allowance for climate change, to that of a greenfield condition. A minimum requirement is for a 50% betterment. Calculations to demonstrate that such requirements can be met should be submitted to the Local Planning Authority as part of a planning application.						
C: Strengthen the policy by adding specific policy requirements for all sites within CDAs.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C		
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0		
SA2: Housing	0	0	0	0		
SA3: Health	+	0	0	+		
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0		
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0		
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	+	0	0	+		
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0		
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0	0		
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0		
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0	0		
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0		
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0	0		
SA13: Flood risk	++	++	++	++		
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0	0		
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0	0		
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0		

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 8.70 As well as preventing development at risk of adverse effects of flooding, this policy aims to ensure the safety of people in development in areas at risk of flooding, such as provision of safe access and egress, resulting in positive effects on SA objective 3: health.
- 8.71 The policy states that development should explore opportunities for riverside restoration, which could lead to biodiversity enhancements. In addition, there is potential for new flood management measures, such as attenuation ponds, to contribute to local biodiversity. This may result in positive effects on SA objective 6: biodiversity and geodiversity, although this remains uncertain as it depends on the location and design of development.
- 8.72 This policy will have significant positive effects on SA objective 13: flood risk, as the policy is intended to reduce development at risk of flooding, by locating development away from areas of high flood risk and requiring management and mitigation of flooding.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 8.73 Option A would focus solely on reducing susceptibility of development to flood risk, therefore this option is likely to have a significant positive effect on SA objective 13: Flood risk only.
- 8.74 Option B requires development on previously developed land of more than one dwelling or commercial building or development of a site greater than 0.1 hectares to reduce post development run off rates with an allowance for climate change; the minimum requirement is for a 50% betterment. This would avoid increases in flood risk on development sites and may lower overall flood risk, therefore a significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 13: Flood risk.
- 8.75 Option C would strengthen the policy by adding specific policy requirements for all sites within CDAs. This would improve the safety of people within CDAs through the provision of safe access and egress. In addition, there is potential for new flood management measures to contribute to local biodiversity. This may result in positive effects on SA objective 6: biodiversity and geodiversity, although this remains uncertain. Option C would have positive effects on SA objective 13: flood risk due to the fact that all sites within CDAs will be required to implement specific measures in order to reduce flood risk.

Policy LPP 79: Surface Water Management Plan

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 8.76 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan).						
A: Development will comply with the aims and objectives of the Surface Water Management Plan. (preferred)						
B: Omission of the policy pending publication of the SWMP and its adoption as a material consideration. (The Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) is being prepared by the LLFA. Although not completed it is expected to be completed by this plan's Examination in Public.)						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0			
SA2: Housing	+	+	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	+	+	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	++	++	0			
SA13: Flood risk	++	++	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 8.77 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 8.78 A significant positive effect is expected for SA objective 12: Water environment and SA: Objective 13: Flood Risk as this policy ensures that development will comply with the aims and objectives of the Surface Water Management Plan. A Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) outlines the predicted risk and preferred surface water management strategy for a given area.

The SWMP will help ensure that new development within Braintree District does not increase the number of people or properties at risk of flooding and does not result in increased flood risk elsewhere. It is also likely to result in improved water efficiency and sustainable water resource management on the whole across the District. It is also likely to reduce water pollution from flooding events.

- 8.79 Minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 2: Housing because the SWMP will help to ensure that new development does not increase the number of properties at risk of flooding, providing a greater opportunity for everyone to live in a decent home.
- 8.80 The policy seeks to reduce the risk of flooding which can also have benefits to the natural environment in terms of reduced habitat fragmentation/erosion for example. Therefore a minor positive is also expected for SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 8.81 Policy option B is to have no policy and rely on the adoption of the Surface Water Management Plan being adopted as a material consideration. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

DRAFT

Policy LPP 80: Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

- 8.82 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with additional wording supporting dual use of land for SUDS and open space.						
A. Require SUDS in developments of 10 dwellings or more and major commercial development; planning applications to provide details on proposed SUDS and their on-going and maintenance; cross reference to relevant standards. (preferred)						
B: The level of detail the Local Planning Authority requires before the application is determined could be set out in a more detailed and prescriptive manner.						
C: The maintenance and funding of SUDs could be set out in a more prescriptive manner.						
D: SUDs measures might be explicitly excluded from counting as "Open Space" for the purposes of calculating spaces requirements if they are not fit for that purpose e.g. swales and ponds might be dangerous for small children.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B	C	D	
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	0	0	0	0	0	
SA2: Housing	+	+	+	+	+	
SA3: Health	+	0	0	0	0	
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0	0	0	
SA5: Economy	0	0	0	0	0	
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	+	+	+	+	+	
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0	0	0	
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0	0	0	
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0	0	0	
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0	0	0	
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0	0	0	
SA12: Water environment	+	+	+	+	+	
SA13: Flood risk	++	++	++	++	++	
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0	0	0	
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0	0	0	0	0	
SA16: Soil	0	0	0	0	0	

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 8.83 The Publication approach is similar to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies, with the following exception. The Publication approach supports the dual use of land for SUDs and for open space, where neither

use is compromised by the other. This is expected to have positive implications for SA Objective 3: health, as it could lead to the provision of new recreational space.

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 8.84 Policy 53 is expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to SA objective 13: Flood risk by requiring the inclusion of SUDS in all major residential and commercial development unless the developer provides compelling evidence that is not suitable or viable. This should attenuate surface run-off during extreme rainfall events and help to ensure that a natural run-off profile is achieved, avoiding increased flood risk on-site and downstream of the development.
- 8.85 Minor positive effects are expected in relation to SA objective 2: Housing because the requirement for SUDS will help to ensure that new development is adapted to a changing climate, high intensity rainfall events being more likely in the future under climate change.
- 8.86 Minor positive effects are also expected in relation to SA objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity and SA objective 12: Water environment because naturalistic SUDS systems such as reed beds can provide new habitats and can improve water quality by filtering out contaminants. These benefits are uncertain as they will only arise for certain types of SUDS solution which are unlikely to be suitable for all scales of development or all site conditions.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 8.87 Policy options B and C would provide more detail within the policy on the information required in planning applications about proposed SUDS and about management and maintenance arrangements respectively. Whilst these could provide the developer with more certainty, this type of detailed information can readily be provided in separate guidance or during pre-application discussions; its inclusion within policy could be inflexible, stifling design innovation and could quickly become out of date. None of these considerations is judged to alter the sustainability performance of the policy options relative to the preferred policy.
- 8.88 Policy option D would set out how different types of SUDS would count towards open space requirements in development. Open space requirements are more appropriately dealt with in a separate policy or supporting guidance and in any event, such a change to the policy would not alter the sustainability performance of the policy option relative to the preferred policy.

External lighting

8.89 The section of the Draft Local Plan sets out policies in relation to external lighting.

Policy LPP 81: External Lighting

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

8.90 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant. The preferred option from the Draft Local Plan is Option A below.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), with additional wording supporting use of open space for SUDS.						
A: Proposals for external lighting will be permitted subject to design criteria to minimise its impact on its neighbours and one the environment. If approved hours of operation may be limited. (preferred)						
B: Lighting is now classed as a form of pollution and its use has consequences for energy use and impacts on wildlife, amenity and character. The impacts of lighting could be considered with design and pollution policies.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP	A	B			
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	++	++	0			
SA2: Housing	0	0	0			
SA3: Health	0	0	0			
SA4: Service centre vitality	0	0	0			
SA5: Economy	0	0	0			
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	+	+	0			
SA7: Sustainable travel	0	0	0			
SA8: Accessibility	0	0	0			
SA9: Education and skills	0	0	0			
SA10: Historic environment	0	0	0			
SA11: Climate change mitigation	0	0	0			
SA12: Water environment	0	0	0			
SA13: Flood risk	0	0	0			
SA14: Air quality	0	0	0			
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	++	++	0			
SA16: Soil	0	0	0			

SA findings for the Publication approach

8.91 The Publication approach is not significantly different to Option A (the preferred option from the Draft Local Plan), therefore the assessment for Option A below applies

SA findings for the preferred approach (Option A)

- 8.92 Policy 55 will have a significant positive effect for SA objective 1: Community safety and cohesion as it will seek to increase the safety and security of new development. The policy will help limit pollution and help conserve or enhance dark skies by incorporating strict design criteria. Therefore a significant positive effect is expected in relation to SA Objective 15: Townscapes and landscapes.
- 8.93 A minor positive effect is also expected for SA Objective 6: Biodiversity and geodiversity as the policy may limit the hours of use which may minimise the impacts on wildlife.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 8.94 Policy option B is to have no policy and rely on design and pollution policies. This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Draft Local Plan relative to a 'do-nothing' scenario.

DRAFT

9 Delivery and Implementation

9.1 This section of the Plan sets out policies for ensuring delivery and implementation of the plan.

Implementation and Monitoring

9.2 This part of the plan concerns monitoring of the plan to ensure that it is effective and delivering the intended outcomes.

Policy LPP 82: Infrastructure delivery and impact mitigation policy

Policy approaches considered and summary of sustainability effects

9.3 The policy approaches considered by the Council and a summary of their likely sustainability effects are shown in the matrix below. The effects are then described in the following text, focussing on those effects which are likely to be significant.

Summary of policy options:						
Publication: Permission will only be granted if it can be demonstrated that there is sufficient appropriate infrastructure capacity to support the development or that such capacity will be delivered by the proposal and that this is sustainable over time. The cumulative impacts of development must be considered and mitigated.						
As this policy was not included in the Draft Local Plan and has been added to the Publication version of the plan, the policy was not previously assessed.						
SA Objective	Pub. LP					
SA1: Community safety & cohesion	+					
SA2: Housing	0					
SA3: Health	+					
SA4: Service centre vitality	0					
SA5: Economy	0					
SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	+					
SA7: Sustainable travel	+					
SA8: Accessibility	++					
SA9: Education and skills	+					
SA10: Historic environment	0					
SA11: Climate change mitigation	+					
SA12: Water environment	0					
SA13: Flood risk	0					
SA14: Air quality	0					
SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	0					
SA16: Soil	0					

SA findings for the Publication approach

- 9.4 This policy ensures that there will be sufficient infrastructure availability and capacity to serve new development and that this is sustainable over time. This is expected to ensure that key infrastructure and services are available and accessible to residents and workers, leading to significant positive effects on SA objective 8: accessibility.
- 9.5 The policy states that 'the widest definition of infrastructure and infrastructure providers will be applied'. This is expected to include healthcare infrastructure, such as GP surgeries, open space and recreation, community facilities, transport, including sustainable transport, and educational facilities, leading to positive effects with regards to SA objectives 3: health and 9: education and skills. This could also refer to green infrastructure, which has many benefits including positive effects on health and wellbeing, biodiversity benefits and climate change mitigation benefits, leading to positive effects on SA objectives 3: health, 6: biodiversity and geodiversity and 11: climate change mitigation.

SA findings for the reasonable alternatives considered

- 9.6 No alternatives were considered by the Council.

DRAFT

10 Summary of SA findings for the site allocations and reasonable alternatives

- 10.1 This chapter presents a summary of the assessment findings for site allocations included in the Draft Local Plan, including reasonable alternatives, and those allocated in the Publication Draft Local Plan.

SA findings for the Draft Local Plan site options

Screening of site options

- 10.2 As described in the methodology chapter, an initial, high level assessment was carried out to determine whether site allocation options being considered by the Draft Local Plan were individually capable of having significant effects. All sites exceeding certain criteria and thresholds were deemed to have the potential for significant effects and were flagged for detailed assessment.
- 10.3 The screening exercise identified that of the 272 sites being considered by the Council as site allocation options, 152 had the potential to individually have a significant effect. Of these 152 site allocation options, 75 were assessed in relation to their potential effects on all SA objectives relevant to the proposed use because they either had an area of more than five hectares or a development capacity of more than 150 dwellings; these sites are listed in Table 10.1. The remaining 77 site allocation options were judged to have the potential for significant effects in relation to a limited number of SA objectives because they were situated within a sensitive area; these sites are listed in Table 10.2. The remaining 120 site options were screened out from requiring SA because they did not have an area of more than five hectares, did not have a development capacity of more than 150 dwellings and did not fall within a sensitive area. Any of these sites that were selected by the Council as preferred and which are allocated in the Draft Local Plan were assessed against all SA objectives, as described in the Methodology chapter.
- 10.4 The results of the screening of site allocations options for their potential to have significant effects are set out in **Error! Reference source not found.**

SA findings for screened-in site allocation options

- 10.5 A set of assumptions was devised for determining the significance of effects in relation to each SA objective to ensure that assessments were consistent and the reasons for judgements were transparent. These assumptions are presented in **Error! Reference source not found.**¹⁸. It should be noted that a number of the assessment criteria were not relevant to site options which would not include residential development; these are designated as 'non-housing' sites in Table 10.1 and Table 10.2. These tables also state the Council's estimate of the dwelling capacity of each site which, as described in the Methodology chapter, determined the assumptions made about bus services, schools and community facilities that will be required as part of any development.
- 10.6 The likely effects of each site allocation option that had an area of more than five hectares or with capacity for more than 150 dwellings are summarised in Table 10.1 in relation to each relevant SA objective. The likely effects of site allocation options which did not meet these criteria but which are situated within a sensitive area are summarised in relation to the relevant SA objectives. A detailed appraisal form for each site option is included in **Error! Reference source not found.**

¹⁸ Note that the assumptions presented in Appendix 4 have been updated since the assessment of the Draft Local Plan and reasonable alternatives, as explained in paragraph 2.35.

or Appendix 7. Appendix 6 presents detailed appraisal forms for site options that are not allocated in the Publication Draft Local Plan and Appendix 7 presents detailed appraisal forms for site options that are allocated in the Publication Draft Local Plan. Only one site appraisal form is included per site to show the most up to date site assessment, despite the fact that the same site may have been considered at different stages of the appraisal process.

- 10.7 The narrative below summarises the main types of effects identified, with particular consideration given to those effects which are likely to be significant, in line with the SEA Regulations.
- 10.8 Development at any of the site allocation options shown in Table 10.1 would give rise to a mixture of positive and negative effects in relation to the SA objectives. Significant positive effects (++ or ++?) were identified in relation to six SA objectives:
- SA2: Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home.
 - SA3: Improve the health of the District's residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities.
 - SA5: Achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth.
 - SA7: Promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake.
 - SA8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development.
 - SA9: Improve the education and skills of the population.
- 10.9 Significant negative effects (-- or --?) were identified in relation to seven SA objectives:
- SA5: Achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth.
 - SA6: Conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment.
 - SA8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development.
 - SA13: Reduce the risk of flooding.
 - SA14: Improve air quality.
 - SA15: Maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes.
 - SA16: Safeguard and enhance the quality of soil.
- 10.10 Uncertain effects were identified for a large proportion of site options in relation to two SA objectives:
- SA10: Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.
 - SA12: Improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity.
- 10.11 The smaller site allocation options within sensitive areas shown in Table 10.2 would generally give rise to negative or uncertain effects in relation to the limited range of SA objectives against which they were assessed. However, potential significant positive effects (++ or ++?) were identified in relation to two SA objectives:
- SA2: Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home.
 - SA5: Achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth.
- 10.12 Significant negative effects (-- or --?) were identified in relation to four SA objectives:
- SA6: Conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment.
 - SA10: Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.
 - SA13: Reduce the risk of flooding.
 - SA15: Maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes.
- 10.13 All of these effects are discussed further below.

Table 10.1 Summary of SA findings for the site allocation options > 5 hectares or with capacity for > 150 homes

Site ID	Area (Ha)	No. of Dwellings	Assess site?	Q1a Community facilities	Q1c AD and Waste sites	Q2a Affordable housing	Q3a Primary healthcare	Q3c ANG	Q3e Open space	Q4a Retail provision	Q4c Shops & services	Q5a Mineral reserves	Q5c Employment areas	Q5e Broadband availability	Q6a Designated wildlife	Q7a Public transport	Q8a Service centres	Q8c Public transport	Q8e Highway access	Q9a Primary schools	Q9c Secondary schools	Q10a Historic environment	Q11a Climate change	Q12a Groundwater SPZ	Q12c Sewage capacity	Q13a Flood risk	Q14a Air quality	Q15a Landscape sensitivity	Q15c AONB extension	Q15e Greenfield / brownfield	Q15g VIS	Q15i Country parks	Q16a Agricultural land	Q16c Contaminated land
BLAN 113	8.31	0 Non-housing		0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	0	n/a	0	n/a	++	-	+	-	++	+	n/a	n/a	?	X	0	n/a	0	n/a	?	0	?	0	0	-	0
BLAN 119	6.01	45 Full		0	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	-	+	-	+	0	++	+	-	++	?	X	0	?	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
BLAN 501	5.05	60 Full		0	0	++	-	-?	+	?	+	0	-	++	-	+	0	++	+	-	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	0	0	-	0
BOCN 126	27	638 Full		?	0	++	-	-?	?	0	-?	0	+	+	-	+	++	++	?	++	+	?	X	-	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
BOCN 132	65.9	1000 Full		+	0	++	-	-?	?	0	-?	-	-	++	-	++	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	-
BOCN 133	9.47	240 Full		0	-	++	-	-?	+	+	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	+	+	++	?	X	-	?	-	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
BOCN 137	43.1	1150 Full		+	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	++	-	++	+	++	++	?	X	-	?	0	0	-	0	?	0	0	-	0
BOCS 138	8.38	0 Non-housing		0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	0	n/a	0	n/a	++	-	+	++	++	?	n/a	n/a	?	X	0	n/a	0	n/a	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
BOCS 140	11.5	264 Full		0	0	++	+	-?	+	0	-?	0	+	++	-	+	++	+	?	+	++	?	X	0	?	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
BRAD 142	7.48	20 Full		0	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	-	++	-?	+	0	+	?	-	-	?	X	0	?	-	-?	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
BRAD 503	12.1	100 Full		0	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	0	+	?	-	+	?	X	0	?	0	-?	-	0	-	0	0	-	?
BRAW 154	11.3	1500 Full		+	0	++	+	-?	++	+	-?	0	+	++	-?	++	++	++	?	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
BURE 165	5.34	85 Full		0	0	++	+	-?	++	0	-?	0	-?	++	-	+	+	++	?	-	-?	?	X	-	?	-	0	-	-?	-	0	0	-	0
CASH 505	8.76	60 Full		-	0	++	+	-?	++	+	+	0	?	++	0	+	0	++	+	++	++	-	X	-	?	-	0	-	0	+	0	0	-	?
COGG 177	19.3	500 Full		0	0	++	+	-?	+	0	+	0	+	0	-?	+	+	++	-	-	++	?	X	0	?	-	-?	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
COGG 180	25.9	135 Full		0	0	++	+	-?	+	0	+	0	+	0	-	+	+	++	+	-	++	?	X	0	?	0	-?	+	0	-	0	0	-	?
COGG 181	20.6	440 Full		0	0	++	+	-?	+	+	+	0	+	0	-	+	+	++	-	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	-?	?	0	-	0	0	-	0
COGG 182	17.2	500 Full		+	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	+	0	-	+	+	++	?	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	-?	?	0	-	0	0	-	0
COGG 183	13.7	500 Full		+	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	+	0	-	+	+	++	+	+	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
COLE 188	11.4	0 Non-housing		0	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	0	n/a	0	n/a	++	-	+	++	++	+	n/a	n/a	?	X	?	n/a	0	n/a	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
CRESS 191	14.7	250 Full		0	-	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	+	++	?	+	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
CRESS 193	13.6	300 Full		0	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	+	++	+	++	+	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
CRESS 204	29	1725 Full		+	0	++	-	-?	+	+	-?	0	+	++	-	++	++	++	-	++	++	?	X	0	?	-	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
CRESS 205	34.1	1725 Full		+	-	++	-	-?	+	+	+	0	+	++	-	++	+	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
CRESS 211	13.4	700 Full		+	0	++	-	-?	+	+	+	0	-	++	-	++	+	+	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
CRESS 212	184	14500 Full		+	-	++	-	-?	+	+	-?	0	+	++	-?	++	++	++	?	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	?
CRESS 508	24.8	600 Full		0	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	0	-	+	+	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
FEER 231	463	6000 Full		+	0	++	-	-?	+	+	+	0	+	++	-	++	?	++	+	++	++	-	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
FEER 232	17.3	880 Full		+	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	-?	++	-	++	+	++	+	++	?	?	X	0	?	0	-?	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
FEER 233	57.5	950 Full		+	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	++	+	++	+	++	?	?	X	0	?	-	-?	-	0	-	0	0	-	?
GGHR 283	11.2	75 Full		0	0	++	+	-?	+	0	-?	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	?	+	++	+	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	?
GGHR 284	10.7	274 Full		+	0	++	+	-?	?	+	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	+	+	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
GGHR 430	10.1	262 Full		+	0	++	-	-?	?	+	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	-	-	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	0
GOSF 249	21.4	2 Full		0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	0	n/a	0	n/a	++	-	-	-	-	+	n/a	n/a	?	X	0	n/a	0	n/a	-	0	?	0	0	-	?
GRBA 255	5.44	145 Full		+	0	++	+	-?	+	-	-?	0	-	++	-	+	+	-	?	+	-?	?	X	?	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
GRNO 260	39.6	500 Full		0	0	++	+	0?	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	+	+	?	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
Group A	120	2210 Full		+	0	++	+	-?	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	++	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
Group D	36.9	1920 Full		0	0	++	+	0?	+	0	-?	0	+	++	-?	++	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	-	-?	+	0	+	0	0	-	0
Group E	63.1	2118 Full		+	-	++	-	-?	+	+	+	0	-	++	-	++	+	+	?	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	?
Group F	6.29	163 Full		0	0	++	+	-?	+	0	+	0	+	++	-?	+	+	++	+	++	?	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
Group G	3.32	154 Full		0	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	+	++	+	++	+	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0

