

Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Stratford Neighbourhood Plan

SEA Environmental Report

March 2017



LEPUS CONSULTING
LANDSCAPE, ECOLOGY, PLANNING & URBAN SUSTAINABILITY

Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan

Environmental Report

LC-268	Document Control Box
Client	Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Stratford-on-Avon District Council
Report Title	Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan: Environmental Report
Status	Final
Filename	LC-268_Stratford_NDP_SEA_Postconsultation_10_210317RB
Date	March 2017
Author	Molly Gallagher
Review	Russell Buckley
Approved	Neil Davidson

Contents

1	Introduction	8
1.1	Introduction	8
1.2	History of the NDP	8
1.3	The SEA process	9
1.4	Best Practice Guidance	10
1.5	Aims of the NDP	13
1.6	Structure of the NDP	14
1.7	Meeting the SEA Directive requirements	18
1.8	How the NDP SEA has evolved	19
1.9	Relationship with the Core Strategy	21
2	Scoping	22
2.1	Introduction	22
2.2	Policy, plan and programme review	22
2.3	Baseline Data and Information	23
2.4	The SEA Framework	23
3	Reasonable Alternatives	25
3.1	Introduction	25
3.2	Reasonable Alternatives	26
3.3	Assessing the do nothing scenario	28
3.4	Identifying reasonable alternatives and preferred options	28
3.5	Reasons for the selection of the preferred alternatives	29
3.6	Key SEA issues	32
4	Appraisal Methodology	35
4.1	Assessment of the Stratford-upon-Avon NDP	35
4.2	Approach to the appraisal	35
4.3	Geographic scale	37
4.4	Impact magnitude	38
4.5	In-combination effects assessment	38
4.6	Sources	39
4.7	Assumptions	40
5	Appraisal Findings	43
5.1	Introduction	43
5.2	Development Strategy and Housing	43
5.3	Employment	48
5.4	Town Centre	52
5.5	Built Environment and Design	69
5.6	Natural Environment	77
5.7	Infrastructure	80
5.8	Community, Leisure and Wellbeing	87
5.9	Site Specific Briefs	96
5.10	Assessment of in-combination effects	101
6	Significant effects and mitigation	105
6.1	Introduction	105
6.2	Significant effects, mitigation and uncertainty	105
6.3	SEA Objective 1 (Historic and cultural features)	105

6.4	SEA Objective 3 (Biodiversity and geodiversity)	106
6.5	SEA Objective 4 (Flooding).....	106
6.6	SEA Objective 5 (Minimise climate change)	107
6.7	SEA Objective 6 (Plan for climate change).....	107
6.8	SEA Objective 7 (Natural resources)	107
6.9	SEA Objective 9 (Waste)	108
6.10	SEA Objective 10 (Transport)	108
6.11	SEA Objective 12 (Countryside)	108
6.12	SEA Objective 14 (Health).....	109
7	Recommendations to enhance environmental performance.....	110
7.1	Introduction	110
7.2	Recommendations for enhancement	110
8	Monitoring	112
8.1	Monitoring proposals.....	112
8.2	Links with the Annual Monitoring Report	114
9	Next Steps	116
9.2	Commenting on the Environmental Report.....	117
10	References	118

Appendix A: SEA Framework

Appendix B: Assessment Protocol

Appendix C: Alternatives assessments

Appendix D: Do Nothing Assessments

List of Tables

1.1	List of NDP policies
1.2	Meeting the requirements of the SEA directive
2.1	SEA Objectives
3.1	Reasonable alternatives to Policy H3 of the Pre-Submission NDP policies
4.1	Key to the matrix assessment
4.2	Geographic Scales
4.3	Key data sources
5.1	Assessment of in-combination effects
8.1	Discussion of effects to be monitored

List of Figures

1.1	SEA stages presented in the DCLG guidance
-----	---

Acronyms

AA	Appropriate Assessment
DAM	Detailed Assessment Matrix
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government
DEFRA	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
DPD	Development Plan Document
EIA	Ecological Impact Assessment
GI	Green Infrastructure
LDF	Local Development Framework
NDP	Neighbourhood Development Plan
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
ODPM	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
PAS	Planning Advisory Service
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
PPP	Policies, Plans and Programmes
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SSB	Site specific brief

Non-Technical Summary

What is Strategic Environmental Assessment?

Lepus Consulting is conducting a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP), on behalf of Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Stratford-on-Avon District Council. SEA is the process of informing and influencing the preparation of the NDP to optimise the environmental performance of the plan.

This document is known as an Environmental Report (SEA Report). It includes the requirements of an environmental report in accordance with the SEA Directive.

Purpose and content of the Environmental Report

The purpose of this Environmental Report is to:

- Identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effect of the plan on environmental factors;
- Suggest measures by which any adverse effects could be mitigated;
- Make recommendations to improve the environmental performance of the plan; and
- Provide an effective opportunity for statutory consultees, interested parties and the public to offer views on any aspect of the SEA process that has been carried out to date.

The Environmental Report contains:

- An outline of the contents and main objectives of the NDP and its relationship with other relevant plans, programmes and strategies;
- The SEA Framework of objectives and indicators against which the plan has been assessed;
- A summary of the reasonable alternatives stage of the NDP;
- The likely significant effects of the NDP in environmental terms;
- The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects which may arise as a result of the plan;
- A description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring; and
- The next steps for the SEA.

This report is one in a series of SEA Reports that have been prepared to facilitate an iterative and informative approach to SEA for the NDP. The stages of plan preparation and the associated SEA work is detailed below.

The screening stage

Lepus Consulting undertook a screening assessment of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan in September 2013¹, to determine whether the NDP should be screened into the SEA process. This assessment determined that the NDP had potential to lead to likely significant effects on the environment, thus it was screened in, in accordance with the SEA Directive.

The scoping stage

The first stage of the SEA was to prepare a Scoping Report² to outline the background to environmental issues in Stratford-upon-Avon and use this information to develop a framework against which to assess environmental impacts of the plan.

The Scoping Report identified relevant plans, policies and programmes and baseline information relating to environmental issues in Stratford-upon-Avon. This information was then used to identify the key environmental issues in Stratford-upon-Avon. The key environmental issues were then used as a basis to set out a series of objectives for environmental protection and prepare a SEA framework, against which the plan was to be assessed.

Assessment of reasonable alternatives

In the UK, reasonable alternatives are commonly referred to as 'options'. The assessment of reasonable alternatives refers to the plan making process stage of exploring policy options. The NDP Steering Group started the plan-making process with an identification of potential development policies and sites via the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), a call for sites, and through the Stratford-on-Avon District Council Proposed Submission Core Strategy (2014). The Steering Group came to the decision that there were reasonable alternatives for Policy H3, Local Service Village Allocations.

All reasonable alternatives for Policy H3, as identified by the NDP Steering Group, were assessed by Lepus Consulting in June 2015. Assessment findings were sent to the NDP Steering Group in order to inform the selection of preferred options. In addition, policy BE7 Sustainable Drainage was identified in the Pre-Submission Draft Consultation and not included in the Updated Pre-Submission Draft. It has been assessed here as a reasonable alternative.

¹ Lepus Consulting (2013) Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan: Screening Document

² Lepus Consulting (2014) Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan: Final Scoping Report

The main findings and assessment results of these options stages are discussed in **Chapter 3**. Assessment results for reasonable alternatives are presented in **Appendix C**.

Following consultation on the NDP under Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations the decision was taken to undertake a consultation on the SEA. The consultation took place from 3rd October 2016 to the 7th November 2016. Following receipt of consultation comments, the decision was taken to review those alternatives considered in the SEA process to date and in turn whether any further reasonable alternatives could be identified. This process led to the decision to assess additional alternatives to Policies H1 and H2, the assessments for which are presented in Appendix C. The decision was also taken to assess the 'do nothing' scenario for all policies and projects, the assessment of which is set out in Appendix D.

Draft NDP

A working draft of the NDP was published in January 2013. The plan was subsequently reviewed taking into account consultation responses received, and outcomes of the Core Strategy examination. Due to the preliminary nature of this draft, no SEA work was undertaken.

Pre-Submission NDP

The NDP was subject to Pre-Submission Consultation in October 2015. An SEA of the Pre-Submission NDP was prepared and consulted on from the 3rd October 2016 to the 7th November 2016. The Pre-Submission NDP which was consulted upon in May 2015 did not include an SEA consultation at that time. Although an SEA was in draft based on the Pre-submission NDP, the likely changes as a result of the emerging Core Strategy meant that it was not prudent to carry out a full SEA consultation on the draft NDP. Once the Core Strategy had become adopted, the NDP was finalised with some certainty and the SEA prepared in full and consulted upon.

Submission NDP

This report presents a SEA of the submission version of the NDP. The assessment of the NDP was undertaken using a combination of empirical evidence, and to a lesser extent, professional judgement. The findings are presented in matrix format and are accompanied by a commentary on identified effects. The matrix is not a conclusive tool. Its main function is to show visually whether or not the proposed options are likely to bring positive, adverse or uncertain effects in relation to the SEA Objectives. The commentary provides a written description of the findings of the assessment.

The established likely positive significant effects on each SEA Objective are presented in **Table N1**. **Table N2** provides summary details of some potentially significant negative effects on each SEA Objective. Some effects have been associated with uncertain environmental

performance, meaning they could be either positive, negative or possibly both depending on the range of receptors that may be affected. In the case of any potential negative or uncertain effects, recommendations are made in terms of mitigation and monitoring.

Table N1: Potential positive environmental effects of the NDP

Potential positive environmental effects of the NDP
Historic and cultural features
The plan allocations are expected to be sympathetic to their surroundings. None of the allocations require direct demolition or degradation of a listed building or historic site or feature.
Landscape and townscape
Many policies include the protection or enhancement of landscape and townscape, through protecting distinctive features and using landscaping to protect the visual amenity of existing development.
Biodiversity and geodiversity
The NDP contains policies that are likely to contribute to supporting local biodiversity and connectivity of green spaces across the plan area, as well as a policy to create a new local nature reserve.
Flooding and climate change
The plan includes policies that are expected to help Stratford-upon-Avon mitigate and adapt to the impacts of future climate change. Site allocations are located primarily within Flood Zone 1, which is land at low risk of flooding. Policies in the NDP encourage development that includes sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS). The incorporation of green space and planting in and around development may also be beneficial in the light of future climate change.
Natural resources and countryside
By encouraging development within and adjacent to current built up area boundaries, the plan restricts encroachment of development into the countryside. The plan prioritises development on brownfield land and aims to improve previously developed land.
Pollution
Some policies are expected to reduce traffic and congestion in the Stratford-upon-Avon air quality management area (AQMA), which is likely to contribute towards improving local air quality.
Waste
Re-use of previously developed land and existing buildings may help minimise waste building materials.
Transport and rural barriers
Sustainable transport accessibility is generally good in and around Stratford-upon-Avon, particularly public transport links.
Housing
The plan has very positive impacts on housing as it is expected to meet the type and number of dwellings required in the area over the plan period.
Health

Potential positive environmental effects of the NDP
Accessibility to health and recreation services is generally good across the plan area, including for the allocated sites. Services are either within a reasonable walking distance or accessible by public transport.
Economy
The plan is expected to improve the local economy, both directly through allocating business floorspace and encouraging job creation, as well as by making the plan area more attractive to visitors.

Table N2: Potential negative environmental effects of the NDP

Potential negative environmental effects of the NDP and areas for improvement
Historic and cultural features
Some site allocations are in areas of high archaeological potential or are on the site of known archaeological features, such as ridge and furrow. Development may lead to loss of archaeological features.
Landscape and townscape
No negative effects were identified with regards to landscape as the NDP includes policies that would prevent development that is out of character with the existing landscape and townscape.
Biodiversity and geodiversity
Most site allocations are on greenfield land. The environmental quality of this land should be investigated before development and areas or features of particular value should be avoided or mitigated where necessary.
Flooding and climate change
Some development supported by the plan may be located in Flood Zones 2 or 3, which is land at high risk of flooding. The extent of development outside of Flood Zone 1 is unknown, as many policies do not specify development sites for new services and facilities. Development is likely to increase the area of non-permeable surfaces in the locality, which may exacerbate local flood risk both now and in the future. The NDP contains some policies that may lead to loss of green infrastructure, which could reduce the ability of Stratford-upon-Avon to adapt to future climate change.
Natural resources and countryside
Development may lead to loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.
Pollution
No negative effects were identified with regards to pollution.
Waste
Some policies have potential to generate waste from building demolition. Other policies have potential to lead to land use that would increase waste production in the operational phase.
Transport and rural barriers
Alveston generally has poor public transport links and has a lower accessibility to services and facilities than other parts of the plan area.
Health

Potential negative environmental effects of the NDP and areas for improvement
Alveston generally has poor access to health and recreation services. Some allocations may result in the loss of recreational space, which could have negative implications for health if this loss is not adequately compensated for.
Economy
No negative effects were identified with regards to pollution.

Mitigation

In cases where potentially adverse effects have been identified through uncertainty, mitigation suggestions have been given in **Chapter 6**. Mitigation should be considered as part of a sequential hierarchy to deal with adverse effects: avoid, reduce, and then compensate. Mitigation measures might include changes to policy wording, advocating design guides, offsetting biodiversity effects or provision of new supporting green infrastructure. In the case of this SEA Report, mitigation has been supplied to help address potential negative effects associated with classifications of uncertainty or adverse effects in the assessment process so that, if possible, positive or no residual affects remain.

Recommendations

Whilst the NDP brings a range of positive environmental effects, a number of recommendations have been proposed to help further improve its environmental performance when implemented. These are presented in **Chapter 7**.

Monitoring

Chapter 8 of the SEA Report explains why there should be a monitoring programme for measuring the NDP's implementation in relation to the areas where the SEA has identified significant effects, and where opportunities for an improvement in environmental performance may arise. Monitoring for the SEA could be carried out in conjunction with other monitoring processes carried out by Stratford-on-Avon District Council.

Conclusions

Having appraised Stratford-upon-Avon's NDP, the process has identified several positive and a smaller number of negative effects. Through applying a suite of mitigation measures, it is possible to ensure that most of the residual significant adverse effects are overcome. If all the recommended mitigation measures were applied to the plan, the only residual negative effect relates to the loss of ridge and furrow. Mitigation measures have been presented in **Chapter 6**.

Next Steps

The NDP will be submitted to Stratford-on-Avon District Council under Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations and publicised for representations accordingly.

The NDP will be publicised alongside the other proposed submission documents including this SEA Report. This provides a 6 week consultation opportunity for statutory consultees, the local community and other interested parties to consider the NDP. Stratford-on-Avon District Council will also consider whether the plan is suitable to submit to an independent examiner. If the examiner deems the plan to meet the basic conditions set out in the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended), it will be subject to local referendum. If over 50% of votes are in favour of the NDP, the NDP will be adopted as part of the local development framework.

1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 Lepus Consulting is conducting the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) for Stratford-upon-Avon, on behalf of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group ('the Steering Group'). SEA is the process of informing and influencing the development of development plan documents (DPDs) to maximise the environmental credentials of the plan. This report should be considered through the on-going evolution of the NDP.

1.1.2 This document constitutes the Strategic Environmental Assessment for the NDP and represents an Environmental Report (SEA Report) under the requirements of the SEA Directive. This represents Stage C of SEA, according to the ODPM (2005) A Practical Guide to the SEA Directive³. This report also documents Stage B of SEA, developing and refining alternatives and assessing effects.

1.1.3 Each of the policies in the NDP has been subject to a full SEA, which is recorded in this document. A number of reasonable alternatives were identified for Policies H1, H2 and H3, as detailed in **Table 1.1**. The do nothing alternative was considered for all policies. Policies were assessed against a number of detailed criteria as set out in the SEA Framework (**Appendix A**).

1.1.4 Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a UK-specific procedure used to appraise the sustainability impacts and effects of development plans in the UK. SA is not required for NDPs.

1.2 History of the NDP

1.2.1 The Stratford-upon-Avon NDP website⁴ explains that the creation of neighbourhood plans started with the Government's Localism Act which came into effect in April 2012. The Act sets out a series of measures to shift power away from central government and towards local people. One of the Localism Act's key components is the Neighbourhood Plan; a new tier in planning policy which enables local people to shape the development of the community in which they live.

³ ODPM (2005) A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive

⁴ <http://www.ourstratford.org.uk>

- 1.2.2 The process started in the summer of 2011 when Stratford-upon-Avon Town Council held a series of meetings to find volunteers who were representative of the community and willing to help prepare a Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) for the area. These meetings led to the creation of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group which includes representatives from: The Stratford Society, Stratford Voice, Stratford Vision, Four residents' associations, Warwickshire Police, Clopton Forum, Three secondary schools, Old Stratford and Drayton Parish Council, Stratford BID, Accessible Stratford, SCAN, Stratford Churches Together, Stratford Town Trust, Transition Stratford, Warwickshire County Council, Stratford District Councillors, Stratford Town Council, VASA, and numerous skilled volunteers.
- 1.2.3 The steering group collected public views on what residents would like to change about the area and used these to create a set of planning objectives which they believed reflected most of the major planning concerns in the community, this formed the consultation draft of the NDP.
- 1.2.4 The NDP has been published for consultation as a pre-submission draft plan. This provided an opportunity for the public and local organisations to comment on the plan.
- 1.2.5 After consultation, responses were taken into account and used to prepare the 'submission draft' of the NDP. This version of the plan will be subject to inspection by an independent examiner. If the examiner approves the NDP it will be subject to a local referendum. If 50% or more of people voting in the referendum support the plan, the NDP will be adopted. Once adopted, planning decisions in the area will be made in accordance with the NDP and the Core Strategy.

1.3 The SEA process

- 1.3.1 The European Union Directive 2001/42/EC or 'SEA Directive' applies to a wide range of public plans and programmes on land use, energy, waste, agriculture, transport etc. (see Article 3(2) of the Directive for other plan or programme types). The SEA procedure can be summarised as follows: an environmental report is prepared in which the likely significant effects on the environment and the reasonable alternatives of the proposed plan or programme are identified. The public and the relevant environmental authorities are informed and consulted on the draft plan or programme and the environmental report prepared. Further details on methodology are explained in **Chapter 4**.

- 1.3.2 The Directive has been transposed into English law by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the SEA Regulations, SI no. 1633). Detailed guidance of these regulations can be found in the Government publication ‘A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive’ (ODPM, 2005).
- 1.3.3 Under the requirements of the SEA Directive and Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations (2004), specific types of plans that set the framework for the future development consent of projects, must be subject to an environmental assessment.
- 1.3.4 Where a Neighbourhood Development Plan could have significant environmental effects, it may fall within the scope of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 and so require a SEA. One of the basic conditions that will be tested by the independent examiner is whether the making of the Neighbourhood Plan is compatible with European obligations.
- 1.3.5 Whether a Neighbourhood Plan requires a strategic environmental assessment, and (if so) the level of detail needed, will depend on what is proposed in the draft Neighbourhood Plan. A SEA may be required, for example, where:
- The neighbourhood area contains sensitive natural or heritage assets that may be affected by the proposals in the plan
 - The neighbourhood plan may have significant environmental effects that have not already been considered and dealt with through a sustainability appraisal of higher order plans.
- 1.3.6 The key stages of Neighbourhood Plan preparation and their relationship with the strategic environmental assessment process are shown in **Figure 1.1**, which is taken from National Planning Practice Guidance produced by DCLG.

1.4 Best Practice Guidance

- 1.4.1 A range of guidance documents has been utilized in preparing the SEA of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan. These are presented in **Box 1**.

Box 1: Best Practice Guidance for SEA

Lepus Consulting follows national guidance and best practice standards set out for SEA, including:

European Commission (2004) Implementation of Directive 2001/42 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (September 2005): A Practical Guide to the SEA Directive

Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework

Department for Communities and Local Government (2015) Planning Practice Guidance




Figure 1.1: The key stages of SEA in neighbourhood plan preparation (DCLG 2015)

1.5 Aims of the NDP

1.5.1 The overall aim of the NDP is as follows:

“This Neighbourhood Development Plan aims to make Stratford-upon-Avon, Tiddington and Alveston even better places to live, work or visit. It sets out to ensure that future development respects the character of the town, is supported by adequate infrastructure and brings benefits to the community. It covers the period up to 2031, which is consistent with Stratford-on-Avon District Council’s Core Strategy.”

1.5.2 The aim is supported by the following vision:

- Stratford-upon-Avon will still be instantly recognisable as an historic market town in a beautiful riverside setting. It will have absorbed the additional housing required by SDC but retained its charm and individuality; the historic core will have been sympathetically enhanced and run down areas redeveloped;
- For residents the town will be liveable: compact, walkable, attractive with good public spaces, culture, a strong local economy and housing choice;
- Stratford-upon-Avon will also continue to act as a centre for the surrounding area for shops, services and jobs;
- The town will be much better at accommodating and managing visitors;
- There will have been an integrated approach to investment in infrastructure and transport, traffic will be less intrusive, and congestion will have been reduced and managed effectively;
- Tiddington and Alveston will have retained their separate identities; and
- Stratford-upon-Avon will be greener with more soft landscaping, trees, open spaces and green corridors linking the town to the countryside.

1.5.3 This vision is then supported by a number of objectives identified throughout the various sections of the NDP:

- Promoting new high quality housing in appropriate locations;
- Promoting high quality housing that meets the needs of the neighbourhood area;
- Promoting new high quality employment opportunities in appropriate locations and encouraging the retention of existing employers in the Neighbourhood Area;
- Promoting the vitality and commercial viability of the Town Centre;
- Increasing the presence of housing in the Town Centre;
- Improving the visitor experience in the Town Centre;
- Protecting the town’s heritage;
- Improving access and movement within the Town Centre;
- Promoting high quality sustainable design;
- Preserving and enhancing the historic environment;

- Promoting urban renewal and regeneration;
- Preserving and enhancing local biodiversity;
- Improving access to learning opportunities;
- Promoting a healthy community;
- To prepare a roads and transport strategy to serve the growing town;
- To redistribute traffic destined for the Town Centre with appropriately sited car parking which avoids congested routes and cross town trips;
- To calm traffic on access roads in the interests of safety, convenience and environmental improvement;
- To improve pedestrian and cycle connectivity;
- To improve public transport opportunities;
- Promoting a strong and healthy community;
- Provide green spaces and exercise facilities for the enjoyment of residents and to promote an active community; and
- Promoting a healthy community.

1.6 Structure of the NDP

1.6.1 The Submission NDP is presented in 12 sections, as listed below:

- Section 1: Introduction
- Section 2: The Neighbourhood Development Plan
- Section 3: Stratford-upon-Avon History and Future
- Section 4: Stratford-upon-Avon Vision Statement
- Section 5: Development Strategy and Housing
- Section 6: Employment
- Section 7: Town Centre
- Section 8: Built Environment and Design
- Section 9: Natural Environment
- Section 10: Infrastructure
- Section 11: Community, Leisure and Wellbeing
- Section 12: Specific Briefs

1.6.2 Sections 5 to 11 contain the policies of the NDP that were subject to assessment through the SEA process. Policies are presented in relation to a number of objectives under each section. These objectives group policies in relation to what they aim to achieve on a cumulative level. This hierarchy of grouping policies is expanded in **Table 1.1**.