Site ID	Area (Ha)	No. of Dwellings	Assess site?	Q1a Community facilities	Q1c AD and Waste sites	Q2a Affordable housing	Q3a Primary healthcare	Q3c ANG	Q3e Open space	Q4a Retail provision	Q4c Shops & services	Q5a Mineral reserves	Q5c Employment areas	Q5e Broadband availability	Q6a Designated wildlife	Q7a Public transport	Q8a Service centres	Q8c Public transport	Q8e Highway access	Q9a Primary schools	Q9c Secondary schools	Q10a Historic environment	Q11a Climate change	Q12a Groundwater SPZ	Q12c Sewage capacity	Q13a Flood risk	Q14a Air quality	Q15a Landscape sensitivity	Q15c AONB extension	Q15e Greenfield / brownfield	Q15g VIS	Q15i Country parks	Q16a Agricultural land	Q16c Contaminated land
Group H	7.08	180	Full	0	0	++	+	-?	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	+	++	?	+	++	0	X	0	?	0	--?	?	0	-	0	0	--	0
Group I	73.4	635	Full	+	-	++	+	-?	-	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	+	++	?	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	?	0	-	0	0	--	0
GRSA 269	909	7500	Full	+	0	++	-	-?	?	0	+	0	-?	++	--?	++	--	++	?	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	?	0	0	--	?
GRSA 270	127	1500	Full	+	0	++	-	-?	?	+	+	0	-?	++	--?	++	--	++	?	++	-?	?	X	0	?	-	0	-	0	?	0	0	--	0
GRYE 277	5.79	100	Full	0	0	++	+	-?	+	0	+	0	+	0	-	+	+	++	+	+	+	?	X	0	?	0	0	--	0	-	0	0	--	0
HASA 288	16.1	0	Non-housing	0	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a	++	-	+	++	++	?	n/a	n/a	?	X	0	n/a	0	n/a	+	0	-	0	0	--	?
HASA 290	6.86	175	Full	0	0	++	+	-?	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	-	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
HASA 291	16.2	418	Full	0	-	++	-	-?	+	0	-?	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	?	+	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
HASA 293	10.5	255	Full	0	0	++	+	-?	++	0	+	0	+	++	--?	+	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	?
HATF 314	10.4	45	Full	+	0	++	+	-?	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	+	++	+	+	++	-	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	--	0
HATF 315	16	432	Full	0	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	++	++	+	-	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	--	0
HATR 302	5.88	117	Full	0	0	++	+	-?	+	0	+	0	+	++	--?	+	++	++	?	++	++	-	X	?	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
KELV 333	61.1	1496	Full	+	0	++	+	-?	+	+	+	0	+	++	-	++	+	++	?	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	--	0
KELV 335	10.1	243	Full	+	0	++	+	-?	+	+	+	0	+	++	-	+	+	++	?	+	++	-	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	--	0
KELV 337	23	269	Full	+	0	++	+	-?	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	+	++	+	+	++	-	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	--	0
PANF 136	7.86	0	Non-housing	0	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	0	n/a	0	n/a	++	-	-	++	-	-	n/a	n/a	?	X	0	n/a	0	n/a	+	0	-	0	0	--	0
PANF 345	8.8	220	Full	0	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	0	++	+	-	+	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	--	0
PANF 519	5.65	141	Full	0	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	--	++	-	-	+	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	--	0
RAYN 355	8.07	45	Full	0	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	+	++	-	+	++	0	X	0	?	0	--?	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
RIVE 363	6.85	0	Non-housing	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	0	n/a	0	n/a	++	0	-	++	-	-	n/a	n/a	0	X	0	n/a	0	n/a	-	0	+	0	0	--	0
RIVE 364	6.03	0	Non-housing	?	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	0	n/a	0	n/a	++	0	+	--	++	+	n/a	n/a	?	X	0	n/a	0	n/a	--	0	+	0	0	--	0
RIVE 365	15.8	0	Non-housing	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	0	n/a	0	n/a	++	-	+	0	++	-	n/a	n/a	?	X	0	n/a	0	n/a	+	0	-	0	0	--	0
RIVE 366a	20.3	325	Full	?	0	++	-	-?	?	0	-?	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	?	+	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	--	0
RIVE 367	12.7	318	Full	+	0	++	-	-?	+	+	+	0	-	++	-	+	+	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	-	0	--	0	-	0	0	--	0
RIVE 368	7.74	193	Full	+	0	++	-	-?	?	+	+	0	-	++	-	+	0	++	?	-	++	?	X	0	?	-	0	--	0	-	0	0	--	?
RIVE 369	24.9	623	Full	+	0	++	-	-?	+	+	+	0	-?	++	-	+	0	++	?	-	++	?	X	0	?	0	--?	--	0	-	0	0	--	0
RIVE 370	7.44	185	Full	+	0	++	-	-?	+	+	+	0	-?	++	-	+	0	++	?	-	++	?	X	0	?	0	--?	--	0	-	0	0	--	0
SHAL 371	10.8	268	Full	0	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	-	++	--?	+	+	-	+	++	-	?	X	0	?	0	0	--	0	-	0	0	-	?
SILV 384	5.06	125	Full	0	0	++	+	-?	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	+	++	-	++	+	-	X	0	?	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	--	0
SILV 390	8.35	191	Full	0	0	++	+	-?	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	+	++	+	-	+	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	--	0
STIS 396	5.68	142	Full	0	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	--	+	?	-	+	?	X	0	?	0	--?	+	0	+	0	0	--	?
STIS 397	7.06	172	Full	0	0	++	-	-?	+	0	+	0	-	++	--?	+	--	++	+	+	++	0	X	0	?	0	--?	+	0	-	0	0	--	0
WITN 426	6.48	130	Full	0	0	++	-	-?	+	0	-?	0	-	++	-	+	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	--	0
WITN 428	60.2	1500	Full	+	0	++	-	-?	+	0	-?	0	-	++	-	++	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	--	0

Table 10.2 Summary of SA findings for the site allocation options within sensitive areas but <= 5 hectares and with capacity for <= 150 homes

Site ID	Area (Ha)	No. of Dwellings	Assess site?	Q1a Community facilities	Q1c AD and Waste sites	Q2a Affordable housing	Q3a Primary healthcare	Q3c ANG	Q3e Open space	Q4a Retail provision	Q4c Shops & services	Q5a Mineral reserves	Q5c Employment areas	Q5e Broadband availability	Q6a Designated wildlife	Q7a Public transport	Q8a Service centres	Q8c Public transport	Q8e Highway access	Q9a Primary schools	Q9c Secondary schools	Q10a Historic environment	Q11a Climate change	Q12a Groundwater SPZ	Q12c Sewage capacity	Q13a Flood risk	Q14a Air quality	Q15a Landscape sensitivity	Q15c AONB extension	Q15e Greenfield / brownfield	Q15g VIS	Q15i Country parks	Q16a Agricultural land	Q16c Contaminated land				
BCBG 151	1.05	25	Part	0	0	++	+	-?	+	n/a	n/a	0	+	++	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
BELO 107	0.27	1	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
BELP 108	2.53	50	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
BOCN 125	1.7	30	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
BOCN 128	0.97	1	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
BOCN 135	1.46	40	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
BOCN 502	0.66	6	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
BORL 403	2.57	50	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
BRSO 152	0.75	100	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
BULM 155	1.17	29	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
BULM 160	1.63	32	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	--?	-	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a			
BULM 504	0.88	10	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
BURE 166	1.18	25	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	--?	-	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a			
BURE 526	0.27	3	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	--?	?	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a			
COGG 172	0.84	15	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
COGG 173	0.82	30	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
COGG 174	1.23	12	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
COGG 175	4.78	127	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
COGG 506	3.39	10	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
CRESS 190	0.46	10	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
CRESS 194	0.47	8	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
CRESS 196	0.98	2	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
EARC 216	0.96	12	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
EARC 217	1.04	38	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
EARC 218	3.17	60	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
EARC 220	0.3	5	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
EARC 221	2.27	40	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
EARC 510	0.59	10	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
FINC 235	1.06	20	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
FOX E 236	1.13	28	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
GEST 241	1.49	10	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GGHR 279	1.46	37	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
GGHR 280	2.23	10	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
GGHR 282	4.76	0	Part	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GOSF 217	0.48	12	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
GOSF 244	0.68	10	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GOSF 247	4.34	50	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GOSF 248	0.96	5	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GOSF 251	1	25	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GRBA 254	0.4	17	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Group C	4.8	76	Part	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Site ID	Area (Ha)	No. of Dwellings	Assess site?	Q1a Community facilities	Q1c AD and Waste sites	Q2a Affordable housing	Q3a Primary healthcare	Q3c ANG	Q3e Open space	Q4a Retail provision	Q4c Shops & services	Q5a Mineral reserves	Q5c Employment areas	Q5e Broadband availability	Q6a Designated wildlife	Q7a Public transport	Q8a Service centres	Q8c Public transport	Q8e Highway access	Q9a Primary schools	Q9c Secondary schools	Q10a Historic environment	Q11a Climate change	Q12a Groundwater SPZ	Q12c Sewage capacity	Q13a Flood risk	Q14a Air quality	Q15a Landscape sensitivity	Q15c AONB extension	Q15e Greenfield / brownfield	Q15g VIS	Q15i Country parks	Q16a Agricultural land	Q16c Contaminated land			
GRSA 268	1.52	37	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a			
GRYE 271	0.7	1	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
GRYE 274	2.06	29	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
HASA 287	1.64	50	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
HASA 513	3.22	104	Part	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
HATR 296	2.46	60	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
HATR 298	0.45	12	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
HATR 299	0.81	30	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
HATR 300	1.18	45	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
HATR 301	4.23	90	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		
HATR 305	0.73	16	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
HELI 329	2.13	50	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
KELV 331	0.5	41	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
PEBM 350	0.32	3	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
RIDG 357	2.31	46	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
RIDG 358	1.35	25	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
RIVE 361	3.5	20	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
SIBH 376	0.27	10	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
SIBH 378	2.82	18	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
SIBH 380	1.11	6	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
SIBH 381	1.64	26	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
SIBH 382	0.33	5	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
SILV 388	3.55	80	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
SILV 524	2.39	64	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
STEB 394	0.62	10	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
STEB 395	1.22	25	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
STIS 398	0.64	20	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
STIS 399	0.72	20	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
STIS 400	0.35	10	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
STIS 401	0.86	6	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
WETH 415	1.13	4	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
WETH 417	0.39	6	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
WHIC 419	0.49	10	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
WITC 421	3.06	70	Part	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--?	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
WITC 424	0.79	40	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
WITN 425	0.41	40	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

SA objective 1: Create safe environments which improve quality of life and community cohesion

- 10.14 No significant effects were identified in relation to this SA objective.
- 10.15 A large number of negligible (0) effects was identified for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), where there was no evidence that development would either enhance or lead to loss of community facilities. Minor positive (+) were identified for most of the remaining larger site options the larger site options (>5 ha or > 150 dwelling capacity), indicating that they were suitable for new facilities where none exist currently or would be likely to enhance existing facilities.
- 10.16 None of the smaller site options were found to be within a 'sensitive area' in relation to this SA objective, therefore the potential for significant effects was ruled out and no further assessment was carried out (see Methodology chapter for details).

SA objective 2: To provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home

- 10.17 Mainly significant positive (++) effects were identified in relation to this objective for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that they would deliver at least 15 new dwellings and therefore contribute significantly to the delivery of affordable housing. Minor positive (+) effects were identified for one larger site option and no effect (0) for the remainder.
- 10.18 Only one of the smaller site options within sensitive areas, BCBG 151, was assessed in relation to this SA objective and a significant positive (++) effect was also identified.

SA objective 3: To improve the health of the District's residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities

- 10.19 Mainly minor negative (-) effects were identified in relation to this objective for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity) as they were generally more than 800 m from the nearest NHS GP surgery or hospital. It should be noted, however, that very large sites may offer the potential to incorporate a new GP surgery as part of the development.
- 10.20 Mainly minor negative effects with uncertainty (-?) were identified because most site options fulfilled no more than one of four criteria for accessibility to natural greenspace, the uncertainty reflecting that natural greenspace data were unavailable for neighbouring districts.
- 10.21 Mainly minor positive effects (+) were identified as most site options would not lead to loss of publicly accessible open space; significant positive (++) effects for four site options that would result in provision of new publicly accessible open space.
- 10.22 Only one of the smaller site options within sensitive areas, BCBG 151, was assessed in relation to this SA objective and a mixture of minor positive (+) and minor negative (-?) effects with uncertainty were identified.

SA objective 4: To promote the vitality and viability of all service centres throughout the District

- 10.23 No significant effects were identified in relation to this SA objective.
- 10.24 No effects (0) were identified in relation to this objective for retail provision by the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity) as they generally would lead to no change in provision. Minor positive (+) effects were also identified for a number of site options that are expected to increase retail provision.
- 10.25 Considering proximity to existing shops and services, mainly minor positive (+) effects were identified, reflecting the fact that site options within or directly adjacent the Main Towns (Braintree, Bocking and Great Notley; Witham; Halstead) were generally within 800 m (walking distance) of a primary shopping area or Local Centre with site options elsewhere generally within 8 km (driving distance) of a Local Centre boundary. Minor negative effects with uncertainty (-?) were identified for the remaining larger site options, reflecting longer travel distances to shops

and services, the uncertainty reflecting that shops and services data were unavailable for neighbouring districts.

- 10.26 None of the smaller site options within sensitive areas was assessed in relation to this SA objective.

SA objective 5: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth

- 10.27 For the first criterion assessed under this SA objective, potential sterilisation of mineral reserves, all of the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity) all but one had no effect, reflecting the fact that 25% or less of the site area lay within an area preferred and reserved for mineral extraction. The exception was site BOCN 132, for which a significant negative effect was identified, reflecting the fact that 92% of the site was within a mineral safeguarding area.
- 10.28 The SA also examined the proximity of site options to main employment areas and against this criterion, a mixture of minor positive (+) and minor negative (-) effects was identified.
- 10.29 The third criterion examined was the current or planned availability of a fast broadband internet connection at the site location and for this, significant positive (++) effects were identified for most sites reflecting the fact that a fast (optic fibre) connection was already available or planned by 2019.
- 10.30 Only one of the smaller site options within sensitive areas, BCBG 151, was assessed in relation to this SA objective. The effects identified for this site were no effect (0) on mineral reserves, a minor positive (+) effect for proximity to existing employments areas, and a significant positive (++) effect for broadband availability.

SA objective 6: To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment

- 10.31 Mainly minor negative (-) effects were identified in relation to this objective for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), mainly reflecting the fact that they were greenfield sites where development could lead to the loss or fragmentation of undesignated wildlife habitats. Significant negative effects with uncertainty (--?) were identified for a smaller number of sites, generally because a small (less than 25%) of the site was located within a designated biodiversity site or Ancient Woodland.
- 10.32 A number of the smaller site options were identified as being within a sensitive area in relation to biodiversity. Significant negative (-- or --?) or minor negative effects were identified for most of these sites.

SA objective 7: To promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake

- 10.33 Effects on this SA objective were assessed by considering the proximity of the site to existing public transport facilities and whether the site was large enough to be likely to support provision of a new bus stop. Mainly minor positive (+) effects were identified for the larger site options (>5 ha or > 150 dwelling capacity), generally reflecting the fact that they were within 400 m of an existing bus stop. Significant positive effects were identified for a smaller number of sites, reflecting the fact that these were sites with capacity for at least 700 new dwellings and were therefore assumed to incorporate a new bus stop.
- 10.34 None of the smaller site options within sensitive areas was assessed in relation to this SA objective.

SA objective 8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development

- 10.35 The first criterion assessed under this SA objective was whether the site option was within or directly adjacent to a settlement with a high level of provision of services and facilities. Generally, minor positive (+) or significant positive (++) effects were identified for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting their location at settlements classed as Villages With Services or Main Towns respectively in the settlement hierarchy. Smaller numbers

of allocation options to Other Villages or The Countryside had a negligible (0) effect or a significant negative (--) effect respectively.

- 10.36 The assessment against this SA objective also considered the distance of the site options to public transport services and the regularity of those services. Significant positive (++) effects were identified for most of the larger site options, reflecting the fact that they were within 400 m of a bus stop with a frequent service (either existing stops or the new stops with frequent services assumed for sites with a capacity of at least 3,000 dwellings) or within 800 m of a railway station with a frequent service. Minor positive (+) or minor negative (-) sites were identified for the remaining larger sites.
- 10.37 Finally, the SA considered whether any highway access issues had been identified for the site options; this revealed a mixture of minor positive (+), minor negative (-) and uncertain (?) effects.
- 10.38 None of the smaller site options within sensitive areas was assessed in relation to this SA objective.

SA objective 9: To improve the education and skills of the population

- 10.39 The SA considered the proximity of site options to primary and secondary schools, taking into account the potential for larger housing developments to provide new schools. In relation to access to primary schools, many significant positive (++) effects were identified for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that they either had capacity to develop at least 700 dwellings and were therefore assumed to provide a new primary school, or that they were within 400 m of an existing primary school. Minor positive (+) or minor negative (-) effects were identified for a number of site options that were further away from existing primary schools. A similarly mixed picture existed in terms of access to secondary schools, with scores ranging from significant positive (++) to minor negative (-) although fewer negative scores were identified than for primary schools.
- 10.40 None of the smaller site options within sensitive areas was assessed in relation to this SA objective.

SA objective 10: To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings

- 10.41 No significant effects were identified in relation to this SA objective.
- 10.42 The SA resulted in uncertain effects being identified for the majority of the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that heritage assets exist close to (or in a few cases within) the sites. This was based on GIS mapping which sought to identify designated historic assets up to 1 km distance from the sites subject to SA. However, the Council's site visits did not identify any potential significant effects on the historic environment in relation to these sites, and therefore they were not recorded in the site assessment forms. The Council is of the view that, as the site visits did not reveal significant effects, it is appropriate to carry out detailed assessment of the effects on the historic environment and requirements for mitigation at the planning application stage. No effect was identified for most of the remaining larger site options as there were no historic assets within the vicinity or site visits had been able to rule out such effects. A small number of minor negative (-) effects were also identified. For one larger site option, a minor positive (+) effect was identified, reflecting the potential for enhancement.
- 10.43 A number of the smaller site options were identified as being within a sensitive area in relation to the historic environment. A variety of effects was identified for these, the only significant ones being significant negative (--) effects for two sites: GRBA 254 and PEBM 350. This reflected the likelihood of considerable harm to a designated heritage asset or its setting, where mitigation would be unlikely to be feasible.