1.6.3 Section 12 contains further details of layout and design requirements for specific development sites, referred to as site specific briefs (SSBs). These relative to sites in Stratford-upon-Avon, Tiddington and Alveston and are detailed in **Table 1.1** below.

1.6.4 **Table 1.1** lists all policies of the NDP under the relevant section and objective headings.

Table 1.1: List of NDP policies

SECTION 5: DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY AND HOUSING	
Objective A – Promoting New High Quality Housing in Appropriate Locations	
H1	Built up Area Boundaries
H2	Strategic Gaps
H3	Development in the Local Service Villages
H4	Use of Brownfield Land
H5	Use of Garden Land
Objective B – Promoting High Quality Housing that Meets the Needs of the Neighbourhood Area	
H6	Affordable Housing
H7	Market Housing
SECTION 6: EMPLOYMENT	
Objective A – Promoting New High Quality Employment Opportunities in Appropriate Locations and Encouraging the Retention of Existing Employers in the Neighbourhood Area	
E1	Protecting existing employment sites
E2	Promoting new employment opportunities on the outskirts of the town
E3	Promoting employment associated with culture, media and tourism
E4	Work/Live units
SECTION 7: TOWN CENTRE	
Objective A – Promoting the Vitality and Commercial Viability of the Town Centre	
TC1	Out of Town Centre Retail
TC2	Primary Shopping Frontages
TC3	Bell Court
TC4	Rother Street and Rother Market
TC5	Greenhill Street and Arden Street Environmental Improvement Area
TC6	Rother Triangle Environmental Improvement Area

TC7	Birmingham Road, Arden Street and Windsor Street Environmental Improvement Area
TC8	Town Centre to Maybird Centre Environmental Improvement Area
Objective B – Increasing the Presence of Housing in the Town Centre	
TC9	Homes in the Town Centre
Objective C – Improving the Visitor Experience in the Town Centre	
TC10	Promoting a Cultural and Learning Quarter
TC11	Promoting New Conference Facilities in the Town Centre
Objective D – Protecting the Towns Heritage	
TC12	Shop Fronts
SECTION 8: BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND DESIGN	
Objective A – Promoting High Quality Sustainable Design	
BE1	Creating a Strong Sense of Place
BE2	Responding to Local Character
BE3	Master Planning
BE4	Design Review Panels
BE5	Designing Out Crime
BE6	Design Quality
BE7	Effective and Efficient Use of Land
BE8	Advertisements
BE9	Supplementary Guidance
Objective B – Preserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment	
BE10	Designated Heritage Assets
Objective C – Promoting Urban Renewal and Regeneration	
BE12	Replacement Dwellings
BE13	Conversation and Reuse of Buildings
BE14	Empty Homes and Spaces
SECTION 9: NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	
Objective A – Preserving and Enhancing Local Biodiversity	

NE1	Local Nature Reserve
NE2	River Avon Biodiversity Corridor
NE3	Trees and Hedges
NE4	Sites of Special Scientific Interest
SECTION 10: INFRASTRUCTURE	
Objective A – Improving Access to Learning Communities	
INF1	Protecting and Enhancing Education Facilities
INF2	New Educational Facilities
Objective B – Promoting a Healthy Community	
INF3	Protecting and Enhancing Existing Healthcare Provision
INF4	Promoting New Healthcare Provision
Objective C – To prepare a strategic roads and transport strategy to serve the growing town and district in which through and peripheral traffic is taken off town centre routes	
INF5	Honeybourne Rail Link
SECTION 11: COMMUNITY, LEISURE and WELLBEING	
Objective A – Promoting a Strong and Healthy Community	
CLW1	Protecting and Enhancing Existing Community Facilities
CLW2	Promoting Leisure, Entertainment and New Community Facilities
Objective B – Provide green spaces and exercise facilities for the enjoyment of residents and to promote an active community	
CLW3	Protecting and Enhancing Existing Open Spaces
CLW4	Open Space and Play Areas within New Development
CLW5	Walking and Cycling Routes
CLW6	Stratford Leisure Centre
CLW7	Allotments and Growing Space
Objective C – Promoting a Healthy Community	
CLW8	Reducing Air, Noise and Water Pollution
CLW9	Encouraging Local Generation of Renewable and Low Carbon Energy

SECTION 12: Site Specific Briefs	
SSB1	Canal Quarter Regeneration Zone
SSB2	Stratford-upon-Avon Employment Allocation – Land South of the Alcester Road (A46), west of the Wildmoor Roundabout
SSB3	Tiddington Fields

1.7 Meeting the SEA Directive requirements

1.7.1 **Table 1.2** includes the requirements of the SEA Directive and shows where they are met within the SEA process.

Table 1.2: Meeting the requirements of the SEA Directive

Requirement for Environmental Report	Location
Include an outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes.	SEA Scoping Report, Chapters 1 and Chapters 3 to 13 Scoping Report Appendix B SEA Report Chapter 1
Include information on the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the plan or programme.	SEA Scoping Report, Chapters 3 to 13
Describe the environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected	SEA Scoping Report, Chapters 3 to 13
Specify 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.	SEA Scoping Report, Chapters 3 to 3 (Key Issues boxes) SEA Report Chapter 5
Consider 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 Scoping Report, Chapters 3 to 13 Scoping Report Appendix B SEA Report Chapter 2

Assess 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, and cultural heritage including architectural and archaeological heritage, landscape and the interrelationship between the above factors.	SEA Report Chapter 5 and Appendices C and D
Give details of 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.	SEA Report Chapter 6
Give 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.	SEA Report Chapters 3, 4 and 6
Include a description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring.	SEA Report Chapter 8
Include a non-technical summary of the information provided	SEA Report Non-Technical Summary

1.8 How the NDP SEA has evolved

- 1.8.1 This report is part of a series of reports that have been prepared to facilitate an iterative and informative approach to SEA. Lepus Consulting undertook a screening assessment of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan in September 2013⁵, to determine whether the NDP should be screened into the SEA process. This assessment determined that the NDP had potential to lead to likely significant effects on the environment, thus it was screened in, in accordance with the SEA Directive.

⁵ Lepus Consulting (2013) Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan: Screening Document

Scoping

- 1.8.2 Once screened into the process, the first stage of the SEA was to prepare a Scoping Report⁶ to outline the background to environmental issues in Stratford-upon-Avon and use this information to develop a framework against which to assess environmental impacts of the plan. The Scoping Report represents Stage A of the SEA process (see **Figure 1.1**).
- 1.8.3 The Scoping Report identified relevant plans, policies and programmes and baseline information relating to environmental issues in Stratford-upon-Avon. This also set out a series of objectives for environmental protection and a SEA framework, against which the plan is to be assessed. This is discussed in more detail in **Chapter 2**.

Reasonable alternatives

- 1.8.4 At the pre-submission stage the Steering Group came to the decision that the only policy for which reasonable alternatives could be considered was Policy H3, Local Service Village Allocations. These policies were assessed and subject to a five week public consultation process. Following consultation the decision was taken to also assess the do-nothing option and alternatives for policies H1, H2, H3 and BE 7. Details of these assessments are given in **Chapter 3** and **Appendices C** and **D**.

Pre-Submission NDP

- 1.8.5 A working draft of the NDP was published in January 2013. The plan was then reviewed, taking into account consultation responses received, and outcomes of the Core Strategy examination, into account. The Draft NDP was then subject to Pre-Submission Consultation, closing on the 27 July 2015. Following that consultation, further revisions were made to the plan.

Submission NDP

- 1.8.6 This report presents a SEA of the Submission NDP. This represents Stage D of the SEA process, as described above and also documents Stage B, as described in **Chapter 3**. Once the NDP has been formally adopted, a SEA Post-Adoption Statement will be prepared, in order to demonstrate how environmental considerations highlighted in the SEA process were taken into consideration during the preparation of the plan. The Post-Adoption Statement will fulfil Stage E of the SEA process (see **Figure 1.1**).

⁶ Lepus Consulting (2014) Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan: Final Scoping Report

1.9 Relationship with the Core Strategy

- 1.9.1 The Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy was adopted on the 11 July 2016. The Core Strategy forms the key planning document for Stratford-upon-Avon, and Stratford-on-Avon District as a whole. The Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy is a high-level document and forms the basis of other development plans in the area.
- 1.9.2 The planning hierarchy dictates that the NDP must be complimentary to the Core Strategy and provide more detailed policies, rather than alternative policies that would negate the CS. The Core Strategy was subject to an integrated Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which assessed the plan for significant effects on sustainability and fulfilled the requirements of the SEA Directive. SEA assesses the likely implications of a plan on social and economic factors, as well as environmental effects. Mitigation measures were suggested where negative or uncertain impacts were identified.

2 Scoping

2.1 Introduction

2.1.1 The first phase of preparation for the SEA was the scoping stage. This represented Stage A of SEA, according to the DCLG (2015) Guidance on SEA for Neighbourhood Plans (**Figure 1.1**). Scoping is the process of deciding the scope and level of detail of an SEA, including the environmental effects and alternatives to be considered, the assessment methods to be used, and the structure and contents of the SEA Report.

2.1.2 The purpose of the Scoping Report is to set the criteria for assessment (including the SEA Objectives), and establish the baseline data and other information, including a review of relevant policies, programmes and plans. The scoping process involves an overview of key issues, highlighting areas of potential conflict.

2.1.3 The Scoping Report covers the early stages of the SEA Process and includes information about:

- Identifying other relevant policies, plans and programmes, and environmental objectives;
- Collecting baseline information;
- Identifying environmental issues and problems; and
- Developing the SEA Framework.

2.1.4 The Scoping Report that accompanies this report was carried out by Lepus Consulting in 2014⁷.

2.2 Policy, plan and programme review

2.2.1 A plan or programme may be influenced in various ways by other plans or programmes, or by external environmental protection objectives such as those laid down in policies or legislation. The SEA process takes advantage of potential synergies and addresses any inconsistencies and constraints.

2.2.2 The Scoping Report presented an analysis of the objectives of the key policies, plans and programmes (including legislation) that are relevant to the NDP and the SEA assessment process. These were presented by their geographic relevance, from international to local level.

⁷ Lepus Consulting (2014) Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan: Scoping Report

2.3 Baseline Data and Information

2.3.1 A key part of the scoping process is the collection of baseline data. The purpose of this exercise is to help identify key issues and opportunities facing the area which might be addressed by the NDP, and to provide an evidence base for the assessment.

2.3.2 The baseline chapters in the Scoping Report (Chapters 3 to 13) provided a review of existing environmental conditions within Stratford-upon-Avon and their likely evolution in absence of the NDP. One of the purposes of consultation on the Scoping Report was to seek views on whether the data selected was appropriate. Helpful comments were received from a range of stakeholders in response to the Scoping Report and in some cases new baseline information was provided.

2.4 The SEA Framework

2.4.1 The purpose of the SEA Framework is to provide a way of ensuring that the NDP considers the environmental needs of Stratford-upon-Avon in terms of its environmental effects. It also enables the environmental effects of the NDP policies to be described, analysed and compared.

2.4.2 The SEA Framework consists of environmental objectives, which, where practicable, the achievement of which is measurable using indicators. There is no statutory basis for setting objectives but they are a recognised way of considering the environmental effects of a plan and comparing alternatives. The SEA Objectives provide the basis from which effects of the NDP were assessed.

2.4.3 The SEA Objectives were developed through the PPP review, the baseline data collection and the key issues identified for the plan area. The SEA Framework has been aligned with those of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy in order to provide consistency of assessments across the tiers of plan-making. The SEA topics identified in Annex I (f) of the SEA Directive⁸ were one of the key determinants when considering the SEA Objectives to be used for appraisal purposes. The SEA Objectives seek to reflect each of these influences to ensure the assessment process is robust and thorough. The full SEA framework is presented in **Appendix A**.

⁸ Biodiversity flora and fauna; Population; Human health; Soil; Water; Air; Climatic factors; Material assets; Cultural heritage (including architectural and archaeological heritage); and Landscape.

Table 2.1: SEA Objectives

Reference	SEA Objective
1	Histor. Protect, enhance and manage sites, features and areas of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.
2	Lands. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.
3	Biodiv. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity.
4	Flood. Reduce the risk of flooding.
5	Climate contrib. Minimise the district's contribution to climate change.
6	Climate plan. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change.
7	Resrce. Protect and conserve natural resources.
8	Polln. Reduce air, soil and water pollution.
9	Waste Reduce waste generation and disposal, and promote the waste hierarchy of reduce, reuse, recycle/compost, energy recovery and disposal.
10	Transp. Improve the efficiency of transport networks by increasing the proportion of travel by sustainable modes and by promoting policies, which reduce the need to travel.
11	Rural Barrier Reduce barriers for those living in rural areas.
12	Countr. Protect the integrity of the district's countryside.
13	House. Provide affordable, environmentally sound and good quality housing for all.
14	Health Safeguard and improve community health, safety and wellbeing.
15	Econ. Develop a dynamic, diverse and knowledge-based economy that excels in innovation with higher value, lower impact activities.

3 Reasonable Alternatives

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 The Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive requires that the SEA process considers:

'Reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme' and give 'an outline of the reasons for selecting the alternatives dealt with' (Article 5.1 and Annex I (h)).

3.1.2 In the UK, reasonable alternatives are commonly referred to as 'options'. The assessment of reasonable alternatives refers to the plan making process stage of exploring policy options. This represented Stage B of SEA, according to the PPG (DCLG, 2015).

3.1.3 The role of the SEA is to inform the plan making group in their selection and assessment of options. The findings of the SEA can help with refining and further developing these options in an iterative and on-going way. The SEA findings do not form the sole basis for decision-making; other studies, the feasibility of the option and consultation feedback will also contribute to the decision made by Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Stratford-on-Avon District Council.

3.1.4 Options assessment is proportionate; in higher levels of strategic planning, such as the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy, the assessment may have a criteria-based approach and focus on the key differences between possibilities for scale, distribution and quality of development. The options do not have to be mutually exclusive and elements of each may be further developed into a preferred option. Consequently the process is fluid with options changing and developing as further studies are undertaken, additional findings are established and the responses from previous consultation stages are considered.

3.1.5 The results of a SEA may reveal that there is no single, best performing option. Where there is no obvious discernable difference at a strategic scale, the SEA process will record this as an outcome for that particular stage of the assessment process. Whilst SEA informs plan making and selection of polices, the plan makers are not obliged to carry forward the most sustainable options if they have reason to prefer an alternative option.

3.2 Reasonable Alternatives

This section identifies the reasonable alternatives that have been identified as a part of the SEA part of the SEA process. As discussed in Chapter 1, additional alternatives were identified for consideration following consultation on the Pre-Submission NDP.

Policy H1: Built Up Area Boundary

3.2.1 Five alternatives were considered to Policy H1: Built up Area Boundary (BUAB). These were:

- Alternative A: Business as usual (No BUAB Defined);
- Alternative B: Tiddington larger boundary;
- Alternative C: Tiddington smaller boundary;
- Alternative D: Alverston larger boundary; and
- Alternative E: Alverston Smaller boundary.

3.2.2 The assessment of these options can be found in Appendix C.

Policy H2 Strategic Gap

3.2.3 Three alternative were considered to Policy H2: Strategic Gap. These were:

- Alternative A: Business as usual (no strategic gap);
- Alternative B: Larger strategic gap; and
- Alternative C: Smaller strategic gap.

3.2.4 The assessment of these options can be found in Appendix C.

Policy H3: Development in Local Service Villages

3.2.5 A number of reasonable alternatives were identified for Policy H3 Local Service Village Allocations. **Table 3.1** shows the reasonable alternatives considered. Preferred options, i.e. those included in the Pre-Submission NDP, are shown in bold.

Table 3.1: Reasonable alternatives to Policy H3 of the Pre-Submission NDP policies. Preferred Options are shown in **bold**.

HOUSING

Objective A – Promoting New High Quality Housing in Appropriate Locations Policy H3: Local Service Village Allocations

H3a	Alveston allocations
H3b	Tiddington housing allocation – Home guard club (1a)
H3c	Tiddington housing allocation – Home guard club (1b)
H3d	Tiddington housing allocation – Home guard club (1a and b combined)
H3e	Tiddington housing allocation – Tiddington Fields (2a)
H3f	Tiddington housing allocation – Tiddington Fields (2b)
H3g	Tiddington housing allocation – Tiddington Fields (2a and b combined)
H3h	Tiddington housing allocation – Knights Lane (3a)
H3i	Tiddington housing allocation – Knights Lane (3b)
H3j	Tiddington housing allocation – Knights Lane (3c)
H3k	Tiddington housing allocation – dispersal (4a)
H3l	Tiddington housing allocation – dispersal (4b)
H3m	Tiddington housing allocation – dispersal (4c)

- 3.2.6 These alternatives were subject to SA, the results of which are presented in **Appendix C**. The best performing option in terms of environmental performance was H3k, although this site is not large enough to deliver the total housing requirement for the NDP area. Of the other options, it was not possible to identify a best performing option. The summary of SEA results at the alternatives stage relates only to Policy H3 (**Table 3.1**).
- 3.2.7 Negative effects were identified for the preferred options with regards to SEA Objectives 1, 5, 6, 10, 11 and 14. Strong negative effects were identified against SEA Objective 6 for site H3d, due to the loss of Green Infrastructure (GI). Uncertain effects were identified with regards to SEA Objectives 3, 4, 6, 7 and 12.
- 3.2.8 In terms of alternatives not taken forward, negative effects were identified against SEA Objectives 1, 2, 4, 6, 10 and 12. Strong negative effects were identified against SEA Objective 6 for site H3c, due to the loss of GI. Strong negative effects were also identified against SEA Objective 7 for sites H3h, H3i, H3j and H3k, as development at these sites would lead to loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.

Pre-Submission Draft Policy BE7: Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems

- 3.2.9 The Pre-Submission draft iteration of the NDP included a Policy BE7: Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems. This policy had a considerable overlap with local and national policy on flood risk. For those reasons, it could be considered an unreasonable alternative. Nonetheless, it has been assessed and is included in **Appendix C**.

3.3 Assessing the do nothing scenario

- 3.3.1 A 'do nothing' assessment has been undertaken of all of the policies in the plan. To assist in drawing out the likely effects of the do nothing scenario, policies were grouped. The results are presented in Appendix D, with the exception of those policies assessed within Appendix C. The 'do nothing' option was not considered for Policy H3 as not including any housing within the NDP would not be in accordance with the basic conditions and as such not a reasonable alternative.

Do nothing assessments were also undertaken for all the projects. The projects are designed to support and maximise other policies within the NDP. It is acknowledged within the NDP that these are considered to be different from land use policies, and as such will not form part of the development management process. Rather they are matters that the Town Council will commit to undertake.

3.4 Identifying reasonable alternatives and preferred options

- 3.4.1 Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)⁹ states that the environmental report accompanying a neighbourhood plan should 'outline the reasons the alternatives were selected, the reasons the rejected options were not taken forward and the reasons for selecting the preferred approach in light of the alternatives'.
- 3.4.2 Reasonable alternatives were identified against Policy H3. The alternatives were selected through looking at deliverable sites included in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)¹⁰ and a call for sites.

⁹ DCLG (2015) Planning Practice Guidance

¹⁰ Stratford-on-Avon District Council (2012) SHLAA Review

3.4.3 It is stressed that selection and rejection of sites is a decision made by the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and not by Lepus Consulting. The role of Lepus Consulting is to provide an objective assessment of options, which can then be used by plan makers to make decisions regarding the selection of preferred options. The plan makers, in this case the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, are not obliged to carry forward the most environmentally sustainable option.

3.4.4 The preferred options selected mirror the Core Strategy allocations SUA.1 and SUA.2. Two other additional sites were originally identified on the edge Tiddington but both have now received planning permission, one with outline permission and one with detailed permission. Taken together, these sites provide sufficient housing to meet the Core Strategy housing requirements for the local area.

3.4.5 Policy BE7 was identified as a potential reasonable alternative due to its inclusion in the Pre-Submission Draft of the NDP. It is understood that it was not retained because it was superfluous to existing local and national policy.

3.4.6 Following the receipt on consultation comments on the Pre-submission NDP, further consideration was given to whether reasonable alternatives should be considered to the proposed strategic gap and built up area boundary. The decision was taken to assess additional alternatives to these policies to ensure all reasonable options had been given full consideration in identifying the preferred option. Similarly, following consultation feedback the decision was taken to assess the do nothing alternative for all policies and projects to inform the decision making process.

3.5 Reasons for the selection of the preferred alternatives

3.5.1 This section presents the reasons for the selection of the preferred alternatives.

Policy H1: Tiddington Built up Area Boundary (BUAB)

3.5.2 The policy approach to the BUAB for Tiddington was chosen over the alternatives considered as a result of:

- The advice and guidance relating to 'Defining Built up Area Boundaries' from Stratford-on-Avon District Council (August 2016);
- The results of the Tiddington Village Residents Association Consultation Questionnaire (August 2014);
- The presence of proposed Strategic Gap to the west of the village;

- The presence of existing Areas of Restraint (Core Strategy Policy CS.13) as identified on the District Council's Policies Map and the River Avon Flood Plain to the north of the village;
- The existing housing commitments at Home Guard Club and Tiddington Fields to the east of the village; and
- The strategic direction of Core Strategy in particular Policies CS.15 and CS.16 and the role of Tiddington as a Category 1 Local Service Village.

3.5.3 The defined BUAB has therefore been drawn up having regard to the specific constraints surrounding the village and taking account of public opinion whilst recognising the need to accommodate housing to a level as set out in the Core Strategy. The defined BUAB recognises the existing commitments in the village. The defined BUAB would have lesser environmental impacts than the reasonable alternatives considered.

Policy H1: Alveston Built up Area Boundary (BUAB)

3.5.4 The policy approach to the BUAB for Alveston was chosen over the alternatives considered as a result of:

- The advice and guidance relating to 'Defining Built up Area Boundaries' from Stratford-on-Avon District Council (August 2016);
- The results of the Alveston Village Association Survey November 2014
- The presence of proposed Strategic Gap to the west of the village;
- The presence of the River Avon Flood Plain to the north and east of the village;
- The presence of important heritage assets (conservation area and listed buildings) to the south of the village;
- The objective as set out in the Alveston Village Design Statement (November 2015) to maintain the strong hidden character of the village; and
- The strategic direction of Core Strategy in particular Policies CS.15 and CS.16 and the role of Alveston as a Category 4 Local Service Village.

3.5.5 The defined BUAB has therefore been drawn up having regard to the specific constraints surrounding the village and taking account of public opinion whilst recognising the need to accommodate housing to a level as set out in the Core Strategy. The defined BUAB would facilitate a positive approach to windfall development within the village which will assist in achieving its role as a category 4 LSV in the Core Strategy. The defined BUAB would have lesser environmental impacts than the reasonable alternatives considered.