SA objective 11: To reduce contributions to climate change

- 10.44 Effects of the Draft Local Plan on this SA objective were judged to be more appropriately assessed on the basis of the features and designs of individual development proposals and the development

management policies that govern these. Site allocation options were not, therefore, assessed against this SA objective.

SA objective 12: To improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity

- 10.45 No significant effects were identified in relation to this SA objective.
- 10.46 The first criterion assessed under this SA objective was whether the site option was within a groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ). Generally, no effects (0) were identified for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that they did not fall within any SPZ or only an insignificant proportion (less than 25%) was within SPZ1, 2 or 3. Minor negative (-) effects were identified for a small number of the larger sites, reflecting the fact that 25% or more of the site was within SPZ1 or 2.
- 10.47 Uncertain effects were identified for all site options in relation to the second criterion, the capacity of sewerage infrastructure to accommodate allocations at different locations. This reflected the fact that the Council had not yet updated its Water Cycle Study.
- 10.48 None of the smaller site options within sensitive areas was assessed in relation to this SA objective.

SA objective 13: To reduce the risk of flooding

- 10.49 Effects on this SA objective were assessed by determining whether the site option was located within an area of high flood risk. No effect (0) was identified for most of the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that less than 5% of the site was within Flood Zone 3 or less than 25% of the site was within Flood Zone 2. Significant negative (--) effects were identified for two of the larger sites, BLAN 119 and CASH 505, reflecting the fact that at least 25% of the site was within Flood Zone 3a or 3b. Minor negative (-) effects were also identified for a number of sites.
- 10.50 A number of the smaller site options were identified as being within a sensitive area in relation to flood risk. Significant negative (--) effects were identified for the majority of these sites.

SA objective 14: To improve air quality

- 10.51 Significant negative effects with uncertainty (--?) were identified in relation to this SA objective for a small number of the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that they were within 200 m of the A12 or A120 but that mitigation might be possible, for example by site layout or screening. No effect (0) was identified for the remainder of the larger sites.
- 10.52 None of the smaller site options within sensitive areas was assessed in relation to this SA objective.

SA objective 15: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes

- 10.53 Effects in relation to this SA objective were assessed via a number of criteria, with results as follows.
- 10.54 Firstly, it was determined whether the site fell within an area with high sensitivity to change, as determined by the Council's Landscape Character Assessment studies. A variety of effects was identified for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), the only significant ones being significant negative effects for a minority of site options where at least 25% of the site fell within a landscape character area with high sensitivity to change.
- 10.55 Secondly, a check was made whether the site was within the proposed extension to Dedham Vale AONB. A significant negative effect with uncertainty (--?) was identified for one of the larger site options, BURE 165, reflecting the fact that at least 25% of the site fell within the proposed extension; no effect (0) was identified for the remainder of the larger sites.

- 10.56 Thirdly, it was determined whether the site was on greenfield or previously developed land and whether the potential existed for remediation of any degraded landscape or derelict buildings. Minor negative (-) effects were identified for most of the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that at least 25% of the site was on greenfield land.
- 10.57 Finally, it was determined whether the site options were located in any locally designated Visually Important Spaces or within a Country Park. No effect (0) was identified for any of the site options, reflecting the fact that no more than 25% of any site was within such areas.
- 10.58 A small number of the smaller site options were identified as being within a sensitive area in relation to landscape. A variety of effects was identified for these, the only significant ones being significant negative effects with uncertainty (-- or --?) for three sites, reflecting the fact that they were located within areas of high landscape sensitivity and within the proposed extension to Dedham Vale AONB.

SA objective 16: To safeguard and enhance the quality of soil

- 10.59 Effects in relation to this SA objective were firstly assessed by considering whether development would lead to loss of good quality agricultural land. Mainly significant negative (--) effects were identified for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that at least 25% of the site was on grade 1 (excellent) or grade 2 (very good) agricultural land.
- 10.60 Secondly, the SA considered the potential for development of site options to remediate known areas of contaminated land. No effect (0) was identified for most site options, reflecting the fact that no known contaminated land was present. Uncertain (?) or minor negative (-) effects were identified for the remainder of larger sites.
- 10.61 None of the smaller site options within sensitive areas was assessed in relation to this SA objective.

SA findings for the preferred site allocations

- 10.62 Subsequent to and informed by the assessment of site allocation options above, the Council selected a number of these options as preferred options to be allocated through the Local Plan. Sites which had already been granted planning permission at the time of the appraisal of preferred sites were not subject to SA as these are now considered to form part of the baseline and the SA could not inform decisions on the allocation of these sites.
- 10.63 Appraisals for preferred site allocations that do not include any residential development are presented in the section of the SA Report that covers the corresponding Draft Local Plan Policy. For example, the SA of strategic employment sites allocated by Policy LPP1 Location of Employment Land (now Policy LPP 2) is presented in the "A Strong Economy" section of Chapter 6. In the first instance, the preferred site allocations were assessed using the same set of assumptions for determining the significance of effects in relation to each SA objective as was used in the assessment of the reasonable alternative sites (see **Error! Reference source not found.**). These scores were then adjusted using professional judgement to reflect any elements of the site-specific allocation policy that were judged to modify the 'raw' effect. It is important to note that the assessment criteria shown in Appendix 4 have since been updated, following development of the Publication Draft version of the Local Plan.
- 10.64 Appraisals for preferred site allocations that include residential development are summarised in this section of the SA Report. As for the non-housing allocations, the preferred housing and mixed use site allocations were assessed in the first instance using the same set of assumptions as was used in the assessment of the reasonable alternative sites (see **Error! Reference source not found.**). The resulting 'raw' scores are summarised in Table 10.3 which also states the Council's estimate of the dwelling capacity of each site which, as described in the Methodology chapter, determined the assumptions made about bus services, schools and community facilities that will be required as part of any development. A detailed appraisal form setting out the justifications for the raw scores for each preferred housing or mixed use site is included in **Error!**

Reference source not found.. Most preferred housing sites are allocated by Policy LPP16 Housing Provision and Delivery (now LPP 17) and nothing within that policy was judged to alter the raw scores arrived at using the site assessment framework. However, for the small proportion of housing sites allocated by a site-specific policy, for example Policy LPP19 Strategic Growth Location – Former Towerlands Park Site (now LPP 20), raw scores arrived at using the site assessment framework were adjusted using professional judgement to reflect the detailed provisions of the site specific policy. In the few instances where such adjustments were made, this is noted in the assessment text for the relevant policy.

- 10.65 The narrative below summarises the main types of effects identified for preferred housing and mixed use sites, with particular consideration given to those effects which are likely to be significant, in line with the SEA Regulations.
- 10.66 Development at any of the preferred housing and mixed site allocations shown in Table 10.3 would give rise to a mixture of positive and negative effects in relation to the SA objectives. Significant positive effects (++ or ++?) were identified in relation to 6 SA objectives:
- SA objective 2: To provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home.
 - SA objective 3: To improve the health of the Districts' residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities.
 - SA objective 5: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth.
 - SA objective 7: To promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake.
 - SA objective 8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development.
 - SA objective 9: To improve the education and skills of the population.
- 10.67 Significant negative effects (-- or --?) were identified in relation to 7 SA objectives:
- SA objective 5: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth.
 - SA objective 6: To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment.
 - SA objective 8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development.
 - SA objective 13: To reduce the risk of flooding.
 - SA objective 14: To improve air quality.
 - SA objective 15: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes.
 - SA objective 16: To safeguard and enhance the quality of soil.
- 10.68 Uncertain effects were identified for a large proportion of site options in relation to 7 SA objectives:
- SA10: Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.
 - SA12: Improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity.
- 10.69 The effects of preferred allocations are discussed further below; an assessment of the cumulative effects of all preferred allocations and preferred policies is provided in Chapter 11.

SA objective 1: Create safe environments which improve quality of life and community cohesion

- 10.70 No significant effects were identified in relation to this SA objective.
- 10.71 A large number of negligible (0) effects was identified, where there was no evidence that development would either enhance or lead to loss of community facilities. Minor positive (+) were identified for most of the remaining sites, indicating that they were suitable for new facilities

where none exist currently or would be likely to enhance existing facilities. Minor negative effects were identified for one preferred site.

SA objective 2: To provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home

- 10.72 Mainly significant positive (++) effects were identified in relation to this objective, reflecting the fact that the preferred sites would deliver at least 15 new dwellings and therefore contribute significantly to the delivery of affordable housing. Minor positive (+) effects or no effect (0) were identified for the remaining preferred sites.

SA objective 3: To improve the health of the District's residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities

- 10.73 Minor positive (+) effects were identified in relation to this objective for more than half of preferred sites, indicating they were within 800 m of the nearest NHS GP surgery or hospital or, in the case of some of the larger sites, contributing to new on-site provision. The remaining sites were scored minor negative (-), reflecting the absence of nearby health facilities.
- 10.74 All but one preferred site scored minor negative effects (-) because they fulfilled no more than one of four criteria for accessibility to natural greenspace.
- 10.75 Mainly minor positive effects (+) were identified as most site options would not lead to loss of publicly accessible open space; insufficient information was available to rule out loss for most of the remaining sites. A significant positive (++) effect was identified for one site that would provide new publicly accessible open space.

SA objective 4: To promote the vitality and viability of all service centres throughout the District

- 10.76 No significant effects were identified in relation to this SA objective.
- 10.77 No effects (0) were identified in relation to retail provision for most sites as they generally would lead to no increase or loss. Minor positive (+) effects were also identified for a number of site options that provide for additional retail use.
- 10.78 Considering proximity to existing shops and services, mainly minor positive (+) effects were identified, reflecting the fact that site options within or directly adjacent the Main Towns (Braintree, Bocking and Great Notley; Witham; Halstead) were generally within 800 m (walking distance) of a primary shopping area or Local Centre with site options elsewhere generally within 8 km (driving distance) of a Local Centre boundary. Minor negative effects with (-) were identified for the remaining sites, reflecting longer travel distances to shops and services.

SA objective 5: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth

- 10.79 For the first criterion assessed under this SA objective, potential sterilisation of mineral reserves, all but one had no effect, reflecting the fact that 25% or less of the site area lay within an area preferred and reserved for mineral extraction. The exception was 'Group J', representing the strategic growth location 'Land East of Broad Road, Braintree', for which a significant negative effect was identified, reflecting the fact that 92% of the location was within a mineral safeguarding area.
- 10.80 The SA also examined the proximity of site options to main employment areas and against this criterion a minor positive (+) was identified for the majority of sites with the remainder scoring minor negative (-).
- 10.81 The third criterion examined was the current or planned availability of a fast broadband internet connection at the site location and for this, significant positive (++) effects were identified for most sites reflecting the fact that a fast (optic fibre) connection was already available or planned by 2019.

SA objective 6: To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment

- 10.82 Mainly minor negative (-) effects were identified in relation to this objective for most sites, mainly reflecting the fact that they were greenfield sites where development could lead to the loss or fragmentation of undesignated wildlife habitats. Significant negative effects with uncertainty (--?) were identified for two sites, COGG 506 and WITC 421, where a very small proportion of the sites are located in Local Wildlife Sites.

SA objective 7: To promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake

- 10.83 Effects on this SA objective were assessed by considering the proximity of the site to existing public transport facilities and whether the site was large enough to be likely to support provision of a new bus stop. Mainly minor positive (+) effects were identified, generally reflecting the fact that they were within 400 m of an existing bus stop. Significant positive effects were identified for three sites, reflecting the fact that these were sites with capacity for at least 700 new dwellings and were therefore assumed to incorporate a new bus stop. A minor negative effect was identified for one site.

SA objective 8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development

- 10.84 The first criterion assessed under this SA objective was whether the site option was within or directly adjacent to a settlement with a high level of provision of services and facilities. Generally, minor positive (+) or significant positive (++) effects were, reflecting the location of sites at settlements classed as Villages With Services or Main Towns respectively in the settlement hierarchy. For sites located in the Countryside had a significant negative (--) effect.
- 10.85 The assessment against this SA objective also considered the distance of the site options to public transport services and the regularity of those services. Significant positive (++) effects were identified for most of the sites, reflecting the fact that they were within 400 m of a bus stop with a frequent service (either existing stops or the new stops with frequent services assumed for sites with a capacity of at least 3,000 dwellings) or within 800 m of a railway station with a frequent service. Minor negative (-) sites were identified for the remaining larger sites.
- 10.86 Finally, the SA considered whether any highway access issues had been identified for the site options; this revealed mostly minor positive (+) effects, reflecting no issues, with minor negative (-) or uncertain (?) effects for the remainder.

SA objective 9: To improve the education and skills of the population

- 10.87 The SA considered the proximity of sites to primary and secondary schools, taking into account the potential for larger housing developments to provide new schools. In relation to access to primary schools, many significant positive (++) effects were identified, reflecting the fact that the sites either had capacity to develop at least 700 dwellings and were therefore assumed to provide a new primary school, or that they were within 400 m of an existing primary school. Minor positive (+) or minor negative (-) effects were identified for a number of site options that were further away from existing primary schools. A mixed picture also existed in terms of access to secondary schools, but with most sites scoring significant positive (++), indicating they lay within 2.4 km of a secondary school.

SA objective 10: To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings

- 10.88 No significant effects were identified in relation to this SA objective.
- 10.89 The SA resulted in uncertain effects being identified for the majority of the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that heritage assets exist close to (or in a few cases within) the sites. This was based on GIS mapping which sought to identify designated historic assets up to 1 km distance from the sites subject to SA. However, the Council's site visits did not identify any potential significant effects on the historic environment in relation to these

sites, and therefore they were not recorded in the site assessment forms. The Council is of the view that, as the site visits did not reveal significant effects, it is appropriate to carry out detailed assessment of the effects on the historic environment and requirements for mitigation at the planning application stage. A minor negative (-) effect was identified for a small proportion of sites where the Council's site visit identified a potential negative effect where mitigation was deemed likely to be feasible. A minor positive (+) effects was also identified for a small number of sites, reflecting the potential for enhancement. No effect was identified for the three sites as there were no historic assets within the vicinity or site visits had been able to rule out such effects.

SA objective 11: To reduce contributions to climate change

- 10.90 Effects of the Draft Local Plan on this SA objective were judged to be more appropriately assessed on the basis of the features and designs of individual development proposals and the development management policies that govern these. Site allocations were not, therefore, assessed against this SA objective, although effects were subsequently identified for a small number of sites in relation to site-specific policy wording.

SA objective 12: To improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity

- 10.91 No significant effects were identified in relation to this SA objective.

The first criterion assessed under this SA objective was whether the site option was within a groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ). Generally, no effects (0) were identified, reflecting the fact that that the site did not fall within any SPZ or only an insignificant proportion (less than 25%) was within SPZ1, 2 or 3. Minor negative (-) effects were identified for a small number of sites, reflecting the fact that 25% or more of the site was within SPZ1 or 2. AN uncertain effect was identified for two sites with 25% or more of their area within SPZ3.

- 10.92 Uncertain effects were identified for all site options in relation to the second criterion, the capacity of sewerage infrastructure to accommodate allocations at different locations. This reflected the fact that the Council had not yet updated its Water Cycle Study.

SA objective 13: To reduce the risk of flooding

- 10.93 Effects on this SA objective were assessed by determining whether the site option was located within an area of high flood risk. No effect (0) was identified for most of the sites, reflecting the fact that less than 5% of the site was within Flood Zone 3 or less than 25% of the site was within Flood Zone 2. Significant negative (--) effects were identified for 'Group O' representing the Comprehensive Redevelopment Area at Factory Lane West, 40% of which is within Flood Zone 3. However, consideration of mitigation provided by site-specific text in policy LPP 23 (now LPP 26) resulted in this score being adjusted to a minor negative effect. Minor negative (-) effects were also identified for a number of sites.

SA objective 14: To improve air quality

- 10.94 Significant negative effects with uncertainty (--?) were identified in relation to this SA objective for a small number of sites, reflecting the fact that they would result in residential development within 200 m of the A12 or A120 but that mitigation might be possible, for example by site layout or screening. No effect (0) was identified for the remainder of sites.

SA objective 15: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes

- 10.95 Effects in relation to this SA objective were assessed via a number of criteria, with results as follows.

- 10.96 Firstly, it was determined whether the site fell within an area with high sensitivity to change, as determined by the Council's Landscape Character Assessment studies. A variety of effects was identified, the only significant ones being significant negative effects for a minority of site sites where at least 25% of the site fell within a landscape character area with high sensitivity to

change. In a number of cases, these effects were mitigated when site-specific policy text was taken into account.

- 10.97 Secondly, a check was made whether the site was within the proposed extension to Dedham Vale AONB. A significant negative effect with uncertainty (--?) was identified for two sites, BURE 165 and BURE 166, reflecting the fact that at least 25% of the site fell within the proposed extension; no effect (0) was identified for the remainder of sites.
- 10.98 Thirdly, it was determined whether the site was on greenfield or previously developed land and whether the potential existed for remediation of any degraded landscape or derelict buildings. Minor negative (-) effects were identified for most of the sites, reflecting the fact that at least 25% of the site was on greenfield land. Minor positive (+) or uncertain (?) effects were identified for the remaining sites.
- 10.99 Finally, it was determined whether the site options were located in any locally designated Visually Important Spaces or within a Country Park. No effect (0) was identified for almost all sites, the only exceptions being WITC 421 for which a minor negative (-) effect related to its overlap with a Visually Important Space.

SA objective 16: To safeguard and enhance the quality of soil

- 10.100 Effects in relation to this SA objective were firstly assessed by considering whether development would lead to loss of good quality agricultural land. Significant negative (--) effects were identified for a number of sites, reflecting the fact that at least 25% of the site was on grade 1 (excellent) or grade 2 (very good) agricultural land. Similar numbers of sites scored minor negative (-) or no effect (0).
- 10.101 Secondly, the SA considered the potential for development of site options to remediate known areas of contaminated land. No effect (0) was identified for most site options, reflecting the fact that no known contaminated land was present. Uncertain (?) effects were identified for the remainder of sites, indicating potential contamination but no information on whether remediation would be a condition of development.