Policy H2: Strategic Gaps

3.5.6 The policy approach to the Strategic Gap was chosen over the alternatives considered as a result of:

- The results of the Tiddington Village Residents Association Consultation Questionnaire (August 2014)
- The need to prevent coalescence between the settlements of Stratford-upon-Avon and Tiddington and Tiddington and Alveston
- The presence of existing Areas of Restraint (Core Strategy Policy CS.13) as identified on the District Council's Policies Map and the River Avon Flood Plain to the north of the Strategic Gap
- The nature and general open character of the land within the defined Strategic Gap.
- The nature of adjacent land uses (e.g. Stratford-on-Avon Golf Club)
- The presence of defendable boundaries such as lanes and field enclosures

3.5.7 The defined Strategic Gap has therefore been drawn up having regard to the character of the land, specific constraints and taking account of public opinion. The defined Strategic Gap has the most positive environmental effects than the other reasonable alternatives considered.

Policy H3: Development in the local service villages

3.5.8 A number of alternative sites were considered as a part of the preparation of the NDP. Various planning applications have been determined on the sites that have been considered, which has informed the approach to a number of sites. All sites considered are presented in **Table 3.1**. Set out below are the reasons why the alternatives considered were less favorable than the preferred option:

- **H3a:** There are no allocations for Alveston as it is a Category 4 village heavily constrained by Conservation Area, Grade II listed church, flood risk and a main road. Public opinion and planning constraints have influenced a windfall only approach, along with a prominent appeal decision (ref. APP/J3720/A/14/2222479)
- **H3b/H3c/H3d:** This alternative was not taken forward as an allocation within the NDP because planning permission has been granted (ref. 14/03250/FUL). It is therefore shown as a commitment in the NDP.
- **H3e and H3f:** Similarly, planning permission has also been granted for development on this site (15/02057/OUT). However, since the permission was for outline, the site has remained as an allocation rather than a commitment in order to exercise some control over the reserved matters application.
- **H3h-H3m:** This site was dropped as an allocation on the basis of two appeal decisions which were dismissed (refs. APP/J3720/W/15/3017900 and APP/J3720/W/15/3132950). The main reason for dismissing the appeal was to prevent coalescence between Tiddington and Alveston.

The do nothing scenario

- 3.5.9 Progressing with the NDP was chosen in favor of the do nothing scenario in light of the community support identified for the NDP and the desire of the community to plan positively for the local area whilst maintaining those characteristics and features that make the area special. The do-nothing scenario was no considered to deliver any of these ambitions.

3.6 Key SEA issues

- 3.6.1 The key issues for each SEA Objective, identified in the Scoping Report have been summarised below:

SEA Objective 1: Historic and cultural features

Increased traffic could affect integrity of the historic environment and its setting

Potential direct damage to cultural and historic features

Potential damage to archaeological remains

SEA Objective 2: Landscape and townscape

North of the town is part of the West Midlands Green Belt

Stratford-upon-Avon is one of the least tranquil areas in the district

SEA Objective 3: Biodiversity and geodiversity

There is one LNR and one SSSI in the NDP area

The condition of Racecourse Meadows SSSI is unfavourable declining

River Avon and other watercourses are an important biodiversity asset

Noise and light disturbance from traffic

SEA Objective 4: Flooding

Increases in flood risk linked to climate change

SEA Objective 5: Minimise climate change

Carbon emissions from transport, industry, commercial and domestic sources

Identify and support opportunities for renewable energy provision locally

SEA Objective 6: Plan for climate change

Risks posed by climate change include increase in incidents of heat-related illnesses and deaths, risk of injury and death due to storms,

increased flooding, changes in biodiversity and increased drought and flood related problems (e.g. soil shrinkage, subsidence)

Changes in landscape due to invasive species, changes in farming practice and soil erosion

SEA Objective 7: Natural Resources

Need to encourage development on brownfield land

Areas of best and most versatile agricultural land exist in the plan area

Infrastructure to accompany growth may result in soil erosion and loss

SEA Objective 8: Pollution

The majority of Stratford-upon-Avon is an AQMA

Increased traffic and congestion add to air pollution issues

Land contamination may exist in the plan area

Improvements are still required to meet the target of all watercourses to reach 'good' water quality status

SEA Objective 9: Waste

Continue to improve recycling rates

SEA Objective 10: Transport

Congestion in the town centre, radial and sub-radial routes

Barriers to pedestrians and cyclists

Lack of a bus station

SEA Objective 11: Rural barriers

Barriers to pedestrians and cyclists

The plan area generally has good access to public transport

SEA Objective 12: Countryside

The majority of the rural urban fringe to the north, east and south of Stratford-upon-Avon is highly sensitive to both commercial and housing development

Areas of best and most versatile agricultural land exist in the plan area

SEA Objective 13: Housing

Increased pressure on housing provision from growing population

Ageing population will increase demand for certain types of housing

Shortfall of affordable housing

Need for affordable rented accommodation

Inadequate provision of housing and support for people who are vulnerable or at risk of homelessness

Stratford-on-Avon has the most empty homes in the district

SEA Objective 14: Health

Health inequalities exist in the NDP area

Ageing population and increased dependency ratio

Shortfall in mini and junior football pitches, junior rugby pitches and play space for children and young people

Areas of Stratford-upon-Avon experience the most crime in the district

SEA Objective 15: Economy

Tourism and the visitor economy are important for Stratford-upon-Avon

New business start-ups should be encouraged

Average earnings are above national average

4 Appraisal Methodology

4.1 Assessment of the Stratford-upon-Avon NDP

4.1.1 A full list of NDP policies can be found in **Table 1.1**. Each of the policies has been assessed against the 15 SEA Objectives established through the Scoping Report’s SEA Framework (which is reproduced in full in **Appendix A**). Lepus Consulting have also put together an assessment protocol (**Appendix B**), which gives further examples of how to apply to matrix in **Table 4.1** to the assessment.

4.2 Approach to the appraisal

4.2.1 The assessment of the NDP was undertaken using a combination of empirical evidence, and to a lesser extent professional judgement. Each policy was assessed against each of the SEA Objectives.

4.2.2 The findings are presented in matrix format and are accompanied by a commentary on identified effects. The matrix is not a conclusive tool. Its main function is to show visually whether or not the proposed options are likely to bring positive, adverse or uncertain effects in relation to the SEA Objectives. The commentary is then used to interpret the matrix findings. **Table 1** shows the key to identifying whether the effects of an option are positive, adverse or uncertain.

Table 4.1: Key to the matrix assessment

Key:	
Likely strong positive effect	++
Likely positive effect	+
Neutral/no effect	0
Likely adverse effect	-
Likely strong adverse effect	--
Uncertain effects	+/-

4.2.3 Whilst the orders of magnitude are determined by impact magnitude and geographic significance or sensitivity, the determination of impact takes into consideration the characteristics of the resultant effect as presented in **Box 2.1**.

- 4.2.4 As demonstrated in **Table 2.1**, significance is determined by the sensitivity or geographic scale of the receptor and the impact magnitude. The coloured boxes represent the level of significance of the predicted effect. The text in each of these boxes describes the level of significance, whilst the plus (+) and minus (-) symbols, along with the colours, give a visual representation of this.
- 4.2.5 To understand the overall effect of the site or policy being assessed, the effect identified against each objective needs to be taken into account to gain a balanced outcome that takes into account the environmental, social and economic aspects of sustainability. A site or policy that is found to have negative effects against certain objectives is not necessarily unsuitable as these negatives must be considered in light of any positive effects that may have been identified. Note too that the impact magnitudes are not intended to be summed. For example, two '+' are not to be considered equal to a single '++'. The scores assigned are a matter of professional judgement taking into account the baseline data, policy context and other sources of information available to inform the assessment.
- 4.2.6 Geographic scale relates primarily to the level of importance of the receptor, or the level at which it is designated, if applicable. Geographic scale may also refer to the physical area of the receptor, or the part of the receptor likely to be affected.
- 4.2.7 Impact magnitude relates to the degree of change the receptor will experience, including the probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects (see **Box 2.1**). The terms used in **Table 2.1** are explained in more detail below.

Box 2.1 Annex II of the SEA Directive

Criteria for determining the likely significance of effects referred to in Article 3(5) of the SEA Directive

The characteristics of plans and programmes, having regard, in particular, to

- the degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources;
- the degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy;

- the relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development;
- environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme;
- the relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community  legislation on the environment (e.g. plans and programmes linked to waste-management or water protection).

Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to

- the probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects;
- the cumulative nature of the effects;
- the transboundary nature of the effects;
- the risks to human health or the environment (e.g. due to accidents);
- the magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the  population likely to be affected);
- the value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to:
 - special natural characteristics or cultural heritage;
 - exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values;
 - intensive land-use;
 - the effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, Community or international protection status.

4.2.8 Limitations in terms of the level of detail and confidence of assessment are cited in the explanatory text; the worst case scenario has been assumed in accordance with the Precautionary Principle.

4.3 Geographic scale

4.3.1 Impact assessment in the sustainability appraisal considers a range of geographic scales and sensitivities at which the impact and subsequent effects might be experienced. A guide to the range of scales used in the impact significance matrix is presented in **Table 2.2**.

Table 4.2: Geographic scales

Sensitivity	Typical criteria
International / national	The international level is aimed at designations that have an international aspect or consideration of transboundary effects beyond national boundaries. This also applies to predicted effects at the national level or designations/receptors that have a national dimension.
Regional	This includes the regional and sub-regional scale, including county-wide level and regional areas such as the East of England.
Local	This is the district and neighbourhood scale.

4.4 Impact magnitude

4.4.1 Impacts are assessed by combining judgements about susceptibility to the type of change arising from the specific proposal with judgements about the value attached to the receptor.

4.4.2 On a strategic basis, the appraisal considers the degree to which a location can accommodate change without detrimental effects on known receptors (identified in the baseline) and the degree to which individual receptors will be affected by the change. This is determined by considering factors included in Annex II of the SEA Directive:

- Probability
- Duration;
- Frequency; and
- Reversibility.

4.4.3 SA and SEA are concerned with likely significant effects. As such, if an effect is considered improbable, it will not be considered in assessment. It is considered that most effects cannot be predicted with absolute certainty, as many impacts depend on the design of development and may be subject to mitigation. Effects identified are considered to be long-term, irreversible and local scale unless stated otherwise.

4.5 In-combination effects assessment

4.5.1 As required by the SEA Regulations, cumulative, synergistic and indirect effects have been identified and evaluated during the assessment.

- 4.5.2 Indirect effects are effects that are not a direct result of the plan, but occur away from the original effect or as a result of a complex pathway;
- 4.5.3 Cumulative effects arise where several developments each have insignificant effects but together have a significant effect, or where several individual effects of the plan have a combined effect;
- 4.5.4 Synergistic effects interact to produce a total effect greater than the sum of the individual effects.
- 4.5.5 To enable an assessment of the complete range of environmental effects resulting from the NDP, the full range of cumulative, incorporating secondary, indirect and synergistic effects were evaluated. Whilst a number of these effects are recorded by the appraisal findings for the assessment of the policies, a number of these effects can only be established through examining all of the policies and proposals presented by the NDP together. These interactions are examined in **Table 5.1** of this report.

4.6 Sources

- 4.6.1 The assessments presents presented in Chapter 5 draw on a variety of data sources, including the information contained in the March 2014 Scoping Report¹¹. Some datasets were checked for each assessment; these are presented in **Table 4.4** below. Other data sources have been referenced in the text, or in footnotes.

Table 4.4: Key data sources used in SEA assessments

Information	Data source
Agricultural Land Classification	Natural England (2010) Agricultural Land Classification map West Midlands Region
Agricultural Land Classification (note: this shows Grade 3a and Grade 3b land separately, but it is an incomplete dataset) Listed Buildings LNRs Registered Parks and Gardens Scheduled Monuments SSSIs	Natural England (2015) MAGIC, available at: http://www.magic.gov.uk

¹¹ Lepus Consulting (2014) Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan: Final Scoping Report

Bus routes and timetables	<p>Johnsons Coach and Bus Travel (2015) Johnsons website, available at: http://www.johnsonskoaches.co.uk</p> <p>Stagecoach Group Plc (2015) Stagecoach bus website, available at: https://www.stagecoachbus.com/default.aspx</p> <p>Flexibus (2014) Flexibus website, available at: www.lexi-bus.co.uk</p> <p>National Express (2015) National Express website, available at: www.nationalexpress.com</p> <p>North Cotswold Community Bus Association Ltd (date not available) The Hedgehog Bus, available at: http://hedgehogbus.org</p> <p>Warwickshire County Council (2015) Warwickshire Direct: Buses, travel and transport, available at: http://www.warwickshire.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/buses</p>
Flood Zone	<p>Environment Agency (2015) What's in Your Backyard: Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea), available at: http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?x=357683&y=355134&scale=1&layerGroups=default&ep=map&textonly=off&lang=e&topic=floodmap#x=357683&y=355795&lg=1,2,&scale=1</p>
<p>Habitats present</p> <p>Current land use</p> <p>Locations of services and amenities</p>	<p>Google (2015) Google Maps, available at: https://www.google.co.uk/maps</p>

4.7 Assumptions

- 4.7.1 There are a number of limitations, which should be borne in mind when considering the results and conclusions of this assessment.
- 4.7.2 SEA is a tool for predicting potential significant effects. The actual effects of the policies may be different from those identified. Prediction of effects is made using an evidence based approach and incorporates a judgement. The assessment matrices should not be regarded as conclusive, as further drafting will be done on the policies, and additional information may come to light.

- 4.7.3 The strategic nature of the assessment identifies issues that could be improved and can therefore be used to guide the next iteration of the plan. However due to the broad nature of the policies, the assessment does not go into great depth.
- 4.7.4 The assessments above are based on the best available information, including that provided to us by Stratford-on-Avon District Council and information that is publicly available. Every attempt has been made to predict effects as accurately as possible using the available information.
- 4.7.5 All distance measurements have been taken from the centre of each site, as the crow flies. The only exception to this is when a service, facility or feature abuts the boundary of a proposed site, in which case this has been stated.
- 4.7.6 Policies may be subject to further alterations and additional information may come to light before the NDP is adopted.
- 4.7.7 Many effects will depend on the size and location of development, building design and construction, proximity to sensitive receptors such as wildlife sites, conservation areas, flood risk areas and watercourses, and the range of uses taking place.
- 4.7.8 This report has been produced to assess the environmental effects of the NDP and meets the requirements of the SEA Directive. It is not intended to be a substitute for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) or Appropriate Assessment (AA). For further information on the differences between these assessments please see: https://www.rspb.org.uk/Images/environmentalassessment_tcm9-257008.pdf

SA1 Historic and cultural features

- 4.7.9 As yet to be discovered archaeological sites have the potential to exist across the plan area. This assessment can only reference historic features that have been recorded and assessments of archaeological potential.

SA5 Minimise climate change

4.7.10 There is an assumption that the majority of residents moving into new residential developments will own a car, or other private vehicle. An increase in housing in the plan area is expected to lead to a proportional increase in cars on the road and an increase in greenhouse gas emissions associated with transport. This has potential negative implications for SEA Objective 5, minimise climate change.

4.7.11 The assessment below considers whether the plan is likely to increase or decrease carbon omissions per head of the population, rather than overall, in order to give a more meaningful assessment of policies. This follows the assumption that car use is likely to be lower if local services and amenities are close enough to be accessible by foot (using the distances stated in Barton *et al*, 2010¹²) or if there are good links to sustainable modes of transport, particularly buses and cycleways.

SA14 Health

4.7.12 There is little information available regarding the capacity of local services, including doctors' surgeries. The NHS choices website¹³ shows that all doctors' surgeries in Stratford-upon-Avon, except Rother House Branch Surgery, are currently accepting new patients, suggesting that there is capacity for a substantial number of new patients across the borough.

¹² Barton, H., Grant, M. and Guide, R. (2010) Shaping Neighbourhoods for local health and global sustainability

¹³ <http://www.nhs.uk/Service-Search/GP/BB4/Results/4/-2.29234647750854/53.7102699279785/4/0?distance=10>

5 Appraisal Findings

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 Each policy has been individually assessed against each of the 15 SEA Objectives. This chapter contains the results of this appraisal. The results for each policy can be found in a single line matrix, which displays whether the policy has been assessed positively or negatively against each SEA Objective. The matrices are followed by an explanation of the results. Assessment findings have been presented by theme and objective below.

5.1.2 Note that references to ‘recognised’ green infrastructure (GI) assets refers to those identified in the UE Associates (2011) Stratford-on-Avon Green Infrastructure Study.

5.2 Development Strategy and Housing

Objective A: Promoting new high quality housing in appropriate locations

Policy H1 Built Up Area Boundaries

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Historic	Landscapes	Biodiversity	Flood	Climate contribution	Climate plan	Resource	Pollution	Waste	Transport	Rural Barrier	Countryside	House	Health	Economic
0	+	+	+/-	+	0	++	0	0	+	+	++	0	+	0

5.2.1 The majority of historic features, such as listed buildings, in the plan area are within the Built Up Area Boundaries. No development is proposed within the built up area boundary that would be expected to adversely affect any historic assets or their setting. Policy BE10 is expected to conserve these features (SEA Objective 1) giving a negligible effect.

5.2.2 Restricting development to the urban area may protect the landscape value of the wider countryside. Policies BE1 and BE2 are expected to conserve local townscape character (SEA Objectives 2 and 12).

5.2.3 This policy is likely to contribute to the conservation of biodiversity and geodiversity, the majority of recorded biodiversity and geodiversity features, and high quality habitat, are located outside of the urban Built Up Area Boundaries (SEA Objective 3).

- 5.2.4 The built up areas within the plan contain areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3. Whilst Policy NE2 restricts the majority of development in Flood Zone 3, Flood Zone 2 is also at high risk of flooding. Restricting development to built up area boundaries may result in development at risk of flooding (SEA Objective 4).
- 5.2.5 This policy is likely to lead to development close to existing services and facilities, as well as to bus services serving these, thus reducing the need to travel and reducing the carbon footprint of Stratford-upon-Avon per head (SEA Objectives 5, 10, 11 and 14).
- 5.2.6 Development within the Built Up Areas Boundary is unlikely to encroach on agricultural land, thus preserving this resource for future use (SEA Objective 7).
- 5.2.7 This policy will not lead to housing provision in itself, rather it will influence the location of any housing proposed by other policies, in turn having a neutral effect against SEA Objective 13.

Policy H2 Strategic Gap

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0

- 5.2.8 This policy will protect local distinctiveness and the current landscape character by ensuring the Stratford-upon-Avon plan area retains its individual villages, minimising the risk of urban coalescence (SEA Objective 2).
- 5.2.9 The strategic gap may also contribute to preserving the integrity of the countryside, as it ensures that settlements, such as Alveston, are still surrounded by countryside (SEA Objective 12).

Policy H3 Development in the Local Service Villages

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	+	0	+/-	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0

5.2.10 This policy limits development in Tiddington and Alveston that is additional to Core Strategy allocations to windfall sites. Most windfall sites in these villages are likely to be small. This, in combination with Policies BE1, BE2 and BE10, is likely to conserve the character of these villages, including their historic environment (SA Objectives 1, 2 and 12).

5.2.11 There are no designated biodiversity or geodiversity features in the Local Service Villages within the plan area. Due to the likely small size of windfall sites, significant effects on biodiversity are not anticipated (SA Objective 3).

5.2.12 There are areas of Flood Zones 2 and 3 in both Tiddington and Alveston, which are areas at high risk of flooding. Windfall sites may be at high risk of flooding, although this depends on the location of such sites (SA Objective 4).

5.2.13 The assessment of Policy H1 explains that any development within the built up area boundary, including windfall sites, is unlikely to lead to loss of agricultural land and is likely to be close to services, facilities and public transport facilities (SA Objectives 5, 7, 10, 11 and 14).

5.2.14 This policy makes some provision for housing in addition to that already allocated, which may contribute towards meeting local housing demand (SA Objective 13).

Policy H4 Use of Brownfield Land

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	++	+	+/-	0	+	++	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0

- 5.2.15 This policy requires proposals to lead to an enhancement in the character and appearance of the site. This has positive implications for SEA Objective 2, as it brings the potential for previously developed sites to make a greater contribution to the local townscape or landscape (SEA Objective 2).
- 5.2.16 Policy H4 states that redevelopment of brownfield land will only be permitted where it does not result in loss of land of high environmental value. It is implied that this policy will not lead to loss of sites that are valuable in terms of biodiversity or geodiversity (SA Objective 3).
- 5.2.17 Without identification of specific brownfield development sites, it is unknown whether development would be at risk of flooding (SEA Objective 4). It is possible that development on brownfield land would be less likely to exacerbate flood risk, as brownfield land is expected to have poorer drainage due to the presence on impermeable surfaces, such as paving, concrete and buildings. In addition, brownfield land is less likely to incorporate recognized green infrastructure assets, thus this policy contributes positively to planning for the anticipated levels of climate change (SEA Objective 6).
- 5.2.18 Prioritising development on brownfield land has positive implications for natural resources (SEA Objective 7), as it will protect agricultural land by building on previously developed land. This may mean that more of the local housing need is met on non-agricultural land (SEA Objective 12).
- 5.2.19 The requirement of the policy for development to remediate any contamination issues has positive implications for SEA Objective 8.
- 5.2.20 Whilst development on brownfield sites may lead to provision of housing (SEA Objective 13) or employment (SEA Objective 15), this policy may not necessarily lead to such development. For this reason, SEA Objectives 13 and 15 have been assessed as neutral.

Policy H5 Use of Garden Land

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land	Biodiv	Flood	Climate cont rb	Climate plan	Resrce	Polln	Waste	Transp	Rural Barrier	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	0	+/-	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0

- 5.2.21 This policy requires development of garden land to maintain or enhance local landscape character as well as ensuring that development is in keeping with local settlement character. This is expected to maintain landscape character and local distinctiveness, leading to positive implications for SEA Objective 2.
- 5.2.22 Gardens are generally considered to be of low value to native biodiversity, due to the high proportion of alien flora species planted in gardens, presence of pets, such as cats and declines in garden size¹⁴. For this reason, policy H5 has been assessed as having neutral implications for SEA Objective 3.
- 5.2.23 Without identification of specific garden development sites, it is unknown whether development would be at risk of flooding (SEA Objective 4). Garden land may be less likely to incorporate recognized green infrastructure assets, thus this policy contributes positively to planning for the anticipated levels of climate change (SEA Objective 6).
- 5.2.24 Development on garden land has positive implications for natural resources (SEA Objective 7), as it will reduce the requirement for development on agricultural land. This may mean that more of the local housing need is met on non-agricultural land (SEA Objective 12).

Objective B: Promoting high quality housing that meets the needs of the Neighbourhood Area

Policy H6 Affordable Housing

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	coun tr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0	0

- 5.2.25 The explanatory text requires affordable housing to be integrated into market housing and indistinguishable in location and layout. This is likely to ensure that local distinctiveness is retained (SEA Objective 2).