Table 10.3 Summary of SA findings for preferred housing and mixed use site allocations

N.B. Table shows 'raw' scores using assessment criteria in **Error! Reference source not found.**, i.e. prior to any adjustments for effects of any site-specific allocation policy; such adjustments are described in the policy assessments in Chapter 6

Site ID	Area (Ha)	No. of Dwellings	Assess site?	Q1a Community facilities	Q1c AD and Waste sites	Q2a Affordable housing	Q3a Primary healthcare	Q3c ANG	Q3e Open space	Q4a Retail provision	Q4c Shops & services	Q5a Mineral reserves	Q5c Employment areas	Q5e Broadband availability	Q6a Designated wildlife	Q7a Public transport	Q8a Service centres	Q8c Public transport	Q8e Highway access	Q9a Primary schools	Q9c Secondary schools	Q10a Historic environment	Q11a Climate change	Q12a Groundwater SPZ	Q12c Sewage capacity	Q13a Flood risk	Q14a Air quality	Q15a Landscape sensitivity	Q15c AONB extension	Q15e Greenfield / brownfield	Q15g VIS	Q15i Country parks	Q16a Agricultural land	Q16c Contaminated land
BCBG 149	1.89	75	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	-	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	?	+	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
BCBG 150	0.35	10	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	-	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	+	++	++	0	X	0	?	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
BCBG 550	4.36	95	Full	?	0	++	-	-	?	0	-	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	+	+	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
BLAN 115	3.98	97	Full	?	0	++	+	-	?	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	++	-	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	--	0
BOCN 134	2.07	100	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	++	++	?	-	++	?	X	-	?	0	0	?	0	-	0	0	-	0
BOCN 137	31.39	600	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	--	++	+	-	++	?	X	-	?	0	0	-	0	?	0	0	--	0
BOCS 140	11.54	136	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	-	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	?	+	++	?	X	0	?	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
BOS16	0.67	10	Full	?	0	0	+	-	?	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	+	+	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
BRAW 153	2.77	70	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	+	-	0	+	0	0	+	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
BRC34	0.22	10	Full	?	0	0	+	-	?	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	-	-	++	?	X	-	?	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	?
BRC6	0.59	10	Full	?	0	0	+	-	?	0	+	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	++	++	+	X	-	?	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
BRC76	0.11	20	Full	?	0	++	+	-	?	0	+	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	-	++	?	X	-	?	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	?
BRC77	0.08	10	Full	?	0	0	+	-	?	0	+	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	-	++	?	X	-	?	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	?
BRSO 152	0.75	100	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	-	-	++	?	X	-	?	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	?
BURE 165	5.34	85	Full	0	0	++	+	-	++	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	+	++	?	-	-	?	X	-	?	-	0	--	--?	-	0	0	-	0
BURE 166	1.18	20	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	+	++	?	-	-	?	X	-	?	0	0	--	--?	-	0	0	-	0
COGG 174	1.23	12	Full	0	0	+	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	0	-	+	+	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
COGG 181	1.42	10	Full	0	0	+	+	-	+	+	+	0	+	0	-	+	+	++	-	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	--?	?	0	-	0	0	--	0
COGG 506	3.21	30	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	-	0	--?	+	--	++	+	-	++	?	X	0	?	-	0	-	0	?	0	0	-	?
CRESS 201	2.29	70	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	-	0	0	+	--	-	+	+	+	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	+	0	0	--	0
EARC 221	2.27	50	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	+	++	+	++	-	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
GNBN 264	9.49	215	Full	0	0	++	+	0	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	--	++	+	+	++	?	X	0	?	0	--?	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
Group A	114.82	2000	Full	+	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	++	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	--	0
Group J	67.36	1000	Full	+	0	++	-	-	?	0	-	--	-	++	-	++	++	++	-	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	--	?
Group K	23.48	600	Full	0	-	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
Group L	76.76	1000	Full	+	0	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	++	+	++	+	++	+	?	X	0	?	0	--?	-	0	-	0	0	--	?
Group M	18.71	450	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	++	++	+	-	++	?	X	0	?	0	--?	-	0	-	0	0	--	0
Group N	0.45	10	Full	?	0	0	+	-	?	0	+	0	+	0	-	+	++	++	+	+	++	-	X	-	?	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
Group O	1.62	35	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	++	++	+	X	-	?	--	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	?
GRYE 274	2.06	29	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	0	-	+	+	-	+	++	+	-	X	-	?	0	0	--	0	-	0	0	--	0
HASA 286	0.92	20	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	+	+	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0
HASA 287	1.64	50	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	++	++	-	X	-	?	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	?
HASA 289	0.82	24	Full	0	-	++	-	-	+	0	-	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	+	+	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
HASA 295	2.11	70	Full	0	-	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	-	+	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0

Site ID	Area (Ha)	No. of Dwellings	Assess site?	Q1a Community facilities	Q1c AD and Waste sites	Q2a Affordable housing	Q3a Primary healthcare	Q3c ANG	Q3e Open space	Q4a Retail provision	Q4c Shops & services	Q5a Mineral reserves	Q5c Employment areas	Q5e Broadband availability	Q6a Designated wildlife	Q7a Public transport	Q8a Service centres	Q8c Public transport	Q8e Highway access	Q9a Primary schools	Q9c Secondary schools	Q10a Historic environment	Q11a Climate change	Q12a Groundwater SPZ	Q12c Sewage capacity	Q13a Flood risk	Q14a Air quality	Q15a Landscape sensitivity	Q15c AONB extension	Q15e Greenfield / brownfield	Q15g VIS	Q15j Country parks	Q16a Agricultural land	Q16c Contaminated land
HATF313	1.99	30	Full	0	0	0	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	+	++	?	-	+	?	X	0	?	0	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	0
HATR 309	1.75	1	Full	+	0	0	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	?	+	++	-	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
KELV 331	0.50	1	Full	+	0	0	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	+	++	+	+	-	0	X	0	?	-	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0
KELV 335	10.12	300	Full	+	0	++	+	-	+	+	+	0	+	++	-	+	+	++	?	+	+	-	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
RIDG 359	0.79	10	Full	0	0	+	-	-	+	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	+	-	?	++	-	?	X	?	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
SIBH 377	2.36	50	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	0	-	+	-	+	+	++	?	X	-	?	0	0	-	0	+	0	0	-	0
SILV 388	3.55	80	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	-	++	0	+	+	++	+	++	-	+	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	+	0	0	-	0
STEB 395	1.22	25	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	+	-	?	++	-	-	X	?	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
WCH14	0.64	15	Full	?	0	++	+	-	?	0	+	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	-	++	+	X	0	?	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
WETH414	0.24	9	Full	0	0	+	+	-	+	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	+	++	?	+	-	?	X	-	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
WITC 421	3.06	40	Full	0	-	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	-	+	++	-	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	0	?
WITN 425	0.41	40	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	-	+	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	?	++	++	+	X	0	?	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
WITN 427	0.32	10	Full	-	0	0	-	-	+	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0
WITN 429	0.55	13	Full	0	0	0	-	-	+	0	-	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
WITW 431	1.72	40	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	++	++	+	+	++	0	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0

DRAFT

SA findings for additional site options

10.102 Braintree District Council received information regarding 45 new potential sites allocations in response to the consultation on the Draft Local Plan. These were screened on the basis of site size, dwelling capacity and proximity to sensitive features, as described in the methodology chapter. A total of 17 sites were screened in for full SA assessment and seven sites were screened in for partial SA assessment. The results of these assessments are summarised below.

SA findings for screened-in site allocation options

10.103 The likely effects of each site allocation option that had been screened in are summarised in Table 10.4 in relation to each relevant SA objective. The likely effects of site allocation options which did not meet these criteria but which are situated within a sensitive area are summarised in relation to the relevant SA objectives. A detailed appraisal form for each site option is included in **Error! Reference source not found.** or Appendix 7.

10.104 The narrative below summarises the main types of effects identified, with particular consideration given to those effects which are likely to be significant, in line with the SEA Regulations.

10.105 Development at any of the site allocation options shown in Table 10.4 would give rise to a mixture of positive and negative effects in relation to the SA objectives. Significant positive effects (++) were identified in relation to six SA objectives:

- SA2: Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home.
- SA3: Improve the health of the District's residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities.
- SA5: Achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth.
- SA7: Promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake.
- SA8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development.
- SA9: Improve the education and skills of the population.

10.106 Significant negative effects (-- or --?) were identified in relation to eight SA objectives:

- SA5: Achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth.
- SA6: Conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment.
- SA8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development.
- SA10: Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.
- SA13: Reduce the risk of flooding.
- SA14: Improve air quality.
- SA15: Maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes.
- SA16: Safeguard and enhance the quality of soil.

10.107 Uncertain effects were identified for a large proportion of site options in relation to SA12: Improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity.

10.108 The smaller site allocation options within sensitive areas would generally give rise to negative or uncertain effects in relation to the limited range of SA objectives against which they were assessed.

10.109 All of these effects are discussed further below.

Table 10.4 Summary of SA findings for new housing and mixed use site allocations received in response to Draft Local Plan consultation

Site ID	Area (Ha)	No. of Dwellings	Assess site?	Q1a Community facilities	Q1c AD and Waste sites	Q2a Affordable housing	Q3a Primary healthcare	Q3c ANG	Q3e Open space	Q4a Retail provision	Q4c Shops & services	Q5a Mineral reserves	Q5c Employment areas	Q5e Broadband availability	Q6a Designated wildlife	Q7a Public transport	Q8a Service centres	Q8c Public transport	Q8e Highway access	Q9a Primary schools	Q9c Secondary schools	Q10a Historic environment	Q11a Climate change	Q12a Groundwater SPZ	Q12c Sewage capacity	Q13a Flood risk	Q14a Air quality	Q15a Landscape sensitivity	Q15c AONB extension	Q15e Greenfield / brownfield	Q15g VIS	Q15i Country parks	Q16a Agricultural land	Q16c Contaminated land	
BOCN 607	3.923111	120	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
BOCN 634	7.630504	115	Full	0	-	++	-	-	+	0	-	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	?	++	++	-	X	-	?	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	
BOCN 635	2.291275	65	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
BOCN 649	5.718011	40	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	-	-	+	++	-	+	++	++	?	++	++	-	X	0	?	-	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0	
BOCN 650	8.753116	260	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	-	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	-	++	+	-	X	-	?	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	-	
BRAW 647	12.91342	250	Full	0	0	++	-	0	+	0	-	0	+	+	-	+	++	++	+	+	+	+	X	0	?	0	-?	+	0	-	0	0	-	0	
COGG 623	19.45291	20	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	-	0	-	+	-	++	+	-	++	-	X	0	?	-	0	+	0	-	0	0	0	0	
COGG 640	5.977011	100	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	-	0	-	+	-	++	+	-	++	-	X	0	?	0	-?	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	0
COGG 641	539.3561	5000	Full	+	0	++	-	-	+	?	+	0	+	0	-?	++	?	++	+	++	++	-	X	0	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	?	
FINC 646	5.680716	95	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	-	+	+	++	-	-	X	-	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	
GGHR 639	59.88294	850	Full	0	0	++	+	-	++	+	+	0	+	++	-	++	++	++	+	++	++	-	X	0	?	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	
GREY 644	5.90842	125	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	X	-	?	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	
HATF 608	3.83253	160	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	-	++	0	+	+	++	+	-	+	0	X	0	?	0	-?	+	0	+	0	0	0	-	
HATF 609	6.480245	190	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	-	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0	
KELV 606	7.564364	225	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	+	++	+	-	+	-	X	0	?	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	
KELV 615	50.71053	600	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-?	+	+	++	+	++	-	-	X	0	?	0	-?	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	
KELV 616	5.378467	160	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	-	++	+	-	+	-	X	0	?	0	-?	+	0	-	0	0	-	0	
KELV 626	2.693381	45	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
KELV 627	5.728659	170	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	+	++	+	+	+	0	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0	
WETH 624	1.451782	23	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
WETH 636	0.7169341	20	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
WHIN 614	0.2674656	10	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
WITN 428A	9.885543	300	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	++	++	+	++	++	0	X	0	?	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0	
WITN 613	0.03994207	10	Part	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	X	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

DRAFT

SA objective 1: Create safe environments which improve quality of life and community cohesion

- 10.110 No significant effects were identified in relation to this SA objective.
- 10.111 A large number of negligible (0) effects were identified for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), where there was no evidence that development would either enhance or lead to loss of community facilities. A minor positive (+) was identified for one of the larger site options, specifically COGG 641 (>5 ha or > 150 dwelling capacity), indicating that it was suitable for new facilities where none exist currently or would be likely to enhance existing facilities.
- 10.112 The SA also examined the proximity of site options to waste facilities and against this criterion, a large number of negligible (0) effects were identified for the large site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity). A minor negative (-) effect was identified for one site, BOCN 634, due to it being located within 250m of a landfill site which would expose any development to noise, odour emissions, dust and pests.
- 10.113 None of the smaller site options were found to be within a 'sensitive area' in relation to this SA objective, therefore the potential for significant effects was ruled out and no further assessment was carried out (see Methodology chapter for details).

SA objective 2: To provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home

- 10.114 Significant positive (++) effects were identified in relation to this objective for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that they would deliver at least 15 new dwellings and therefore contribute significantly to the delivery of affordable housing.
- 10.115 None of the smaller site options were found to be within a 'sensitive area' in relation to this SA objective, therefore the potential for significant effects was ruled out and no further assessment was carried out (see Methodology chapter for details).

SA objective 3: To improve the health of the District's residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities

- 10.116 Mainly minor negative (-) effects were identified in relation to this objective for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity) as they were generally more than 800 m from the nearest NHS GP surgery or hospital. It should be noted, however, that very large sites may offer the potential to incorporate a new GP surgery as part of the development.
- 10.117 Mainly minor negative effects were identified for the second criterion of this SA objective, because most site options fulfilled no more than one of four criteria for accessibility to natural greenspace.
- 10.118 Mainly minor positive effects (+) were identified for the third criterion of this SA objective, because most site options would not lead to loss of publicly accessible open space. A significant positive (++) effect was identified for one of the site options (GGHR 639), because development at the site would result in the provision of new publicly accessible open space.
- 10.119 None of the smaller site options were found to be within a 'sensitive area' in relation to this SA objective, therefore the potential for significant effects was ruled out and no further assessment was carried out (see Methodology chapter for details).

SA objective 4: To promote the vitality and viability of all service centres throughout the District

- 10.120 No significant effects were identified in relation to this SA objective.
- 10.121 Most of the large site options (>5ha or >150 dwellings) scored a negligible (0) effect in relation to this objective for retail provision because they generally would lead to no change in provision. A minor positive (+) effect was identified for one of the site options (GGHR 639), because it is expected to increase retail provision. One site (COGG 641) scored an uncertain effect because it is unknown whether there will be retail provision at the site.
- 10.122 Considering proximity to existing shops and services, mainly minor positive (+) effects were identified, reflecting the fact that site options within or directly adjacent to the Main Towns (Braintree, Bocking and Great Notley; Witham; Halstead) were generally within 800 m (walking

distance) of a primary shopping area or Local Centre with site options elsewhere generally within 8 km (driving distance) of a Local Centre boundary. Minor negative effects were identified for the remaining larger site options, reflecting longer travel distances to shops and services.

10.123 None of the smaller site options within sensitive areas were assessed in relation to this SA objective.

SA objective 5: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth

10.124 For the first criterion assessed under this SA objective, potential sterilisation of mineral reserves, all but one of the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity) had no effect, reflecting the fact that 25% or less of each site lies within an area preferred and reserved for mineral extraction. The exception was site BOCN 649, for which a significant negative effect was identified, reflecting the fact that the entire site lies within a mineral safeguarding area.

10.125 The SA also examined the proximity of site options to main employment areas and against this criterion, a mixture of minor positive (+) and minor negative (-) effects were identified.

10.126 The third criterion examined was the current or planned availability of a fast broadband internet connection at the site location and for this, significant positive (++) effects were identified for most sites reflecting the fact that a fast (optic fibre) connection was already available or planned by 2019.

10.127 None of the smaller site options were found to be within a 'sensitive area' in relation to this SA objective, therefore the potential for significant effects was ruled out and no further assessment was carried out (see Methodology chapter for details).

SA objective 6: To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment

10.128 Mainly minor negative (-) effects were identified in relation to this objective for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), mainly reflecting the fact that they were greenfield sites where development could lead to the loss or fragmentation of undesignated wildlife habitats. Significant negative effects with uncertainty (--?) were identified for two of the larger sites, generally because a small part (less than 25%) of the site was located within a designated biodiversity site or Ancient Woodland.

10.129 Two of the smaller site options were identified as being within a sensitive area in relation to biodiversity. Minor negative (-) effects were identified for these.

SA objective 7: To promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake

10.130 Effects on this SA objective were assessed by considering the proximity of the site to existing public transport facilities and whether the site was large enough to be likely to support provision of a new bus stop. Mainly minor positive (+) effects were identified for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), generally reflecting the fact that they were within 400 m of an existing bus stop. Significant positive effects were identified for two of sites, reflecting the fact that these were sites with capacity for at least 700 new dwellings and were therefore assumed to incorporate a new bus stop.

10.131 None of the smaller site options within sensitive areas was assessed in relation to this SA objective.

SA objective 8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development

10.132 The first criterion assessed under this SA objective was whether the site option was within or directly adjacent to a settlement with a high level of provision of services and facilities. Generally, significant positive (++) or minor positive (+) effects were identified for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting their location at settlements classed as Villages With Services or Main Towns respectively in the settlement hierarchy. A smaller number of allocation options to Other Villages or The Countryside had a negligible (0) effect or a

significant negative (--) effect respectively. One site (COGG 641) received an uncertain effect because although it is not adjacent to an existing service centre, as a new settlement it might provide new services and facilities. However, it is not known whether these will be of a 'high level'.

10.133 The assessment against this SA objective also considered the distance of the site options to public transport services and the regularity of those services. Significant positive (++) effects were identified for most of the larger site options, reflecting the fact that they were within 400 m of a bus stop with a frequent service (either existing stops or the new stops with frequent services assumed for sites with a capacity of at least 3,000 dwellings) or within 800 m of a railway station with a frequent service. Minor positive (+) or minor negative (-) sites were identified for the remaining larger sites.

10.134 Finally, the SA considered whether any highway access issues had been identified for the site options; this revealed mainly minor positive (+) effects. Minor negative (-) or uncertain (?) effects were identified for the remaining larger sites.

10.135 None of the smaller site options within sensitive areas was assessed in relation to this SA objective.

SA objective 9: To improve the education and skills of the population

10.136 The SA considered the proximity of site options to primary and secondary schools, taking into account the potential for larger housing developments to provide new schools. In relation to access to primary schools, many significant positive (++) effects were identified for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that they either had capacity to develop at least 700 dwellings and were therefore assumed to provide a new primary school, or that they were within 400 m of an existing primary school. Minor positive (+) or minor negative (-) effects were identified for a number of site options that were further away from existing primary schools. A similarly mixed picture existed in terms of access to secondary schools, with scores ranging from significant positive (++) to minor negative (-) although fewer negative scores were identified than for primary schools.

10.137 None of the smaller site options within sensitive areas were assessed in relation to this SA objective.

SA objective 10: To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings

10.138 The SA resulted in minor negative (-) effects being identified for the majority of the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity) and for many of the smaller site options, reflecting the fact that heritage assets exist close to (or in a few cases within) these sites and that mitigation would be feasible. A small number of the larger sites scored a significant negative (--) effect due to possible negative impacts to historic assets due to increased traffic and no suggestion of mitigation. No effect was identified for most of the remaining larger site options as there were no historic assets within the vicinity of these sites or site visits has been able to rule out such effects. One site (BRAW 647) received a minor positive (+) effect, reflecting the potential for enhancement.

SA objective 11: To reduce contributions to climate change

10.139 Effects of the Draft Local Plan on this SA objective were judged to be more appropriately assessed on the basis of the features and designs of individual development proposals and the development management policies that govern these. Site allocation options were not, therefore, assessed against this SA objective.

SA objective 12: To improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity

10.140 No significant effects were identified in relation to this SA objective.

- 10.141 The first criterion assessed under this SA objective was whether the site option was within a groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ). Generally, no effects (0) were identified for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that they did not fall within any SPZ or only an insignificant proportion (less than 25%) was within SPZ1, 2 or 3. Minor negative (-) effects were identified for a small number of the larger sites, reflecting the fact that 25% or more of each of these sites was within SPZ1 or 2.
- 10.142 Uncertain effects were identified for all site options in relation to the second criterion, the capacity of sewerage infrastructure to accommodate allocations at different locations. This reflected the fact that the Council had not yet updated its Water Cycle Study.
- 10.143 None of the smaller site options within sensitive areas were assessed in relation to this SA objective.

SA objective 13: To reduce the risk of flooding

- 10.144 Effects on this SA objective were assessed by determining whether the site option was located within an area of high flood risk. No effect (0) was identified for most of the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that less than 5% of each of the sites was within Flood Zone 3 or less than 25% of each site was within Flood Zone 2. Significant negative (--) effects were identified for two of the larger sites, BOCN 649 and KELV 606, reflecting the fact that at least 25% of these sites are within Flood Zones 3a or 3b. Minor negative (-) effects were also identified for a number of sites.
- 10.145 One of the smaller site options (KELV 626) was identified as being within a sensitive area in relation to flood risk. A significant negative (--) effect was identified for this site.

SA objective 14: To improve air quality

- 10.146 Significant negative effects with uncertainty (--?) were identified in relation to this SA objective for a small number of the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that they were within 200 m of the A12 or A120 but that mitigation might be possible, for example by site layout or screening. No effect (0) was identified for the remainder of the larger sites.
- 10.147 None of the smaller site options within sensitive areas were assessed in relation to this SA objective.

SA objective 15: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes

- 10.148 Effects in relation to this SA objective were assessed via a number of criteria, with results as follows.
- 10.149 Firstly, it was determined whether the site fell within an area with high sensitivity to change, as determined by the Council's Landscape Character Assessment studies. A variety of effects were identified for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), the only significant ones being significant negative effects for a minority of site options where at least 25% of the site fell within a landscape character area with high sensitivity to change.
- 10.150 Secondly, a check was made whether the site was within the proposed extension to Dedham Vale AONB. No effect (0) was identified for all the larger sites.
- 10.151 Thirdly, it was determined whether the site was on greenfield or previously developed land and whether the potential existed for remediation of any degraded landscape or derelict buildings. Minor negative (-) effects were identified for most of the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that at least 25% of each of these site was on greenfield land. A minor positive (+) effect was identified for one of the sites because it is located on previously developed land.
- 10.152 Finally, it was determined whether the site options were located in any locally designated Visually Important Spaces or within a Country Park. No effect (0) was identified for any of the site options, reflecting the fact that no more than 25% of any site was within such areas.

- 10.153 A small number of the smaller site options were identified as being within a sensitive area in relation to landscape. A variety of effects was identified for these, the only significant ones being significant negative effects with uncertainty (-- or --?) for three sites, reflecting the fact that they were located within areas of high landscape sensitivity and within the proposed extension to Dedham Vale AONB.
- 10.154 None of the smaller site options within sensitive areas were assessed in relation to this SA objective.

SA objective 16: To safeguard and enhance the quality of soil

- 10.155 Effects in relation to this SA objective were firstly assessed by considering whether development would lead to loss of good quality agricultural land. Mainly significant negative (--) effects were identified for the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that at least 25% of the site was on grade 1 (excellent) or grade 2 (very good) agricultural land.
- 10.156 Secondly, the SA considered the potential for development of site options to remediate known areas of contaminated land. No effect (0) was identified for most site options, reflecting the fact that no known contaminated land was present. Uncertain (?) or minor negative (-) effects were identified for the remainder of larger sites.
- 10.157 None of the smaller site options within sensitive areas was assessed in relation to this SA objective.

Summary of SA findings for the Publication Draft Local Plan site allocations

- 10.158 Subsequent to and informed by the assessment of site allocation options above, the Council selected a number of these options to be allocated through the Local Plan. Sites which had already been granted planning permission at the time of the appraisal were not subject to SA as these are now considered to form part of the baseline and the SA could not inform decisions on the allocation of these sites.
- 10.159 Appraisals for site allocations that do not include any residential development are presented in the section of the SA Report that covers the corresponding Publication Draft Local Plan Policy. For example, the SA of strategic employment sites allocated by Policy LPP2 Location of Employment Land is presented in the "A Strong Economy" section of Chapter 6. The site allocations were assessed using the same set of assumptions for determining the significance of effects in relation to each SA objective as was used in the assessment of preferred site allocations, with the exception of SA objectives 1: Community safety & cohesion, 5: Economy and 12: Water environment (see Appendix 4). These scores were then adjusted using professional judgement to reflect any elements of the site-specific allocation policy that were judged to modify the 'raw' effect.
- 10.160 Appraisals for site allocations that include residential development are summarised in this section of the SA Report. As for the non-housing allocations, the preferred housing and mixed use site allocations were assessed using the same set of assumptions for determining the significance of effects in relation to each SA objective as was used in the assessment of preferred site allocations, with changes to SA objectives 1: Community safety & cohesion, 5: Economy and 12: Water environment (see Appendix 4). The resulting 'raw' scores are summarised in **Table 10.3** which also states the Council's estimate of the dwelling capacity of each site which, as described in the Methodology chapter, determined the assumptions made about bus services, schools and community facilities that will be required as part of any development. A detailed appraisal form setting out the justifications for the raw scores for each preferred housing or mixed use site is included in **Error! Reference source not found..** Most preferred housing sites are allocated by Policy LPP17 Housing Provision and Delivery and nothing within that policy was judged to alter the raw scores arrived at using the site assessment framework. However, for the small proportion of housing sites allocated by a site-

specific policy, for example Policy LPP20 Strategic Growth Location – Former Towerlands Park Site, raw scores arrived at using the site assessment framework were adjusted using professional judgement to reflect the detailed provisions of the site specific policy. In the few instances where such adjustments were made, this is noted in the assessment text for the relevant policy.

10.161 The narrative below summarises the main types of effects identified for proposed housing and mixed use sites, with particular consideration given to those effects which are likely to be significant, in line with the SEA Regulations.

10.162 Development at any of the preferred housing and mixed site allocations shown in **Table 10.3** would give rise to a mixture of positive and negative effects in relation to the SA objectives. Significant positive effects (++ or ++?) were identified in relation to 7 SA objectives:

- SA objective 2: To provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home.
- SA objective 3: To improve the health of the Districts' residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities.
- SA objective 5: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth.
- SA objective 7: To promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake.
- SA objective 8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development.
- SA objective 9: To improve the education and skills of the population.

10.163 Significant negative effects (-- or --?) were identified in relation to eight SA objectives:

- SA objective 5: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth.
- SA objective 6: To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment.
- SA objective 8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development.
- SA objective 12: To improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity
- SA objective 13: To reduce the risk of flooding.
- SA objective 14: To improve air quality.
- SA objective 15: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes.
- SA objective 16: To safeguard and enhance the quality of soil.

10.164 Uncertain effects were identified for a large proportion of site options in relation to 13 SA objectives:

- SA objective 1: Create safe environments which improve quality of life and community cohesion
- SA objective 2: To provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home.
- SA objective 3: To improve the health of the Districts' residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities.
- SA objective 4: To promote the vitality and viability of all service centres throughout the District
- SA objective 5: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth.
- SA objective 7: To promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake.
- SA objective 8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development.

- SA objective 10: Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings.
- SA objective 12: Improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity.
- SA objective 13: To reduce the risk of flooding.
- SA objective 14: To improve air quality.
- SA objective 15: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscape.
- SA objective 16: To safeguard and enhance the quality of soil.

10.165 The effects of allocations are discussed further below; an assessment of the cumulative effects of all allocations and policies is provided in Chapter 11.

SA objective 1: Create safe environments which improve quality of life and community cohesion

10.166 No significant effects were identified in relation to this SA objective.

10.167 A large number of negligible (0) effects were identified, where evidence demonstrated that development would not result in the loss of community facilities or where a site was not located within 500m of an AD or 250m of a Waste Plant. Additionally, uncertain (?) effects were identified for a number of sites, where there was no evidence that development would either enhance or lead to a loss of community facilities. Minor positive (+) effects were identified for small number of the remaining sites, indicating that they were suitable for new facilities where none exist currently or would be likely to enhance existing facilities.

10.168 Minor negative (-) effects were identified for a small number of the remaining sites, due to them being situated within 500m of an AD or 250m of a Waste Plant.

SA objective 2: To provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home

10.169 Mainly significant positive (++) effects were identified in relation to this objective, reflecting the fact that the proposed allocations would deliver at least 15 new dwellings and therefore contribute significantly to the delivery of affordable housing. Minor positive (+) effects or no effect (0) were identified for the remaining proposed sites.

10.170 A very small number of sites scored an uncertain (?) effect because the BDC site assessment forms did not specify the number of dwellings to be delivered at these sites.

SA objective 3: To improve the health of the District's residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities

10.171 Minor positive (+) effects were identified in relation to this objective for more than half of the proposed sites, indicating that they were within 800m of the nearest NHS GP surgery or hospital or, in the case of some of the larger sites, contributing to new on-site provision. The remaining sites scored minor negative (-), reflecting the absence of nearby health facilities.

10.172 All but one proposed site scored minor negative effects (-) because they fulfilled no more than one of four criteria for accessibility to natural greenspace.

10.173 Mainly minor positive effects (+) were identified as most site options would not lead to the loss of publicly accessible open space; insufficient information was available to rule out loss for most of the remaining sites giving them an uncertain (?) effect. A significant positive (++) effect was identified for one site that would provide new publicly accessible open space.

SA objective 4: To promote the vitality and viability of all service centres throughout the District

10.174 One significant positive (++) effect was identified in relation to this SA objective, due to one of the sites being located within a Local Centre.

- 10.175 No effects (0) were identified in relation to retail provision for most of the sites because development generally would not result in an increase or loss of retail provision. Minor negative (-) effects were identified for a very small number of sites where development would result in the loss of retail provision, whilst one site received a minor positive (+) effect because it would provide for additional retail use. An uncertain (?) effect was given to any site where there was no evidence to determine whether development would result in a net increase or loss of retail provision on-site.
- 10.176 Considering proximity to existing shops and service, mainly minor positive (+) effects were identified, reflecting the fact that site options within or directly adjacent to Main Towns (Braintree, Bocking and Great Notley; Witham; Halstead) were generally within 800 m (walking distance) of a primary shopping area or Local Centre with site options elsewhere generally within 8km (driving distance) of a Local Centre boundary. Minor negative effects (-) were identified for the remaining sites, reflecting longer travel distances to shops and services.

SA objective 5: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth

- 10.177 For the first criterion assessed under this SA objective, potential sterilisation of mineral reserves, all but two had no effect, reflecting the fact that 25% or less of each of the site areas are within an area preferred and reserved for mineral extraction. The exceptions were 'BOCN 127' and 'Group J', for which a significant negative effect was identified, reflecting the fact that a significant proportion of both sites is within a mineral safeguarding area. 'Group J Employment' was awarded an uncertain (?) effect because the actual effect will depend on where development is located within the site. This is because although the majority of the site is within a mineral safeguarding area, the remainder is not and it could be this part of the site that development is located in.
- 10.178 The SA also examined the proximity of site options to main employment areas and against this criterion a minor positive (+) was identified for the majority of sites with the remainder scoring minor negative (-).
- 10.179 The third criterion examined was the current or planned availability of a fast broadband internet connection at the site location and for this, significant positive (++) effects were identified for most sites reflecting the fact that a fast (optic fibre) connection was already available or planned by 2019.

SA objective 6: To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment

- 10.180 Mainly minor negative (-) effects were identified in relation to this objective for most sites, mainly reflecting the fact that they were greenfield sites where development could lead to the loss or fragmentation of undesignated wildlife habitats. Significant negative effects with uncertainty (--?) were identified for two sites, COGG 506 and WITC 421, where a very small proportion of the sites are located in Local Wildlife Sites.

SA objective 7: To promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake

- 10.181 Effects on this SA objective were assessed by considering the proximity of the site to existing public transport facilities and whether the site was large enough to be likely to support provision of a new bus stop. Mainly minor positive (+) effects were identified, generally reflecting the fact that most of the sites are within 400m of an existing bus stop. Significant positive effects were identified for three sites, reflecting the fact that these were sites with capacity for at least 700 new dwellings and were therefore assumed to incorporate a new bus stop.
- 10.182 An uncertain (?) effect was given to three of the sites due to the fact that some parts of these sites are within 400m of existing bus stops while other parts are not. The actual effect would depend on where development is located within those sites. A minor negative (-) effect was identified for two sites.

SA objective 8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development

- 10.183 The first criterion assessed under this SA objective was whether the site option was within or directly adjacent to a settlement with a high level of provision of services and facilities. Generally, minor positive (+) or significant positive (++) effects were given, reflecting the location of sites at settlements classed as Villages With Services or Main Towns respectively in the settlement hierarchy. Sites located in the Countryside were given a significant negative (--) effect. An uncertain (?) effect was given to 'Group L Employment' due to the fact that part of the site is adjacent to Feering (Village With Services) whilst the remainder is not. The actual effect will depend on where development is located within the site.
- 10.184 The assessment against this SA objective also considered the distance of the site options to public transport services and the regularity of those services. Significant positive (++) effects were identified for most of the sites, reflecting the fact that they are within 400m of a bus stop with a frequent service (either existing stops or the new stops with frequent services assumed for sites with a capacity of at least 3,000 dwellings) or within 800m of a railway station with a frequent service. Minor negative (-) effects were identified for the remaining larger sites, while uncertain (?) effects were awarded to the sites where it is unknown where development will be located within them.
- 10.185 Finally, the SA considered whether any highway access issues had been identified for the site options; this revealed mostly minor positive (+) effects, reflecting no issues, with minor negative (-) or uncertain (?) effects for the remainder.

SA objective 9: To improve the education and skills of the population

- 10.186 The SA considered the proximity of sites to primary and secondary schools, taking into account the potential for larger housing developments to provide new schools. In relation to access to primary schools, many significant positive (++) effects were identified, reflecting the fact that the sites either had capacity to develop at least 700 dwellings and were therefore assumed to provide a new primary school, or that they were within 400 m of an existing primary school. Minor positive (+) or minor negative (-) effects were identified for a number of site options that were further away from existing primary schools. A mixed picture also existed in terms of access to secondary schools, but with most sites scoring significant positive (++), indicating they are within 2.4 km of a secondary school.
- 10.187 A negligible (0) effect was given for 'KELV 332' because the site will provide an extension to a residential care home, and proximity to primary and secondary schools is not relevant.

SA objective 10: To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings

- 10.188 No significant effects were identified in relation to this SA objective.
- 10.189 The SA resulted in uncertain effects being identified for the majority of the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that heritage assets exist close to (or in a few cases within) the sites. This was based on GIS mapping which sought to identify designated historic assets up to 1 km distance from the sites subject to SA. However, the Council's site visits did not identify any potential significant effects on the historic environment in relation to these sites, and therefore they were not recorded in the site assessment forms. The Council is of the view that, as the site visits did not reveal significant effects, it is appropriate to carry out detailed assessment of the effects on the historic environment and requirements for mitigation at the planning application stage. A minor negative (-) effect was identified for a small proportion of sites where the Council's site visit identified a potential negative effect where mitigation was deemed likely to be feasible. A minor positive (+) effect was also identified for a small number of sites, reflecting the potential for enhancement. No effect was identified for five of the sites as there were no historic assets within the vicinity or site visits had been able to rule out such effects.

SA objective 11: To reduce contributions to climate change

10.190 Effects of the Publication Draft Local Plan on this SA objective were judged to be more appropriately assessed on the basis of the features and designs of individual development proposals and the development management policies that govern these. Site allocations were not, therefore, assessed against this SA objective, although effects were subsequently identified for a small number of sites in relation to site-specific policy wording.

SA objective 12: To improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity

10.191 The first criterion assessed under this SA objective was whether the site option was within a groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ). Generally, no effects (0) were identified, reflecting the fact that the sites did not fall within any SPZ or only an insignificant proportion (less than 25%) was within SPZ1, 2 or 3. Minor negative (-) effects were identified for a small number of sites, reflecting the fact that 25% or more of the site was within SPZ1 or 2. An uncertain effect was identified for sites with 25% or more of their area within SPZ3, or sites where the actual effect will depend on where development is located within them.

10.192 The second criterion assessed under this SA objective was whether the local sewage network had sufficient capacity to accommodate development. Minor negative (-) effects were identified for most of the sites, which do not have sufficient headroom to accommodate development. This means that the pumping station or sewer pipe size may restrict growth, or the site is located in a non-sewered area where there is a lack of infrastructure. A small number of sites received a significant negative (--) effect from scoring red in the wastewater network RAG assessment, due to their being limited capacity in the sewage network. Additionally, a small number of sites received a negligible (0) effect from scoring green in the network RAG assessment, whilst the remaining sites scored a negligible (0) effect for not being assessed by the WCS.

SA objective 13: To reduce the risk of flooding

10.193 Effects on this SA objective were assessed by determining whether the site option was located within an area of high flood risk. No effect (0) was identified for most of the sites, reflecting the fact that less than 5% of each site was within Flood Zone 3 or less than 25% of each site was within Flood Zone 2. Significant negative (--) effects were identified for one site, 'HATR 299', 73.28% of which is within Flood Zone 3.

SA objective 14: To improve air quality

10.194 Significant negative effects with uncertainty (--?) were identified in relation to this SA objective for a small number of sites, reflecting the fact that they would result in residential development within 200m of the A12 or A120 but that mitigation might be possible, for example by site layout or screening. No effect (0) was identified for the remainder of sites with the exception of 'Group A Employment' and 'Group L Employment', whose actual effect will depend on where development is located within each site. This is because some parts of both 'Group A Employment' and 'Group L Employment' are within 200m of the A2 or A120 whilst other parts are not.

SA objective 15: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes

10.195 Effects in relation to this SA objective were assessed via a number of criteria, with results as follows.

10.196 Firstly, it was determined whether the site fell within an area with high sensitivity to change, as determined by the Council's Landscape Character Assessment studies. A variety of effects were identified, the only significant ones being significant negative effects for a minority of sites where at least 25% of each site fell within a landscape character area with high sensitivity to change. In a number of cases, these effects were mitigated when site-specific policy text was taken into account.

- 10.197 Secondly, a check was made whether the site was within the proposed extension to Dedham Vale AONB. A significant negative effect with uncertainty (--?) was identified for one site, BURE 165, reflecting the fact that at least 25% of the site fell within the proposed extension; no effect (0) was identified for the remainder of sites.
- 10.198 Thirdly, it was determined whether the site was on greenfield or previously developed land and whether the potential existed for remediation of any degraded landscape or derelict buildings. Minor negative (-) effects were identified for most of the sites, reflecting the fact that at least 25% of each the site was on greenfield land. Minor positive (+) or uncertain (?) effects were identified for the remaining sites.
- 10.199 Finally, it was determined whether the site options were located in any locally designated Visually Important Spaces or within a Country Park. No effect (0) was identified for all sites, the only exception being WITC 421 for which a minor negative (-) effect was awarded, due to its overlap with a Visually Important Space.

SA objective 16: To safeguard and enhance the quality of soil

- 10.200 Effects in relation to this SA objective were firstly assessed by considering whether development would lead to the loss of good quality agricultural land. Significant negative (--) effects were identified for a number of sites, reflecting the fact that at least 25% of each the site was on grade 1 (excellent) or grade 2 (very good) agricultural land. A smaller proportion of sites scored minor negative (-) or no effect (0), with the exception of 'Group L Employment' which scored an uncertain (?) effect because although the majority of the site is on grade 1 or 2 agricultural land, the actual effect will depend on where development is located within the site.
- 10.201 Secondly, the SA considered the potential for development of site options to remediate known areas of contaminated land. No effect (0) was identified for most site options, reflecting the fact that no known contaminated land was present. A minor negative (-) effect was identified for 'HATF 608' because the BDC site assessment form suggests there are possible contamination issues at this site. Uncertain (?) effects were identified for the remainder of sites, indicating potential contamination but no information on whether remediation would be a condition of development.