¹⁴ Smith *et al* (2005) Urban domestic gardens (IX): Composition and richness of the vascular plant flora, and implications for native biodiversity

Gaston *et al* (2004) Urban domestic gardens (IV): the extent of the resource and its associated features

5.2.26 This policy supports suitable affordable housing provision in line with demand, which will contribute to fulfilling demand for affordable homes (SEA Objectives 11 and 13).

Policy H7 Market Housing

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	0

5.2.27 This policy ensures that market housing mix is suitable for the Stratford-upon-Avon neighbourhood plan area is appropriate for the local population is likely to contribute to retaining the local distinctiveness of the plan area (SEA Objective 2).

5.2.28 Locating housing for older people near to local amenities may contribute towards minimizing the plan area’s contribution to climate change, as this will allow older members of the population to walk to key services and facilities, rather than getting a taxi (SEA Objectives 5 and 10).

5.2.29 This policy encourages provision of a suitable mix of housing to match local needs, although this policy relates only to market housing, not affordable housing (SEA Objective 13).

5.2.30 This policy requires larger developments to include homes designed for an ageing population, through the provision of bungalows. This may benefit the health and independence of those requiring such housing, which may also have positive implications for mental health (SEA Objective 14).

5.3 Employment

Objective A: Promoting new high quality employment opportunities in appropriate locations and encouraging retention of existing employers in the Neighbourhood Area

Policy E1 Protecting Existing Employment Sites

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	+

- 5.3.1 Protection of existing employment sites will resist change to the use of the site, which is expected to ensure a continuation of character in the area (SEA Objective 2).
- 5.3.2 This policy allows relocation of employment if this would make better use of existing or planned infrastructure. In the explanation of the policy, there is support for locating employment sites with access to the A46 and Stratford-upon-Avon Parkway rail station. This would provide links to the site by sustainable transport and would prevent HGV's having to go through the town, which is likely to reduce transport time for these vehicles, as well as potentially reducing congestion in the town (SEA Objective 10). This is likely to reduce the carbon emissions and exhaust emissions in Stratford-upon-Avon, thus reducing the contribution of the plan area to climate change (SEA Objective 5) and potentially reducing air quality issues associated with vehicle fumes in the Stratford AQMA (SEA Objective 8).
- 5.3.3 This policy has been assessed as having positive implications for SEA Objective 15 as it protects existing employment land and existing business in the plan area, as well as allowing provision for new businesses and new, sustainable employment sites (SEA Objective 15).

Policy E2 Promoting New Employment Opportunities on the Outskirts of the Town

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biodiv	Flood	Climte cont rb	Climte plan	Resrce	Polln	Waste	Tran sp	Rural Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
-	+	0	+	+	+	-	+	0	++	+	+/-	0	0	++

- 5.3.4 The SA of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy¹⁵ states that the proposed development of Land South of the Alcester Road may have negative effects on the historic environment, due to the presence of archaeological remains and ridge and furrow¹⁶ (SEA Objective 1).

¹⁵ Lepus Consulting (2014) Sustainability Appraisal of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy

¹⁶ Warwickshire County Council (2008) Historic Environment Assessment of Proposed Strategic Sites

- 5.3.5 Policies BE1 and BE2 are expected to ensure that the sensitive, edge-of-settlement Land South of Alcester Road site would be developed to appropriate standards in order to conserve sense of place and local character. SSB2 requires this site to incorporate high quality design and high quality landscape-led layout, as well as a scheme to minimize light pollution. Development at an alternative location is also expected to protect or enhance landscape (SEA Objective 2).
- 5.3.6 The SA of the Core Strategy also highlights that there are hedgerows on the site south of Alcester Road, which are a priority habitat as listed in the 2010 UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP). Policy NE3 lends protection to trees and hedgerows, thus biodiversity is expected to be unaffected by development at this site (SEA Objective 3).
- 5.3.7 Land South of Alcester Road lies in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding and it will not remove any recognized green infrastructure assets (SEA Objectives 4 and 6).
- 5.3.8 Land South of Alcester Road currently has poor accessibility by sustainable modes of transport, although SSB2 requires proposals for this site to provide green travel measures, including improving links with existing public transport. Improving the accessibility of this site by sustainable modes of transport, will reduce the need for people working at the site to drive to work, thus reducing the per capita contribution of the plan area to climate change (SEA Objectives 5, 10 and 11). In requiring any additional employment sites to be located with easy access to the A46, or to include road infrastructure changes, this policy is likely to minimize the impacts of new employment development on congestion.
- 5.3.9 Land South of the Alcester Road consists mainly of Grade 3b agricultural land, which is not considered to be best and most versatile. There is an area of Grade 3a agricultural land in the southeastern part of the site, which is considered to be best and most versatile land. Development at this site would sterilize this resource, unless it was retained for landscaping, resulting in a negative assessment for SEA Objective 7.

- 5.3.10 Development at Land South of Alcester Road is not expected to negatively impact the wider landscape, particularly as SSB2 requires a high quality landscape-led design. Whilst the site represents an extension of the urban form, the small scale of the development, along with requirements for landscaping are expected to minimize any negative landscape and visual impacts of building in the countryside. Development at this site may lead to lead to loss of best and most versatile agricultural land on a small part of the site, if this is not retained for landscaping, resulting in uncertain effects on SEA Objective 12.
- 5.3.11 Development of employment opportunities at the Land South of Alcester Road site is expected to provide better links to employment and business sites from the strategic road network. This may reduce the number of HGVs passing through the town, thus reducing traffic volume overall and reducing congestion due to HGVs slowing overall traffic flow. This is likely to lead to improvements in the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA, due to the reduction of pollutants associated with vehicle exhaust fumes (SEA Objective 8).
- 5.3.12 This policy is likely to lead to an increase in employment and office developments, which will be accessible by sustainable modes of transport, due to the requirements of SSB2. This is expected to have positive implications for the local economy, as it will create jobs and increase the number of businesses operating in the plan area. This is reinforced by the policy, as it states that other suitable employment sites would be supported for development should the Land South of Alcester Road not come forward during the plan period (SEA Objective 15).

Policy E3 Promoting Employment Associated with Culture, Media and Tourism

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biodiv	Flood	Climate cont rb	Climate plan	Resrce	Poll n	Waste	Transp	Rural Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+

- 5.3.13 Due to the fact that a large proportion of Stratford-upon-Avon's visitor economy is associated with Shakespeare and Elizabethan theatre, this policy is expected to reinforce the cultural heritage of Stratford-upon-Avon and strengthen its historic visitor attractions.
- 5.3.14 This policy is likely to have positive implications for the local economy (SEA Objective 15), as it will support the visitor economy and provide new employment opportunities.

Policy E4 Work/Live Units

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	0	+

5.3.15 This policy is likely to lead to a reduction in the per capita carbon footprint of Stratford-upon-Avon as development of work/live units would reduce the need to travel for work. In addition, the policy requires such units to have access to service facilities by means other than a private vehicle, which may further reduce car use in the plan area. Reductions in car use are likely to lead to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions associated with vehicle exhaust fumes, including CO and CO₂ (SEA Objectives 5, 10 and 11).

5.3.16 This policy may increase housing provision, thus contributing to fulfilling local housing demand, as well as increasing employment provision, albeit on a small scale (SEA Objectives 13 and 15).

5.4 Town Centre

Objective A: Promoting the vitality and commercial viability of the Town Centre

Policy TC1 Out of Town Centre Retail

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+

5.4.1 This policy is expected to protect local businesses and the economic status of the town centre by encouraging spending in this area. This is expected to support businesses in the plan area and potentially increase employment opportunities in the town centre (SEA Objective 15).

Policy TC2 Primary Shopping Frontages

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+

5.4.2 This policy is unlikely to affect the majority of environmental issues, as it is unlikely to lead to change, rather it is aimed at protecting the existing pattern of retail in the town. Positive effects have been identified against SEA Objective 15 as retention of a high proportion of retail frontages is likely to support the visitor economy and protect income for local businesses. If such shopping areas became less dominated by retail, visitors may be discouraged from shopping in these streets due to the apparent lack of retail offer.

Policy TC3 Bell Court

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	++	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+

5.4.3 This policy is expected to lead to a revitalised Bell Court, that merges with surrounding development and creates open, attractive links to this. This is likely to enhance the local townscape, as the policy proposes to make improvements to the attractiveness of the public realm. In addition, this policy is expected to protect and enhance the historic environment by requiring design to be compatible with the historic town centre (SEA Objectives 1 and 2).

5.4.4 Bell Court is located in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding and contains no recognised green infrastructure assets (SEA Objectives 4 and 6).

5.4.5 This policy is assessed as having positive implications for SEA Objective 10, transport, as it promotes a quality pedestrian link between Rother Market and High Street, which will make walking an easier and more attractive option around the town centre. The policy requires provision for any necessary alternative parking, which should be supported by public transport initiatives, such as INF Project 4.

- 5.4.6 This policy encourages new retail and leisure developments, which may bring both more employment to the area and more spending in the plan area, which is likely to strengthen the local economy (SEA Objective 15).

Policy TC4 Rother Street and the Rother Market

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	++	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+

- 5.4.7 This policy is expected to protect and enhance the landscape of Rother Street and Rother Market, as it seeks to promote the area as a place of public interest and make it more attractive through reducing street clutter and soft landscaping. The policy also permits development that is designed sympathetically to current uses and that is sensitive to the surroundings. These changes are expected to protect and enhance the townscape at this location, which is in turn expected to protect the historic environment in this part of the Stratford-upon-Avon conservation area (SEA Objectives 1 and 2).
- 5.4.8 Rother Street and Rother Market are located in Flood Zone 1, which is at low risk of flooding (SEA Objective 4).
- 5.4.9 It is possible that promoting and expanding the market will draw more people and from further afield. This could potentially increase local traffic flows of people visiting the market, including increases in the number of private vehicles. This has potential to increase greenhouse gas emissions associated with vehicular transport and exacerbate air quality issues in the AQMA. As this policy aims to improve links between other parts of the town, including the High Street, Town Square and Greenhill Street, the increased number of visitors to the market may have been visiting these locations, or other town centre locations anyway. It is expected that other policies in this plan, particularly those under 'Infrastructure', including INF3, INF5 and INF6 will ensure that development does not increase the carbon footprint of Stratford-upon-Avon or exacerbate air quality issues in the AQMA (SEA Objectives 5, 8 and 10).
- 5.4.10 Improvements to Rother Street and the Rother Market are likely to draw more people to this part of town and increase spending in the market. Expanding the market may also provide opportunities for new traders and small businesses to sell their produce in the town (SEA Objective 15).

Policy TC5 Greenhill Street and Arden Street Environmental Improvement Area

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	++	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+

5.4.11 Improvements to this area are expected to protect and enhance the townscape by providing landscaping, bringing empty units into use and introducing stricter rules over advertisements (SEA Objective 1).

5.4.12 This Environmental Improvement Area is located in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding. This area also contains no known green infrastructure assets (SEA Objective 6).

5.4.13 This policy is expected to contribute to minimizing the area’s contribution to climate change by creating high quality pedestrian links (SEA Objectives 5 and 10).

5.4.14 Whilst this policy does not discuss green infrastructure, Environmental Improvement Areas could be an opportunity to enhance the green infrastructure network in the plan area, bringing benefits to human health, wildlife and adaptation to climate change¹⁷.

5.4.15 Bringing empty units back into use may contribute to economic improvement in the area, as it may support new businesses and support the visitor economy by providing outlets, such as cafes, near the train station (SEA Objective 15).