Table 10.5 Summary of SA findings for site allocations in the Publication Draft Local Plan

N.B. Table shows 'raw' scores using assessment criteria in Appendix 4, i.e. prior to any adjustments for effects of any site-specific allocation policy; such adjustments are described in the policy assessments in Chapter 6

Site ID	Area (Ha)	No. of Dwellings	Assess site?	Q1a Community facilities	Q1c AD and Waste sites	Q2a Affordable housing	Q3a Primary healthcare	Q3c ANG	Q3e Open space	Q4a Retail provision	Q4c Shops & services	Q5a Mineral reserves	Q5c Employment areas	Q5e Broadband availability	Q6a Design/ated wildlife	Q7a Public transport	Q8a Service centres	Q8c Public transport	Q8e Highway access	Q9a Primary schools	Q9c Secondary schools	Q10a Historic environment	Q11a Climate change	Q12a Groundwater SPZ	Q12c Sewage capacity	Q13a Flood risk	Q14a Air quality	Q15a Landscape sensitivity	Q15c AONB extension	Q15e Greenfield / brownfield	Q15g VIS	Q15i Country parks	Q16a Agricultural land	Q16c Contaminated land		
BCBG 150	0.35	10	Full	0	0	0	-	-	+	0	-	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	+	++	++	0	X	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0		
BCBG 550	4.36	75	Full	?	0	++	-	-	?	0	-	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	+	+	++	?	X	0	?	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0		
BOCN 127	0.50	9	Full	0	0	0	-	-	+	0	-	-	-	++	0	+	++	++	+	+	++	?	X	-	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0		
BOCN 137	31.39	600	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	-	++	+	-	++	?	X	-	-	0	0	-	0	?	0	0	-	0		
BOS 16	0.41	10	Full	?	0	0	+	-	?	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	+	+	++	?	X	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0		
BRAW 153	2.77	70	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	+	-	0	+	0	0	+	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	
BRC 34	0.22	10	Full	?	0	0	+	-	?	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	-	-	++	?	X	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	?	
BRC 77	0.08	10	Full	?	0	0	+	-	?	0	+	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	-	++	?	X	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	?	
BRE 17H	0.59	10	Full	?	0	++	-	-	?	0	-	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	
BRSO 152	0.75	100	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	-	-	++	?	X	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	?	
BURE 165	5.34	85	Full	0	0	++	+	-	++	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	+	++	?	-	-	?	X	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	0	0	-	0	0	
COGG 506	3.21	30	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	-	0	?	+	-	+	+	-	++	?	X	0	-	-	0	0	-	0	?	0	0	-	?	
CRESS 201	2.29	70	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	-	0	0	+	-	-	+	+	+	?	X	0	-	0	0	-	0	+	0	0	0	-	0	
GRBA 255A	2.69	37	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	+	++	+	+	-	?	X	?	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	
Group A (BLAN 110, 114, 116 & 633)	119.04	2000	Full	+	0	++	+	-	+	?	+	0	+	++	-	++	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	
Group J (BOCN 123 & 132)	66.86	991	Full	+	0	++	-	-	?	0	-	-	-	++	-	++	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	?	
Group L (FEER 230, 232 & 233)	81.77	1000	Full	+	0	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	++	+	++	+	++	+	?	X	0	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	?
Group M (HATF 315 & HATF 316)	18.71	450	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	-	+	0	-	++	0	+	++	++	+	-	++	?	X	0	-	0	-	-	0	+	0	0	0	-	0	
GRYE 274	2.06	29	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	0	-	+	+	-	+	++	+	-	X	-	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	
HASA 286	0.92	14	Full	0	0	0	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	+	+	++	?	X	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0
HASA 287	1.64	50	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	++	++	-	X	-	?	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	?	
HASA 295	2.11	70	Full	0	-	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	-	+	++	?	X	0	-	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	
HATF 313	1.99	40	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	+	++	?	-	+	?	X	0	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	
HATF 608	3.83	170	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	-	++	0	+	+	++	+	-	+	0	X	0	-	0	-	-	+	0	+	0	0	0	-	
HATF 630	2.79	51	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	-	+	-	+	+	++	+	-	+	?	X	0	-	0	-	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	0
HATR 299	0.81	10	Full	0	0	0	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	?
HATR 309	1.75	N/A	Full	0	0	?	-	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	+	+	+	-	X	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	
KELV 332	0.16	N/A	Full	0	0	0	+	-	+	0	+	0	n/a	++	0	+	+	++	-	n/a	n/a	0	X	0	?	0	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	-	0	
KELV 337	21.45	250	Full	+	0	++	+	-?	+	0	+	0	+	++	-	+	+	++	+	+	+	-	X	0	-	0	0	0	+	0	-	0	0	-	0	
LPP 21	43.80	600	Full	?	-	++	+	-	?	?	+	0	+	++	-	+	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	-	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	
LPP 28	0.08		Full	0	0	0	+	-	?	0	+	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	+	++	+	X	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0
LPP 31	10.62	285	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	-	++	-	+	+	++	+	-	+	-	X	0	-	0	-	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
RIDG 359	0.79	10	Full	0	0	+	-	0	+	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	+	+	?	++	-	?	X	?	0	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
SIBH 617 & SIBH 377	2.26	75	Full	0	0	++	-	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	0	-	+	-	+	+	++	?	X	-	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	
SILV 388	3.55	80	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	-	++	0	+	+	++	+	++	-	+	X	0	-	0	0	-	0	+	0	0	0	-	0	
STEB 395	1.22	20	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	+	+	?	++	-	-	X	?	0	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	0	
WCH 14CD	0.64	10	Full	?	0	0	+	-	?	0	+	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	+	++	+	X	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0
WETH 414	0.24	12	Full	0	0	+	+	-	+	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	+	++	?	+	-	?	X	-	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	0

WETH 624	1.45	23	Full	?	0	++	+	-	?	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	+	++	+	++	-	-	X	?	?	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	
WITC 421	3.06	40	Full	0	-	++	+	-	+	0	+	0	+	++	--?	+	++	++	?	+	++	-	X	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	-	0	0	-	0
WITN 425 & WITN 613	0.45	40	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	-	+	0	-	++	0	+	++	++	?	++	++	?	X	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
WITN 427	0.32	10	Full	-	0	0	-	-	+	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	
WITN 429	0.55	13	Full	0	0	0	-	-	+	0	-	0	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	++	++	?	X	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0
WITW 431	1.72	40	Full	0	0	++	+	-	+	0	-	0	-	++	-	+	++	++	+	+	++	0	X	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	
Group A Employment	119.04	0	Non-Housing	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	?	n/a	0	n/a	++	-	?	++	?	?	n/a	n/a	?	X	0	n/a	0	?	?	0	-	0	0	-	0	
Group J Employment	66.86	0	Non-Housing	+	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	0	n/a	?	n/a	++	-	?	++	?	+	n/a	n/a	?	X	?	n/a	0	0	?	0	-	0	0	-	0	
Group L Employment	81.77	0	Non-Housing	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	0	n/a	0	n/a	++	-	?	?	?	+	n/a	n/a	?	X	?	n/a	?	?	?	0	-	0	0	?	?	
BRE31RW	1.72	0	Non-Housing	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	0	n/a	0	n/a	++	-	+	++	++	?	n/a	n/a	?	X	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	
COLE 188	11.39	0	Non-Housing	0	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	0	n/a	0	n/a	++	-	+	++	++	+	n/a	n/a	?	X	?	n/a	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	
CRESS 202	3.92	0	Non-Housing	0	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	0	n/a	0	n/a	0	-	+	++	++	?	n/a	n/a	0	X	0	n/a	0	--?	+	0	-	0	0	-	0	
GRNO 260	39.57	0	Non-Housing	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	0	n/a	0	n/a	++	-	+	++	++	+	n/a	n/a	?	X	0	n/a	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	
LPP 4	9.47	0	Non-Housing	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	?	n/a	0	?	++	-	+	--	++	+	n/a	n/a	?	X	0	n/a	0	--?	--	0	+	0	0	-	0	
RIVE 362, RIVE 363	6.86	0	Non-Housing	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	+	0	n/a	0	n/a	++	0	-	++	-	?	n/a	n/a	?	X	0	n/a	0	--?	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	
X1	8.60	0	Non-Housing	?	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	?	?	n/a	0	n/a	++	-	+	--	+	?	n/a	n/a	?	X	-	n/a	0	0	-	0	-	0	0	-	0	



11 Cumulative effects of the Publication Draft Local Plan

Introduction

- 11.1 Preceding sections of this SA Report have described the likely effects of the individual policies and site allocations set out in the Section Two Publication Draft Local Plan prepared by Braintree District. This section brings together these effects of the separate elements to describe the likely cumulative effects.
- 11.2 As previously described, the strategic elements of the Local Plan have been separately assessed by Place Services in their SA of the joint Section One Local Plans. The potential exists for the effects of the Braintree District Section Two Local Plan to act cumulatively with the development proposed by the Section One Local Plan. In particular, the Section One Local Plan sets the Spatial Strategy for North Essex which the Braintree District Local Plan (Section Two) follows and also proposes three new settlements in the countryside or 'Garden Communities':
- Tendring/Colchester Borders (2,500 homes within the Plan period as part of an overall total of between 7,000-9,000 homes to be delivered beyond 2033);
 - Colchester/Braintree Borders (2,500 homes within the Plan period as part of an overall total of between 15,000 – 24,000 homes to be delivered beyond 2033);
 - West of Braintree in Braintree DC (2,500 homes within the Plan period as part of an overall total of between 7,000- 10,000 homes to be delivered beyond 2033).
- 11.3 Where relevant, the broad findings of the SA of the Section One Local Plan are therefore noted in the following description of the cumulative effects of the Braintree District Publication Draft Local Plan (Section Two).
- 11.4 The assessment of the cumulative effects of the Publication Draft Local Plan needs to be set within the context of the scale of change in terms of additional development that Braintree District will experience over the plan period 2016 to 2033. As an indicator of change, it is anticipated that the total housing stock of the District will increase over the plan period by nearly a quarter. The most up-to-date Office for National Statistics records show that Braintree District had 63,770 homes in April 2015¹⁹. The Local Plan period commences in 2016. Acknowledging that some homes will have been built over the 2015-2016 period, the delivery of a minimum of 14,320 homes over the period 2016 to 2033 represents an increase of around 22% in the existing housing stock.
- 11.5 The development in Braintree District will not be evenly distributed but will be focused on the Main Towns, Key Service Villages and a number of strategic growth locations (Policy LPP 17).
- 11.6 The Publication Draft Local Plan identifies the following strategic growth locations in the District:
- West of Braintree Garden Community (2,500 homes; provided for by the Section One Local Plan)
 - New Colchester Braintree Borders Garden Community (1,150 homes; provided for by the Section One Local Plan)
 - East of Great Notley - in Black Notley Parish (2,000 homes; Policy LPP 18).
 - Land East of Broad Road, Braintree (1,000 homes; Policy LPP 19)
 - Former Towerlands Park site, Braintree (600 homes; Policy LPP 20).

¹⁹ <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/datasets/housingdatafinder>. Accessed 17 June 2016.

- North West Braintree – Panfield Lane (600 homes; Policy LPP 21).
 - Land at Feering (1,000 homes) (Policy LPP 22).
 - Wood End Farm, Witham - Hatfield Peverel Parish (450 homes; Policy LPP 23).
- 11.7 A third garden community proposed by the Section One Local Plan on the Tendring/Colchester border proposes 2,500 homes during the plan period but falls outside of Braintree District. In addition, the Publication Draft Local Plan allocates smaller sites capable of delivering ten or more homes, as identified in the plan's Proposals Maps.
- 11.8 The Garden Communities are anticipated to deliver around 25% of the total dwelling requirement for Braintree District over the Local Plan period, and therefore will make a significant contribution to overall housing need.
- 11.9 The Section Two Publication Draft Local Plan provides for 32.1 ha of industrial land and 19.5 ha of office land (Policy LPP 2):
- Extension to Springwood Drive industrial area in Braintree (10.0 ha).
 - Land to the west of the A131 at Great Notley 'Eastlink 120' (18.5 ha).
 - Extension to Eastways Industrial Estate, Witham (6.8 ha).
 - Extension to Bluebridge Industrial Estate, Halstead (2.0 ha).
 - Land East of Great Notley (3.0 ha).
 - Land East of Broad Road (3.0 ha).
 - Land at Feering (4.0 ha).
 - Maltings Lane Business Park 'Gershwin Park' (3.8 ha).
- 11.10 The Publication Draft Local Plan also allocates the Former Polish Campsite at Allshot's Farm, Rivenhall as for employment use (Policy LPP 5). In addition, the Section Two Local Plan notes that two of the Garden Communities proposed by the Section One Local Plan (west Braintree and Marks Tey) will include major business parks.
- 11.11 The Publication Draft Local Plan identifies the need for 8,966 sq m of convenience food retail floorspace, 15,869 sq m of comparison goods floorspace and 8,304 sq m of food and beverage retail floorspace. Retail development will be focused on the town centres of Braintree, Halstead and Witham and specific allocations made to these as well as the strategic growth locations, new garden communities, and site allocations at land north of Freeport and land off Millennium Way, Braintree. Smaller scale retail provision will be made at the District Centre of Great Notley and at Local Centres (Policies LPP 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30).
- 11.12 The Publication Draft Local Plan safeguards land from development to accommodate proposed new roads, including the A131 Halstead Bypass and the A131 Sudbury Western Bypass as it passes through the District, and road schemes are also proposed to support development allocated in the Local Plan (Policy LPP 48).
- 11.13 The Publication Draft Local Plan makes provision for tourism development (Policy LPP 9), and additional community infrastructure, such as open space, sport and recreation (Policy LPP 53), educational establishments (Policy LPP 64), and other community services and facilities (Policy LPP 65).
- 11.14 Other forms of development supported subject to various criteria include renewable energy schemes (LPP 76, 77), broadband internet infrastructure (LPP 49), and equestrian facilities (LPP 54).
- 11.15 The cumulative effects of development are likely to be focused in and around the three Main Towns, particularly Braintree and Witham, which is where most of the strategic housing and employment development is planned to be delivered. There are no strategic housing growth locations identified for Halstead, although Great Notley and Feering do have such allocations. In addition, the non-strategic site allocations have the potential for significant effects within the context of the scale and character of the settlement concerned.

11.16 Under each of the SA objectives below, a summary is provided of the cumulative effects of the Publication Draft Local Plan in relation to each SA objective. This draws on the summaries of SA scores for the allocated sites in Table 10.5, as well as the summary of SA scores for the Local Plan policies in Table 11.1. The summary also describes ways in which any significant negative effects of the Publication Draft Local Plan may be mitigated by other policies within the Publication Draft Local Plan. Similarly, where an allocated site was the subject of a site-specific policy (the larger, strategic sites), the score awarded to the policy was referenced rather than that awarded to standalone site as the site specific policy provisions were taken into consideration to arrive at an adjusted score for such sites.

DRAFT

Table 11.1 Summary of SA scores for Publication Draft Local Plan policies

Local Plan Policy	SA1: Community safety & cohesion	SA2: Housing	SA3: Health	SA4: Service centre vitality	SA5: Economy	SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	SA7: Sustainable travel	SA8: Accessibility	SA9: Education and skills	SA10: Historic environment	SA11: Climate change mitigation	SA12: Water environment	SA13: Flood risk	SA14: Air quality	SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	SA16: Soil
Policy LPP 1 Development Boundaries	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 2 Location of Employment Land	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy LPP 3 Employment Policy Areas	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0
Policy LPP 4 Kelvedon Park	0	0	++?	0	?	-	+	++/-	0	?	0	0	0	-?	-	-
Policy LPP 5 Allshot's Farm, Rivenhall	0	0	+	0	++	-	-	-	0	?	-	0	0	0	+/-	-?
Policy LPP 6 Business Parks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/-	0	0	-	0	0	-	+	0
Policy LPP 7 Design and Layout of Employment Policy Areas and Business Parks	0	0	+/-	0	+	0	+/-	++	0	0	+/-	0	0	+/-	+	0
Policy LPP 8 Rural Enterprise	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0
Policy LPP 9 Tourist Development within the Countryside	0	0	0	0	++	0	+	+	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	+
Policy LPP 10 Retailing and Regeneration	0	0	0	++	++	0	??	++?	0	?	0	0	0	0	+	+
Policy LPP 11 Primary Shopping Areas	0	0	0	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0
Policy LPP 12 District Centre	0	0	0	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0
Policy LPP 13 Freeport Outlet Centre	0	0	0	+	+	0	-	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0
Policy LPP 14 Leisure and Entertainment	+	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy LPP 15 Retail Warehouse Development	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy LPP 16 Retail Site Allocations	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-?	0	0
Policy LPP 17 Housing Provision and Delivery	0	++	0	0	+	0	0	++?	0	0	-	-?	0	?	0	0
Policy LPP 18 Strategic Growth Location - Land East of Great Notley, South of Braintree	+	++	+/-	+	++	-	++	++	++	?	+	?	0	0	-	-
Policy LPP 19 Strategic Growth Location - Land East of Broad Road, Braintree	+	++	+	+	++/-	-	++	++	++	?	+	0	0	0	-	-?
Policy LPP 20 Strategic Growth Location - Former Towerlands Park Site	+	++	+	+	++	-	+	++	++	?	+	-?	0	0	0	-
Policy LPP 21 Strategic Growth Location - North West Braintree	+/-	++	++	+	++	-	+	++	++	?	0	-	0	0	-	-
Policy LPP 22 Strategic Growth Location - Land at Feering	+	++	+	+	++	-	++	++	++	+	+	-	0	-?	-	-
Policy LPP 23 Strategic Growth Location - Wood End Farm, Witham	+	++	+	+	++	-	+	++	++	?	+	?	0	-?	0	-
Policy LPP 24 Comprehensive Redevelopment Area - Land East of Halstead High Street	+	++	+	+	++	0	+	++	++	0	+	-?	0	0	+	0
Policy LPP 25 Specialist housing - Mount Hill, Halstead	0	?	+/-	+	++	-	+	++	++?	0	0	-	0	0	-	-
Policy LPP 26 Comprehensive Redevelopment Area - Factory Lane West/Kings Road	0	0	+/-	+	++	0	+	++	++	?	+	-	-	0	+	?

Local Plan Policy	SA1: Community safety & cohesion	SA2: Housing	SA3: Health	SA4: Service centre vitality	SA5: Economy	SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	SA7: Sustainable travel	SA8: Accessibility	SA9: Education and skills	SA10: Historic environment	SA11: Climate change mitigation	SA12: Water environment	SA13: Flood risk	SA14: Air quality	SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	SA16: Soil
Policy LPP 27 Comprehensive Redevelopment Area - Former Dutch Nursery, West Street, Coggeshall	+	++	+/-	+	-	-?	+	++/-	++/-	?	0	-	-	0	-	-
Policy LPP 38 Comprehensive Redevelopment Area - Kings Chase	0	0	+/-	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	+	-	0	0	+	0
Policy LPP 29 Newlands Precinct	+	0	+?	+	++	0	+	++	++	+	+	0	+	0	+	0
Policy LPP 30 Rickstones Neighbourhood Centre	+	0	-	+	++	0	+	++	++	?	+	0	0	0	+	0
Policy LPP 31 Comprehensive Redevelopment Area - Land between A12 and GEML, Hatfield Peverel	+	++	+/-	+	++?	-	+	++	+/-	-?	0	-	0	-?	-	-
Policy LPP 32 Residential Allocation Area - Gimsons, Witham	-?	++	+?	+	++	-?	+	++	+	-?	0	-	0	0	-?	?
Policy LPP 33 Affordable Housing	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy LPP 34 Affordable Housing in the Countryside	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy LPP 35 Specialist Housing	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0
Policy LPP 36 Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpersons' Accommodation	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0
Policy LPP 37 Housing Type and Density	+	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy LPP 38 Residential Alterations, Extensions and Outbuildings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 39 Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 40 Rural Workers Dwellings in the Countryside	0	++	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 41 Infill Developments in Hamlets	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 42 Residential Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside	-	++	0	0	-	+	0	-	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0
Policy LPP 43 Garden Extensions	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 44 Sustainable Transport	0	0	+	0	0	0	++	++	0	0	++	0	0	++	0	0
Policy LPP 45 Parking Provision	0	0	+/-	0	0	-?	+/-	++	0	0	+/-	0	0	+/-	0	-?
Policy LPP 46 Protected Lanes	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 47 Transport Related Policy Areas	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 48 New Road Infrastructure	0	0	+/-	0	+	-?	+/-	+	0	-?	+/-	0	0	+/-	-?	0
Policy LPP 49 Broadband	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0
Policy LPP 50 Built and Historic Environment	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 51 An Inclusive Environment	++	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy LPP 52 Health and Wellbeing Impact Assessment	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy LPP 53 Provision for Open Space, Sport and Recreation	+	0	+	0	+	+?	0	+?	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0
Policy LPP 54 Equestrian Facilities	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0
Policy LPP 55 Layout and Design of Development	+	+/-	+	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	0
Policy LPP 56 Conservation Areas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 57 Demolition In Conservation Areas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0

Local Plan Policy	SA1: Community safety & cohesion	SA2: Housing	SA3: Health	SA4: Service centre vitality	SA5: Economy	SA6: Biodiversity and geodiversity	SA7: Sustainable travel	SA8: Accessibility	SA9: Education and skills	SA10: Historic environment	SA11: Climate change mitigation	SA12: Water environment	SA13: Flood risk	SA14: Air quality	SA15: Landscapes and townscapes	SA16: Soil
Policy LPP 58 Shop Fronts, Fascias and Signs in Conservation Areas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 59 Illuminated Signs in Conservation Areas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 60 Heritage Assets and their settings	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy LPP 61 Demolition of Listed Buildings or Structures	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	+	0
Policy LPP 62 Enabling Development	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy LPP 63 Archaeological Evaluation, Excavation and Recording	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	+	0
Policy LPP 64 Educational Establishments	++	0	0	0	+	-	+	++	++	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
Policy LPP 65 Local Community Services and Facilities	++?	0	++?	??	??	-?	??	++?	0	-?	0	-?	↓	0	↓	↓
Policy LPP 66 Cemeteries and Churchyards	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	0	?	0	0	?	-
Policy LPP 67 Natural Environment and Green Infrastructure	0	0	+	0	+	++	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 68 Protected Species, Priority Spaces and Priority Habitat	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Policy LPP 69 Tree Protection	0	0	+	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 70 Protection, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0
Policy LPP 71 Landscape Character and Features	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 72 Green Buffers	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 73 Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	++	+	+
Policy LPP 74 Climate Change	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	+	++	0	??	+	+	+
Policy LPP 75 Energy Efficiency	0	+/-?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	++?	0	0	0	0
Policy LPP 76 Renewable Energy Schemes	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 77 Renewable Energy Within New Developments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	++	0	0
Policy LPP 78 Flooding Risk and Surface Water Drainage	0	0	+	0	0	??	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0	0
Policy LPP 79 Surface Water Management Plan	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	++	++	0	0	0
Policy LPP 80 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems	0	+	+	0	0	??	0	0	0	0	0	??	++	0	0	0
Policy LPP 81 External Lighting	++	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0
Policy LPP 82 Infrastructure delivery and impact mitigation policy	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	++	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0

Cumulative effects assessment

SA objective 1: Create safe environments which improve quality of life and community cohesion

- 11.17 A number of the policies are likely to give rise to significant positive effects due to their contribution to community services (LPP 51 An Inclusive Environment; LPP 64 Educational Establishments; LPP 65 Local Community Services and Facilities), or to creating safe environments (LPP 81 External Lighting). Minor positive effects were identified for a number of other policies.
- 11.18 No significant negative effects on SA objective 1 were identified by the SA of the Publication Draft Local Plan. Potential minor negative effects were identified for a small number of policies (LPP 32 Residential Allocation Area – Gimsons, Witham, LPP 42: Residential Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside) and for two non-strategic site allocations (HASA 295 and WITN 427).
- 11.19 With respect to the non-strategic site allocations, most were assessed as having a neutral effect with a smaller number of minor or uncertain effects also identified.
- 11.20 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was assessed as having minor positive effects on this objective where relevant, predominantly through general place shaping principles and the policy criteria relevant specific to the Garden Communities.
- 11.21 Given the number of significant positive and minor positive effects identified by the SA, it is considered that the Publication Draft Local Plan is likely to have a **significant positive cumulative effect** on SA objective 1.

SA objective 2: To provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home

- 11.22 The Publication Draft Local Plan allocates sufficient sites to meet the objectively assessed housing need for the District through a combination of strategic growth locations and smaller non-strategic sites. In addition, a range of non-site specific policies (LPP 33: Affordable Housing, LPP 34: Affordable Housing in Rural Areas, LPP 35: Specialist Housing, LPP 36: Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showperson's Accommodation, LPP 37: Housing Type and Density, LPP 40: Rural Workers Dwellings in the Countryside, LPP 41: Infill Development in Hamlets, LPP 42: Residential Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside) were found to be likely to give rise to significant positive effects as they provide for a range of needs to meet all sectors of Braintree's population. No significant negative effects and few minor effects were identified.
- 11.23 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was assessed as having significant positive effects in ensuring good quality and inclusive homes.
- 11.24 As a result, a **significant positive cumulative effect** is likely for SA objective 2.

SA objective 3: To improve the health of the Districts' residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities

- 11.25 A significant positive effect (with uncertainty) was identified from provision for expansion of the Essex County Fire and Rescue Headquarters by Policy LPP 4: Kelvedon Park. The requirement in Policy LPP 21 for provision of open space in the North West Braintree Strategic Growth Location also gave rise to a significant positive effect. Policy LPP 52: Health and Wellbeing Impact Assessment was considered likely to result in a significant positive effect because it requires development proposals to assess their impact upon health and well-being, upon the capacity of existing health services and facilities, and the environmental impact and the promotion of health improvement activities. Policy LPP 55: Local Community Services and Facilities was assessed as having a significant positive effect (with uncertainty) due to the protection it gives to existing health facilities and support for enhanced provision.
- 11.26 No significant negative effects were identified from the Local Plan in relation to this SA objective.

- 11.27 Whilst Strategic Growth Locations had mainly minor positive effects, a number of the Comprehensive Redevelopment Areas had negative effects due to their lack of access to primary healthcare facilities and/or natural greenspace, although loss of existing open space was generally avoided.
- 11.28 With respect to the non-strategic site allocations, one site BURE 165, was assessed as having a significant positive effect due to the proposed provision of new open space. The majority of non-strategic sites scored minor positive due to their proximity to primary healthcare facilities but minor negative effects due to relatively poor access to natural greenspace. Nearly all scored minor positive effects for access to open space, with a small number scoring uncertain effects. There were a number identified that are not within easy access to primary healthcare facilities, and these scored minor negative against this SA objective.
- 11.29 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was assessed as having significant positive effects due to a combination of health related infrastructure provision and also adherence to Garden City Principles regarding walking and cycling infrastructure and the provision of open space and recreational facilities.
- 11.30 Overall the Publication Draft Local Plan is likely to give rise to **significant positive cumulative effects** on SA objective 3 mixed with **some minor negative cumulative effects**, reflecting the number of mainly non-strategic sites that are not well located to natural greenspace or primary health facilities.

SA objective 4: To promote the vitality and viability of all service centres throughout the District

- 11.31 The scale of development proposed in the Publication Draft Local Plan, and the focus for development on the Main Towns and Key Service Villages should provide additional demand and use for the existing services and facilities provided by these service centres in the District. Policies LPP 10: Retailing and Regeneration, LPP 11 Primary Shopping Areas, and LPP 12: District Centre scored significant positive effects against this SA objective by continued support for service centres.
- 11.32 All of the Strategic Growth Locations and Comprehensive Redevelopment Areas had minor positive effects on this SA objective, as did a number of the non-strategic site allocations due to their accessibility to primary shopping areas or Local Centres. A minority of non-strategic sites scored minor negative effects as they are more remote from local shops and services.
- 11.33 No significant negative effects were identified. There is a potential risk that the service centre of Halstead could be adversely affected by competition from the greater amounts of new development focused at the other two Main Towns of Braintree (including the out of centre allocations at land north of Freeport and land off Millennium Way) and Witham and the two Garden Communities proposed by Section One of the Local Plan in Braintree District. The two Comprehensive Redevelopment Areas identified for the town should help to mitigate such effects by improving the service offer of the town.
- 11.34 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was assessed as having significant positive effects on the town centre of Braintree as the Spatial Strategy will seek to locate development within such centres in the short-medium term, with long term benefits being experienced in the long term through better infrastructure and connectivity associated with the Garden Communities, particularly regarding public transport networks.
- 11.35 Given the ability of the large scale of development proposed to generate additional demand for goods and services, and the accessibility to service centres for most development proposed in the Publication Draft Local Plan, a **significant positive cumulative effect** is considered likely for this SA objective.

SA objective 5: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth

- 11.36 The Publication Draft Local Plan provides for the amount and types of employment land need identified by the Employment Land Needs Assessment, including some larger sites that were previously provided for in the 2011 Core Strategy. This is reflected in the significant positive

score for Policy LPP 2: Location of Employment Land. Significant positive effects were also identified for Policy LPP 9: Tourism Development within the Countryside, and LPP 10: Retailing and Regeneration due to their support for economic growth.

- 11.37 The allocations at most of the Strategic Growth Locations, Comprehensive Redevelopment Areas and smaller non-strategic sites were assessed as having significant positive effects with respect to broadband internet accessibility. Accessibility of residential allocations to existing employment areas was more mixed with a number scoring minor negative effects as a result.
- 11.38 Potential significant negative effects were identified in relation to two allocations that could result in the sterilisation of mineral resources, the Strategic Growth Locations 'Land East of Broad Road, Braintree (LPP 21) and the non-strategic residential site BOCN 127.
- 11.39 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was assessed as having significant positive effects due to the policy requirement to meet employment land requirements and the choice of locations for the Garden Communities from which existing strategic employment areas are accessible, with further positive effects associated with specific employment provision at each Garden Community and with infrastructure commitments of an enhanced public transport offer to key centres.
- 11.40 Given that the Publication Draft Local Plan seeks to allocate sufficient land to meet employment and other economic needs, and that this land is focused around the main population centres where access to labour can be maximised, a **significant positive cumulative effect** is considered likely.

SA objective 6: To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment

- 11.41 The increase in the area of developed land in the District as a result of the Draft Local Plan will inevitably have an impact on biodiversity. However, greenfield sites do not necessarily exhibit greater biodiversity than urban areas, particularly where they are managed intensively for agriculture. Urban areas can incorporate habitats that are attractive to a range of species, including gardens and green spaces.
- 11.42 The potential for a significant negative effect on biodiversity was identified for one allocation: Policy LPP 27 Comprehensive Redevelopment Area - Former Dutch Nursery, West Street, Coggeshall. This was due to a small proportion of the site being located in Blackwater Plantation Local Wildlife Site. None of the Strategic Growth Locations will result in the loss of designated biodiversity and geodiversity sites, although they will require the use of greenfield land, and so a minor negative effect on biodiversity was assumed. The majority of the non-strategic allocated sites have been assessed as likely to have minor negative effects for the same reason.
- 11.43 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was assessed as having minor positive effects since although it will lead to the development of significant areas of greenfield land, it provides for effective enhancement to green and blue infrastructure for net biodiversity gains.
- 11.44 There are eight policies in the Publication Draft Local Plan that the SA considered to result in significant positive effects on biodiversity due to their provisions for the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity. An even greater number of Local Plan policies were identified as having the potential for minor positive effects. A number of Publication Draft Local Plan policies that seek to safeguard and enhance biodiversity, which are likely to contribute to avoidance or mitigation of the potential negative effects of development.
- 11.45 The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)²⁰ of the Section 2 Local Plan identified potential Likely Significant Effects (LSEs) on the Colne Estuary SPA/Ramsar, Essex Estuaries SAC, and Blackwater Estuary SPA/Ramsar as a result of the effect of recreational impacts in-combination with the Tendring District Part 2 Local Plan, Colchester Borough Section 2 Local Plan, and the Shared Strategic Section 1 for Local Plans which includes the North Essex Authorities of Braintree, Colchester and Tendring.

²⁰ LUC (May 2017) HRA Report for Section 2 of the Braintree Publication Draft Local Plan

- 11.46 The Appropriate Assessment stage identified whether the above LSE would, in light of mitigation and avoidance measures, result in adverse effects on the integrity of the European sites as a result of the in-combination effects identified. Where necessary, suitable mitigation measures and modified policy wording was provided which would enable a sufficient level of certainty to conclude no Adverse Effect on Integrity (AEOI).
- 11.47 The key recommendation made in the HRA Report is for Recreation Avoidance and Mitigation Strategies (RAMS) to be prepared jointly by the North Essex Authorities to mitigate the effect of recreational pressures on the above European Sites. The HRA recommends that this should include provision of alternative open space and green infrastructure, on-site management, and an adaptable approach which responds to regular monitoring of both people and birds. To this end, Natural England and the North Essex Authorities are actively engaging in a strategic, proactive and coordinated approach, and as a result the HRA concluded that there is a high degree of certainty that the impacts identified in the HRA can be avoided.
- 11.48 The HRA found that that the approach being taken by Braintree District Council in addressing the key issues, particularly with regards to working alongside the other North Essex Authorities in relation to strategic growth, is advocated and deemed to be the most appropriate and pragmatic approach in ensuring that Section 2 of the Braintree Publication Draft Local Plan is sound.
- 11.49 The HRA concluded that, provided that key recommendations and mitigation requirements detailed within the HRA Report are fully developed and included within Section 2 of the Braintree Local Plan, including a RAMS which is developed in close consultation with Natural England and can be successfully implemented, there will be no adverse effect on the Colne Estuary SPA/Ramsar, Essex Estuaries SAC, and Blackwater Estuary SPA/Ramsar, either alone or in-combination.
- 11.50 Overall, it is concluded that the Publication Draft Local Plan will result in a **negligible or possibly minor negative cumulative effect** on SA objective 6.

SA objective 7: To promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake

- 11.51 The majority of development proposed by the Publication Draft Local Plan will be close to existing bus or rail services.
- 11.52 Three of the Strategic Growth Location allocations in the Publication Draft Local Plan scored significant positive effects for SA objective 7 – LPP 18: Land East of Great Notley, South of Braintree; LPP 19: Land East of Broad Road, Braintree; and LPP 22: Land at Feering – as these are expected to incorporate a new bus stop served by a frequent service. Nearly all of the remaining strategic and the non-strategic site allocations were assessed as having a minor positive effect on SA objective 7 due to their proximity to existing bus or rail services. The only spatial development policies found to have a minor negative effect due to poor access were Allshot's Farm, Rivenhall (Policy LPP 5) and the non-strategic allocations SIBH 617 and SIBH 377. Policy LPP 13 Freeport Outlet Centre also scored minor negative.
- 11.53 In addition, LPP 40: Sustainable Transport specifically promotes the facilitation of sustainable modes of transport through new developments.
- 11.54 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was assessed as having significant positive effects as the infrastructure requirements of the Garden Communities, in adhering to sustainable transport Garden City Principles, can be expected to offer wider benefits and gain for neighbouring areas, and the geographical distribution of the preferred Garden Community options ensure that these benefits can be experienced across all three authorities with an inclusive coverage across North Essex.
- 11.55 Given the emphasis in the Publication Draft Local Plan on promoting sustainable travel through new development, and the good proximity to, or ease of use of, more sustainable modes of travel, it is considered that the Draft Local Plan will have a **significant positive cumulative effect** on SA objective 7.

SA objective 8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development

- 11.56 The majority of development proposed by the Publication Draft Local Plan will be within or close to existing Main Towns, reducing the need to travel to services, facilities and employment. In addition, as described under SA objective 7, the majority of development proposed by the Publication Draft Local Plan will be close to existing bus or rail services. These circumstances together with the provision of new bus services at the larger new developments mean that most of the spatial development policies in the Publication Draft Local Plan (employment land allocations, retail allocations, Strategic Growth Locations, majority of the non-strategic site allocations, and several of the policies relating to the provision of community services) were assessed as having significant positive effects on this SA objective. There were also a number of policies and non-strategic site allocations that were considered to have minor positive effects.
- 11.57 Significant negative effects were identified in relation to this SA objective for the employment allocation LPP 5: Allshot's Farm because the site is in the open countryside, remote from any service centre; this is exacerbated by an absence of regular bus or rail services within walking distance from the site. Significant negative effects were identified due to the remote locations of the allocations made by Policy LPP 4: Kelvedon Park and LPP 27: Comprehensive Redevelopment Area - Former Dutch Nursery, West Street, Coggeshall, although these two sites do have access to frequent bus services.
- 11.58 Policy LPP 82: Infrastructure delivery and impact mitigation policy requires that there will be sufficient infrastructure availability and capacity to serve new development and that this is sustainable over time. This resulted in significant positive effects on SA objective 8: accessibility and may mitigate the existing poor accessibility of a small number of allocated sites.
- 11.59 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was assessed as having significant positive effects as the infrastructure requirements of the Garden Communities, in adhering to sustainable Garden City Principles can be expected to offer wider benefits and gain, particularly regarding accessibility associated with both transport and services for neighbouring areas, and the geographical distribution of the preferred Garden Community options. This ensures that these benefits can be experienced across all three authorities with an inclusive coverage across North Essex. The Garden Communities are of a sufficient size to stimulate educational infrastructure provision. It should also be noted that the interventionist approach of the North Essex Authorities ensures that both infrastructure provision is self-funded through each Garden Community, and that the approach to their development is one of 'infrastructure first'.
- 11.60 Taken as a whole, the Publication Draft Local Plan seeks to ensure that new development is accessible with respect to community services and facilities, whether existing or proposed, as part of the development proposals, and as a result a **significant positive cumulative effect** on SA objective 8 should result.

SA objective 9: To improve the education and skills of the population

- 11.61 All of the Strategic Growth Locations policies provide for new schools as part of the development proposals for the sites and many of the other housing site allocations are well located to existing primary and/or secondary schools, resulting in significant or minor positive effects for these sites, depending on the distances to the existing schools. A notable minority of non-strategic housing allocations are not in proximity to educational establishments, resulting in minor negative effects for these sites.
- 11.62 Policy LPP 54: Educational Establishments seeks to protect existing educational establishments, and to provide support for new school and educational facilities, resulting in significant positive effects.
- 11.63 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was not explicitly assessed against this SA objective but the SA noted that the Garden Communities are of a sufficient size to stimulate educational infrastructure provision and that this will be self-funded through each Garden Community.
- 11.64 The ability of the planning system to influence educational attainment and skills improvement is limited but it can play its part by ensuring that housing development is well catered for in terms

of access to education, and in this respect the Publication Draft Local Plan scores well. Therefore a **significant positive cumulative effect** is likely to result on SA objective 9.

SA objective 10: To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings

- 11.65 Assessment of the potential effects of site allocations on the historic environment were carried out by Council officers as part of wider site assessments within the SHLAA process, based on a site visit plus relevant desktop sources. The SA resulted in uncertain effects being identified for the majority of the larger site options (>5 ha or >150 dwelling capacity), reflecting the fact that heritage assets exist close to (or in a few cases within) the sites. This was based on GIS mapping which sought to identify designated historic assets up to 1 km distance from the sites subject to SA. However, the Council's site visits did not identify any potential significant effects on the historic environment in relation to these sites, and therefore they were not recorded in the site assessment forms. The Council is of the view that, as the site visits did not reveal significant effects, it is appropriate to carry out detailed assessment of the effects on the historic environment and requirements for mitigation at the planning application stage.
- 11.66 Policies LPP 50: Built and Historic Environment, LPP 56: Conservation Areas, LPP 58: Shop Fronts, Fascias, and Signs in Conservation Areas, LPP 59: Illuminated Signs in Conservation Areas, LPP 60: Heritage Assets and their Settings, LPP 61: Demolition of Listed Buildings or Structures, LPP 62: Enabling Development, and LPP 53: Archaeological Evaluation, Excavation and Recording were all assessed as having significant positive effects on this SA objective. This indicates that strong policy safeguards within the Publication Draft Local Plan are in place that seek to ensure the delivery of development will not have an adverse effect on the historic environment of the District.
- 11.67 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was assessed as having minor positive effects. There could be a perceived negative cumulative impact on the historic environment associated with strategic development at the scale proposed for the Garden Communities, but despite this, the policies have taken on board those recommendations of the Preferred Options SA and ensure that protection will occur in all instances with enhancement a significant possibility. Forthcoming masterplanning and Garden Community specific DPDs have the potential to enhance site specific assets and their settings and deliver a high quality built environment. Although a degree of uncertainty surrounds the status and content of the masterplans and DPDs and whether their content is appropriate to individual assets and designations, the general distribution of growth across the strategic area and the Section One policy content seeks to address any perceived or possible effects on the historic environment.
- 11.68 Notwithstanding the policy safeguards within the Publication Draft Local Plan it was not possible to conclude whether a number of site allocations would have significant effects in relation to this SA objective and an **uncertain cumulative effect** on SA objective 10 is therefore recorded.

SA objective 11: To reduce contributions to climate change

- 11.69 Given the scale of growth to be delivered by the Publication Draft Local Plan, it is inevitable that this will contribute to increased greenhouse gas emissions, through construction and use of materials, heating and lighting, and the generation of traffic. This has resulted in significant negative effect being assessed for Policy LPP 17 Housing Provision and Delivery.
- 11.70 Aside from this, the Publication Draft Local Plan has been assessed on the principle of whether it is likely to keep these increased greenhouse gas emissions to a minimum. Most of the effects on greenhouse gas emissions from policies in the Publication Draft Local Plan are likely to result in either negligible or minor effects, sometimes positive, sometimes negative, but rarely significant. The following policies were, however, assessed as having significant positive effects: Policy LPP 44: Sustainable Transport, which encourages the use of more sustainable transport modes of transport; LPP 67: Natural Environment and Green Infrastructure, which requires proposals to take account of the potential effects of climate change in their design, and to propose measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions where necessary; LPP 74: Climate Change, which requires developments to include climate change mitigation principles in their design and which supports

renewable and low carbon technologies; and Policies LPP 75 Energy Efficiency, LPP 76: Renewable Energy Schemes, and LPP 77: Renewable Energy within New Developments, which seek to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and encourage the development of renewable energy sources and their use in new developments.

- 11.71 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was assessed as having a negligible impact on this SA objective.
- 11.72 Even though the Publication Draft Local Plan includes policies to encourage the use of sustainable transport, energy efficient development, and the use of renewable energy, it is unlikely that these will fully offset the carbon emissions generated by new development and associated traffic. Overall **the cumulative effect is not expected to be minor negative** in relation to SA objective 11.

SA objective 12: To improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity

- 11.73 The scale of development proposed is likely to place additional demands on scarce water resources, on the capacity of the sewer network to carry waste water to WRCs, and on the capacity of these WRCs to treat the waste water.
- 11.74 The Water Cycle Study indicates that four WRCs (Bocking, Braintree, Coggeshall and White Notley) do not have sufficient capacity to serve proposed future development across the District. Without further action, increased wastewater resulting from development could exceed environmental permits and have negative effects on the quality of watercourses with negative effects on SA Objective 12. However, the WCS concludes that it is feasible to upgrade these four WRCs to ensure that watercourses are not significantly harmed.
- 11.75 Two of the Strategic Growth Locations were assessed as having a significant negative effect in relation to SA objective 12. For LPP 21 North West Braintree and LPP 22 Land at Feering, this was due to limited capacity in the sewage network serving the sites and the consequent potential for combined sewer overflows or direct sewer flooding to pollute water bodies; the latter site is also served by Feering WRC, which would require upgrades to serve the proposed growth. Similar issues were identified for two non-strategic sites, BOCN 127 and KELV 337. Minor negative effects were identified for a number of sites due to the potential for groundwater contamination from development within source protection zones.
- 11.76 The Draft Local Plan includes a number of policy safeguards regarding the water environment, most notably within LPP 70: Protection, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity; LPP 73: Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards; LPP 75: Energy Efficiency, which also encourages reduced water consumption and increased water recycling, LPP 79: Surface Water Management Plan, and LPP 80: Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems, most of which were assessed as having significant positive effects on this SA objective.
- 11.77 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was assessed as having uncertain effects. Whilst it can reasonably be assumed that there could be likely negative implications regarding water scarcity and sewerage emanating from Section One due to the scale of growth stated in Policy SP2, the implications of this are best resolved on a site-by-site basis through early discussions with service providers on a plan-level and in certain areas as required. In the specific context of Garden Communities, Policy SP7 seeks to ensure that such issues are not forthcoming from any successful planning application.
- 11.78 Notwithstanding some localised constraints with the water supply and wastewater network which need to be resolved and agreed between the relevant developer and water company, overall the water cycle study concludes there are no constraints with respect to water service infrastructure and the water environment to deliver the Local Plan development, on the basis that strategic water resource options and wastewater solutions are developed in advance of development coming forward. In light of this conclusion and the policy safeguards provided by the Publication Draft Local Plan polices referenced above and the Environment Agency's consenting regimes for

water abstraction and discharges, a **negligible cumulative effect** is recorded on SA objective 12.

SA objective 13: To reduce the risk of flooding

- 11.79 The assessment of the site allocations in the Publication Draft Local Plan identified very few effects with respect to flood risk. Two sites were considered to have a potentially significant negative effect: the Comprehensive Redevelopment Area at Factory Lane West/Kings Road (Policy LPP 28) and a site safeguarded for community facilities at Butler Road, Halstead (Policy LPP 65: Local Community Services and Facilities). There were, in addition, a small number of sites with minor negative effects but most were neutral.
- 11.80 Increased urban development and hardstanding can increase flood risk, for example from run-off and over-flowing water drainage networks during times of extreme rainfall events. Several policies in the Publication Draft Local Plan seek to address such issues and hence scored significant positive effects, being LPP 78: Flooding Risk and Surface Water Drainage; LPP 79: Surface Water Management Plan; and LPP 80: Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems:
- 11.81 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was assessed as having negligible effects as no significant flood risk concerns were identified from the policies and Garden Communities.
- 11.82 Overall the cumulative effect is expected to be negligible on SA objective 13.

SA objective 14: To improve air quality

- 11.83 There are no Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) in Braintree District. However, it is likely that the scale of development proposed in the Publication Draft Local Plan will generate additional road traffic, which is the main source of air pollution in the District. The SA assumed that residential and other sensitive developments within 200 m of the A12 or A120 would be most affected by air pollution from existing and new road traffic.
- 11.84 Two of the strategic growth locations, LPP 22: Land at Feering, and LPP 23: Wood End Farm, Witham, were assessed as having significant negative effects due to their proximity to the A12 or A120, as were the smaller site allocations at Kelvedon Park (LPP 4), the retail allocation Land Off Millennium Way (LPP 16), and the Comprehensive Redevelopment Area on land between the A12 and GEML (LPP 31).
- 11.85 The Publication Draft Local Plan contains a number of policies that were considered to have significant positive effects with respect to SA objective 14, because they would help to mitigate air pollution arising from development and associated traffic. These were LPP 44: Sustainable Transport, LPP 73: Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards, and LPP 77: Renewable Energy Within New Developments.
- 11.86 A small number of policies was considered to have either minor positive effects or minor negative effects, with some assessed as having mixed minor effects.
- 11.87 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was assessed as having minor positive effects. There are no identified implications regarding air quality of the specific content of the policies and preferred Garden Community options contained in the Strategic Part for Local Plans. The Garden Community allocations, as per the Spatial Strategy, correspond to the best possible dispersal across the HMA to alleviate air quality issues in Colchester and associated with the A12 and A120. The stance of allocating Garden Communities as opposed to urban extensions seeks partly to ensure that new growth does not impact on AQMAs, such as those found in Colchester town. It can be expected that there could be some general negative connotations on air quality associated with the level of growth required in North Essex, however the distribution of growth and the policies of Section One seek to address this adequately.
- 11.88 Given that emissions to air are likely to increase as a result of development proposed in the Draft Local Plan, but that only a small number of development locations are likely to be affected, and that there are policies in the Publication Draft Local Plan which will help to mitigate air pollution, a **minor negative cumulative effect** is considered likely in relation to SA objective 14.

SA objective 15: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes

- 11.89 The scale of development proposed within the Draft Local Plan in comparison with the extent of existing development and the inevitable development of greenfield sites will undoubtedly have an effect on the landscape and townscape of the District. It will become more developed, and the sense of increased urbanisation will be felt particularly in and around the Main Towns of Braintree (including Great Notley), and Witham, as well as the two proposed Garden Communities. However, the loss of greenfield land will not necessarily result in a significant adverse effect on the landscape if developments are well designed and in less sensitive landscapes.
- 11.90 With respect to SA objective 15, a range of criteria was used in the SA in order to come to judgements on site allocations. These comprised the sensitivity of the landscape to accommodate development (as defined by the Landscape Character Assessment), whether the site would be within the proposed Dedham Vale AONB extension, whether the site is greenfield or brownfield, whether it would affect Visually Important Spaces, and whether it would affect country parks.
- 11.91 Using these criteria, none of the Strategic Growth Locations, and only eight of the non-strategic site allocations were assessed as having a significant negative effect. Of these, one site (BURE 165) is within the proposed Dedham Vale AONB extension and the remainder are in areas of high landscape sensitivity. A larger number of sites were considered to have minor negative effects in terms of landscape sensitivity of the location, or because they would involve the use of greenfield land, or both.
- 11.92 The Publication Draft Local Plan includes a large number of policies that seek to ensure that development within the countryside does not have an adverse effect on the landscape. Similarly, there are a large number of policies that set down criteria for the design of development to ensure landscape and townscape character is respected. These are anticipated to result in a range of significant or minor positive effects.
- 11.93 The loss of greenfield land to development needs to be acknowledged in the SA but in most instances the most sensitive landscapes have been avoided. The Publication Draft Local Plan includes strong safeguards to ensure that development does not significantly affect the open countryside and more rural areas, and that development is well designed. If well designed, some development may, in time, come to be considered to have a positive effect on the landscape of Braintree District, given that the towns and villages of the District which have developed and evolved over time are an integral component of the its landscape and character.
- 11.94 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was assessed as having uncertain effects on landscapes. These effects are relevant to the specific Garden Community allocations themselves. Potential negative effects are associated with the scale of development required on Greenfield land, however policy exists to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings in each instance and within the context of wider landscape character areas. Beyond the principles contained in Policies SP8-SP10, masterplanning and the Garden Community specific DPDs have further potential to mitigate and minimise site specific issues and delivery a high quality built environment.
- 11.95 For these reasons, it is difficult to come to an overall judgement on the cumulative effects of the proposals and policies in the Draft Local Plan, and how significant these will be. It is concluded that the Publication Draft Local Plan will result in **mixed cumulative effects** on SA objective 15, and that using the objective criteria for assessing sites these are unlikely to be significant, although perceptions of significance (both negative and positive) are likely to vary depending upon individual views.

SA objective 16: To safeguard and enhance the quality of soil

- 11.96 Given that the majority of development proposed in the Draft Local Plan is to be delivered on greenfield land, this will be lost to agriculture. The test of significance for the SA is whether the greenfield land allocated for development is defined as best and most versatile agricultural land, particularly grades 1 and 2.
- 11.97 Five of the Strategic Growth Locations, the allocation for expansion of Essex County emergency services headquarters, one of the employment allocations, one of the Comprehensive

Redevelopment Areas, some of the educational, community and cemetery allocations and 11 of the non-strategic housing allocations will result in the loss of grade 1 or 2 agricultural land and were therefore considered to have a significant negative effect (in a few cases subject to uncertainty about the footprint of new development) on this SA objective. A further eight site allocations were considered to have a minor negative effect.

- 11.98 The SA of site allocations in relation to this objective also considered whether development would be likely to lead to the remediation of a contaminated site. Whilst a number of allocations are on land thought to be contaminated, site allocation policies do not make remediation a condition of allocation for any of these, thus significant positive effects were identified. Instead the minority of sites thought to be on contaminated land scored mostly uncertain effects as it was not known whether remediation will be a condition of development.
- 11.99 The Strategic Section One for Local Plans was assessed as having uncertain effects on soils. There will be minimal effects on safeguarding mineral deposits and the quality of soil associated with the policy content of Section One. The Garden Community allocation at West of Braintree contains a site allocated within the ECC Minerals Local Plan for mineral extraction. Although not considered an insurmountable problem, the implications of this are that the North Essex Authorities will have to work with the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority and the landowner / developer of this minerals site to seek compromises surrounding the restoration of the site for a use compatible with Garden City principles at the masterplanning stage and within the Garden Community specific DPD for West of Braintree.
- 11.100 Whilst a number of Publication Draft Local Plan policies directly seek to protect soils or indirectly benefit soils by seeking to protect the countryside by prioritising development in existing centres (thereby scoring minor positive effects in relation to this SA objective) the fact remains that a considerable amount of best and most versatile agricultural land will be developed, and therefore an irreversible **significant negative cumulative effect** will result.

DRAFT

12 Monitoring

Monitoring

- 12.1 The SEA Regulations require that 'the responsible authority shall monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of each plan or programme with the purpose of identifying unforeseen adverse effects at an early stage and being able to undertake appropriate remedial action' and that the environmental report should provide information on 'a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring'.
- 12.2 Although National Planning Practice Guidance states that monitoring should be focused on the significant environmental effects of implementing the Local Plan, the reasons for this is to enable local planning authorities to identify unforeseen adverse effects at an early stage and to enable appropriate remedial actions. Since effects which the SA expects to be minor may become significant and vice versa, monitoring measures have been proposed in this SA Report in relation to all of the SA objectives in the SA framework. As the Local Plan is implemented and the likely significant effects become more certain, the Council may wish to narrow down the monitoring framework to focus on those effects of the Local Plan likely to be significantly adverse.
- 12.3 Table 12.1 sets out a number of suggested indicators for monitoring the potential sustainability effects of implementing the Local Plan. The data used for monitoring in many cases will be provided by outside bodies, for example the Environment Agency. It is therefore recommended that the Council remains in dialogue with statutory environmental consultees and other stakeholders and works with them to agree the relevant sustainability effects to be monitored and to obtain information that is appropriate, up to date and reliable.

Table 12.1 Proposed Monitoring Framework for Braintree District Local Plan

SA objectives	Proposed monitoring indicators
1) Create safe environments which improve quality of life and community cohesion	<p>Recorded key offences</p> <p>KSI casualties for adults and children</p> <p>Public perceptions on leisure / community facilities.</p> <p>Street level crime statistics.</p>
2) Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home	<p>House Prices.</p> <p>Indices of Multiple Deprivation Score – particularly Housing and Services Domain and the Living Environment Deprivation Domain.</p> <p>Number of affordable dwelling completions.</p> <p>Annual dwelling completions.</p> <p>Population projections and forecasts.</p>
3) Improve the health of the Districts' residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities	<p>Life Expectancy.</p> <p>Indices of Multiple Deprivation – Health and Disability sub-domain scores.</p> <p>Residents' opinion on availability of open space/leisure facilities.</p> <p>Location and extent of accessible open space to development site.</p> <p>Natural England Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt).</p> <p>Location and extent of recreational facilities to development site.</p> <p>Location and extent of accessible greenspace to development site.</p> <p>Proximity of site to healthcare facilities</p> <p>Percentage of population obese.</p> <p>Number of GPs and dentists accepting new patients.</p> <p>Number or % of open spaces receiving Green Flag Award.</p>
4) Promote the vitality and viability of all service centres throughout the District	<p>Amount of retail, leisure and office floorspace in town centres.</p> <p>Implemented and outstanding planning permissions for retail, office and commercial use.</p> <p>Number and type of services from Rural Services Study.</p> <p>Number of post offices closed down.</p> <p>Number of village shops closed down.</p> <p>Pedestrian footfall count.</p>
5) Achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth	<p>Employment land availability.</p> <p>Typical amount of job creation (jobs per ha) within different use classes.</p> <p>Percentage change and comparison in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area.</p> <p>Businesses by industry type.</p> <p>Amount of vacant industrial floorspace.</p> <p>Amount of high quality agricultural land.</p> <p>Travel to work flows.</p> <p>Employment status by residents and job type.</p> <p>Job densities.</p> <p>Economic activity of residents.</p> <p>Average gross weekly pay.</p> <p>Proportion of business in rural locations.</p> <p>Implemented and outstanding planning permissions for retail, office</p>

SA objectives	Proposed monitoring indicators
	<p>and commercial use.</p> <p>Number of minerals sites safeguarded for extraction.</p> <p>Current and planned broadband coverage.</p>
<p>6) Conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment</p>	<p>Spatial extent of designated sites within the District.</p> <p>Achievement of Biodiversity Action Plan targets.</p> <p>Ecological potential assessments.</p> <p>Distance from site to nearest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSSIs. • NNR. • LWS. • Ancient Woodland. • Protected lanes. • Other sensitive designated or non-designated receptors. • Other special landscape features. <p>Condition of the nearest sensitive receptors (where viable).</p> <p>Site visit surveys on typical abundance and frequency of habitats (DAFOR scale).</p> <p>Number of % of permitted developments providing biodiversity value e.g. green/brown roof, living wall, native planting.</p>
<p>7) Promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake</p>	<p>Access to services and business' by public transport.</p> <p>Indices of Multiple Deprivation.</p> <p>Travel to work methods and flows.</p> <p>Car ownership.</p> <p>Network performance on roads.</p> <p>Public transport punctuality and efficiency.</p> <p>Length of Public Rights of Way created/enhanced; number of Rights of Way Improvement Plans implemented.</p>
<p>8) Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development</p>	<p>Residents' opinions on availability of open space/leisure facilities.</p> <p>Access to services by public transport.</p> <p>Indices of Multiple Deprivation – sub-domain scores.</p> <p>Recorded traffic flows.</p> <p>KSI casualties for adults and children.</p> <p>Car ownership.</p> <p>Location of site with regards to areas of high deprivation.</p> <p>Transport Assessments.</p>
<p>9) Improve the education and skills of the population</p>	<p>Additional capacity of local schools.</p> <p>GCSE or equivalent performance.</p> <p>Level 2 qualifications by working age residents.</p> <p>Level 4 qualifications and above by working age residents.</p> <p>Employment status of residents.</p> <p>Average gross weekly earnings.</p> <p>Standard Occupational Classification.</p>

SA objectives	Proposed monitoring indicators
10) Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings	<p>Number and % of Listed Buildings (all grades), Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields, Places of Worship, conservation areas, locally listed heritage assets at Risk.</p> <p>% of Conservation Areas with an up-to-date character appraisal.</p> <p>% of Conservation Areas with published management proposals.</p> <p>Number of historic buildings repaired and brought back into use.</p> <p>% of local authority area covered by historic characterisation studies.</p> <p>Area of highly sensitive historic landscape characterisation type(s) which have been altered and their character eroded.</p> <p>Number of major development projects that enhance the significance of heritage assets or historic landscape character.</p> <p>Number of major development projects that detract from the significance of heritage assets or historic landscape character.</p> <p>Improvements in the management of historic and archaeological sites and features.</p> <p>% change in visits to historic sites.</p> <p>% of planning applications where archaeological investigations were required prior to approval.</p> <p>% of planning applications where archaeological mitigation strategies (were developed and implemented).</p> <p>Number and extent of street / public realm audits.</p> <p>Number of actions taken in response to breach of listed building control.</p>
11) Reduce contributions to climate change	<p>Carbon Dioxide emissions.</p> <p>Energy consumption GWh/households.</p> <p>Percentage of energy supplied from renewable sources.</p> <p>Code for Sustainable Homes certificates.</p>
12) Improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity	<p>Percentage of water bodies at good ecological status or potential.</p> <p>Percentage of water bodies assessed at good or high biological status.</p> <p>Percentage of water bodies assessed at good chemical status.</p> <p>Water cycle study capacity in sewerage and resources.</p>
13) Reduce the risk of flooding	<p>Spatial extent of flood zones 2 and 3</p> <p>Residential properties flooded from main rivers</p> <p>Planning permission in identified flood zones granted permission contrary to advice from the Environment Agency</p> <p>Incidences of flooding and location</p> <p>Distance of site to floodplains</p> <p>SFRA results</p> <p>Incidences of flood warnings in site area</p> <p>Distance to 'Areas susceptible to surface water flooding' – EA Maps</p> <p>Number or % of permitted developments incorporating SuDS</p>
14) Improve air quality	<p>Number and spatial extent of potentially significant junctions for air quality in the District</p> <p>NO₂ emissions</p> <p>PM10 emissions</p>

SA objectives	Proposed monitoring indicators
	Recorded traffic flows on A12 and A120
15) Maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	Developments permitted contrary to Landscape Character Assessment 'sensitivities to change'. Number and extent of field boundaries affected. Development on previously developed land or conversion of existing buildings. Number of permitted developments within Conservation Areas.
16) Safeguard and enhance the quality of soil	Area of high quality agricultural land in District. Number or area of contaminated sites remediated.

DRAFT

13 Next steps

Next steps

- 13.1 The SEA Regulations require that authorities with environmental responsibility and the public be given an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinion on the draft plan or programme and the accompanying environmental report before the adoption of the plan or programme
- 13.2 To meet this requirement, the views of the three statutory consultees (Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency) and those of the public are being sought on both the Publication Draft Local Plan and this SA Report from 16th June to 28th July 2017. This is also known as 'Regulation 19²¹ consultation'.
- 13.3 Following consultation on the Publication Draft Local Plan, the next stage in the Local Plan preparation process will be the Submission stage (Regulation 22²²). The Council will submit the Local Plan and any proposed changes it considers appropriate along with supporting documents to the Planning Inspectorate for examination on behalf of the Secretary of State.
- 13.4 The submitted documents will include those that were made available at the Publication stage (updated as necessary), including details of who was consulted when preparing the Local Plan (at Regulation 18 stage) and how the main issues raised have been addressed. The Council will also include details of the representations made following publication of the Local Plan and a summary of the main issues raised.
- 13.5 It may be necessary to carry out further SA work at this stage, in response to consultation comments received or to appraise proposed major modifications to the Publication Draft Local Plan in order to inform the examination of the Submission Local Plan.

LUC
May 2017

²¹ Of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

²² Of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012