¹⁷ Forest Research (2010) Benefits of Green Infrastructure. Available at: [http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/\\$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf)

Policy TC6 Rother Triangle Environmental Improvement Area

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	+	+/-	+	0	+/-	++	0	+/-	++	0	+	0	+/-	++

5.4.16 There are a number of listed buildings along Rother Street and the Rother Triangle is within the Stratford-upon-Avon conservation area. Development is expected to be sensitively designed with regards to these features, as listed buildings and their settings are protected by Policy BE10 (SEA Objective 1). Historic environment and townscape are closely linked in conservation areas, thus Policy BE10 and policies BE1 and BE2 are likely to work together to protect local character in this area (SEA Objective 2). Although the requirement for a comprehensive masterplan and design brief suggests that the plan group support proposals to enhance the local townscape, this is not explicitly stated in the policy.

5.4.17 The park at the tip of the Rother Triangle, where Rother Street and Grove Road meet, is valuable as a resource for wildlife and people. The park continues across the road between Chestnut Street and Scholars Lane and includes trees that may be suitable for bats and / or breeding birds. Green space in urban areas, such as this park, boosts mental health, happiness and productivity of residents and the working population, as well as local climate regulation and provision of shade on sunny days^{34,18}, which is likely to become increasingly important given predicted climate change. The trees are likely to be protected by Policy NE3, but this area is not listed as an open space asset in Policy CLW3. Policy TC6 designates this area for mixed use development, including open space but there are not details on location, size and nature of greenspace required, which could result in loss of this land without provision of a suitable alternative. If redevelopment of the area does not retain, or reduces this open space, it could have negative impacts for SEA Objectives 3, 6 and 14.

5.4.18 This area is in Flood Zone 1, thus it is at low risk of flooding (SEA Objective 4).

¹⁸ Ian Douglas for UK MAB Urban Forum (2004) Urban Greenspace and mental health

- 5.4.19 If the site creates a new destination in itself, for example if more people come to the area to use the retail, hotel or conference facilities, the redevelopment may increase vehicle movements in the area as more cars come to the site. This would also increase pollution associated with vehicle exhaust fumes, which would exacerbate local air quality issues in the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA. It is expected that other policies in this plan, particularly those under 'Infrastructure', including INF Projects 6, 8 and 9 will ensure that development does not increase the carbon footprint of Stratford-upon-Avon or exacerbate air quality issues in the AQMA, leading to neutral effects on SEA Objectives 5 and 8.
- 5.4.20 As this site is already developed, redevelopment will not sterilize any agricultural land and may lead to more efficient use of this land (SEA Objectives 7 and 12).
- 5.4.21 Implications of redevelopment on waste (SEA Objective 9) remain uncertain. It is possible that redevelopment may lead to demolition of current buildings, with the waste going to landfill and construction using new, non-recycled materials. It is not known if the new uses of the site will generate more or less waste than the existing uses. In addition, the redevelopment could promote recycling and sustainable buildings, to increase its environmental credentials.
- 5.4.22 This area has good accessibility from a number of bus services, which stop adjacent to the site on Greenhill Street and Rother Street. This includes school services, infrequent services and more frequent services, up to twice an hour. In addition, local services are easily accessible from the site on the surrounding roads and redevelopment may increase the accessibility of services and facilities, including educational facilities (SEA Objective 10).
- 5.4.23 The policy does not state that redevelopment would include additional housing. There are a number of houses currently located on the site and it is assumed that these will be retained (SEA Objective 13).
- 5.4.24 This policy is likely to encourage new employment, retail and leisure development, which is accessible by bus, as described above, as well as being connected to the rest of the town centre by footpaths and roads (SEA Objective 15).

Policy TC7 Birmingham Road, Arden Street and Windsor Street Environmental Improvement Area

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	+	0	+	0	+	++	0	+/-	++	0	+	0	+	++

5.4.25 There are two listed buildings along Windsor Street and Birmingham Road and parts of the site along Mansell Street, Windsor Street and Birmingham Road lie within the Stratford-upon-Avon conservation area. Policy BE12 and Policy BE13 protect these features, thus development would be expected to maintain the historic environment (SEA Objective 1). Impacts on landscape and historic environment are closely linked in conservation areas. Local character and distinctiveness is likely to be retained due to the protections of Policies BE12 and BE13, as well as Policies BE1 and BE2 (SEA Objective 2).

5.4.26 This site is located in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding and there are no green infrastructure assets on the site (SEA Objectives 4 and 6).

5.4.27 The redevelopment is likely to create a new destination, for example if more people come to the area to use the shopping or hotel facilities, the redevelopment may increase carbon emissions in the area as more cars come to the site. This would also increase pollution associated with vehicle exhaust fumes, which would exacerbate local air quality issues in the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA. It is expected that other policies in this plan, particularly those under 'Infrastructure', including INF Projects 6, 8 and 9 will ensure that development does not increase the carbon footprint of Stratford-upon-Avon or exacerbate air quality issues in the AQMA (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

5.4.28 This site consists of previously developed, non-agricultural land, thus potentially reducing the need for development on agricultural land if the scheme will lead to more efficient use of space (SEA Objectives 7 and 12).

5.4.29 Implications of redevelopment on waste (SEA Objective 9) remain uncertain. It is possible that redevelopment may lead to demolition of current buildings, with the waste going to landfill and construction using new, non-recycled materials. It is not known if the new uses of the site will generate more or less waste than the existing uses. In addition, the redevelopment could promote recycling and sustainable buildings, to increase its environmental credentials.

- 5.4.30 There are a number of bus stops within 400m of the site, served by a range of services, including the twice-hourly 221 service and 222, which provide a link to and from the rail station. There are good pedestrian links to the site, which are likely to be further improved by Policy TC7 as the policy promotes links with the surrounding area. The policy also requires masterplans to give details of transport implications, which is likely to flag up any transport issues and encourage these to be resolved, having positive implications for local transport (SEA Objective 10).
- 5.4.31 There are a number of residential dwellings on this site. The Policy does not specify that the redevelopment will include housing, instead focussing on commercial uses. It is assumed that existing housing will be retained (SEA Objective 13).
- 5.4.32 This site is adjacent to the hospital and within 300m of the Stratford Canal, an important recreational resource and Stratford Leisure Centre is within 2km, thus the site has good access to healthcare and leisure (SEA Objective 14).
- 5.4.33 This policy is likely to encourage new employment, through retail and hotel development, as well as a higher education facility to increase skills of future workers. As the site is accessible by bus, as described above, as well as being connected to the rest of the town centre by footpaths and roads, it is likely to have strong, positive impacts on local transport (SEA Objective 15).

Policy TC8 Town Centre to Maybird Centre Environmental Improvement Area

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land	Biodiv	Flood	Climate	Climate	Resrce	Polln	Waste	Transp	Rural	Countr	House	Health	Econ
or	s	iv	d	te	plan	ce	n	e	p	Barri	er	se	th	
+	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0

- 5.4.34 Whilst this Environmental Improvement Area includes part of the Stratford-upon-Avon conservation area, historic assets are likely to be conserved as part of Policy BE10. Policy TC8 promotes improvements to the public realm, which is expected to enhance both the setting of historic assets and the overall townscape quality (SEA Objectives 1 and 2).
- 5.4.35 This area lies in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding (SEA Objective 4) and does not contain any green infrastructure assets (SEA Objective 6).

- 5.4.36 This policy is expected to improve walking and cycling routes by widening footpaths and creating attractive pedestrian and cycle crossings. Improving these links is likely to promote walking and cycling as an alternative to car use, thus leading to a reduction in congestion and associated greenhouse gas and air pollutant emissions (SEA Objectives 5, 8 and 10).

TC Project 1 Town Centre Strategic Partnership

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	++

- 5.4.37 The involvement of the RSC and the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust in the Town Centre Economic Partnership, as well as improvements to the visitor experience is expected to broaden access to the historic environment, due to the strong links between tourism and heritage in Stratford-upon-Avon (SEA Objective 1).

- 5.4.38 This policy indicates that the Town Centre Strategy would work towards increasing footfall in the town. Visitors to the town may travel to Stratford-upon-Avon by car, which would increase the contribution of the plan area to climate change if more visitors were encouraged into the town. Increased travel to the town is expected to be mitigated by improved parking and traffic policies, along with improvements in pedestrian and cycling routes, as suggested in the policy (SEA Objectives 5 and 10).

- 5.4.39 This policy is expected to have positive implications for the economy, by supporting independent businesses and craftspeople. In addition, the Town Centre Strategy would intend to bring more income to the area by increasing visitor spending (SEA Objective 15). As described above, this policy is also expected to increase accessibility of the town, including improvements to pedestrian and cycle rights of way.

TC Project 2 Greenhill Street and Arden Street Environmental Improvement Area

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0

5.4.40 This project is expected to protect and enhance the townscape by providing better quality landscaping, paving and signposting (SEA Objective 2).

5.4.41 This Environmental Improvement Area is located in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding. This area also contains no known green infrastructure assets (SEA Objective 6).

5.4.42 This project is expected to contribute to minimizing contribution to climate change by creating pedestrian and cycle routes from the rail station to the town centre, thus promoting sustainable modes of transport (SEA Objectives 5 and 10).

5.4.43 Improvements to the Arden Street junction by providing a new crossing is likely to improve wellbeing of both residents and visitors by providing a safer way across the road (SEA Objective 14).

TC Project 3 Town Centre to Maybird Centre Environmental Improvement Area

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	0	0	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0

5.4.44 Whilst this Environmental Improvement Area includes part of the Stratford-upon-Avon conservation area, this is protected under Policy BE10 (SEA Objective 1).

5.4.45 This site lies in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding (SEA Objective 4) and does not contain any green infrastructure assets (SEA Objective 6).

- 5.4.46 This policy is expected to improve walking and cycling routes by creating a pedestrian and cyclist priority crossing and a new public right of way over the disused railway bridge over the canal. Improving these links is likely to promote walking and cycling, rather than car use, thus leading to a reduction in car use, congestion and associated greenhouse gas and air pollutant emissions (SEA Objectives 5, 8 and 10).
- 5.4.47 Creating dedicated pedestrian and cycle routes, as well as priority crossings, is expected to encourage more people to travel by foot or bike and increase the safety of these, thus improving overall health and wellbeing in the plan area (SEA Objective 14).

Objective B: Increasing the presence of housing in the Town Centre

Policy TC9 Homes in the Town Centre

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land	Biodiv	Flood	Climate	Climate	Resrce	Polln	Waste	Transp	Rural	Countr	Hou	Health	Econ
or	s	iv	d	cont	plan	ce	n	te	sp	Barri	er	se		n
+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+	0	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	0

- 5.4.48 Stratford-upon-Avon town centre is a conservation area and has many listed buildings. There is a possibility that housing development in the centre could negatively impact these buildings or their settings. As Policy BE10 states that listed buildings and conservation areas should be protected and enhanced, development is expected to maintain these assets (SEA Objective 1).
- 5.4.49 Development in the town centre must also be cautious of potential to negatively impact other environmental issues, such as biodiversity impacts and flood risk, which cannot be known without details of location and design (SEA Objectives 3, 4 and 6), although Policies BE1 and BE2 are expected to protect local townscape (SEA Objective 2). It is anticipated that town centre GI assets will be protected and enhanced via other policies in the NDP, including policies to protect open space, such as Policies CLW3, CLW4 and CLW5.

5.4.50 Housing development in the town centre is expected to have positive implications for minimizing the plan area's contribution to climate change by reducing the need to travel. Housing in the town centre is likely to be within walking distance of key services, as well as additional amenities, such as retail and leisure provision. In addition, town centre locations are more likely to be within 400m of a bus stop and other sustainable transport routes (SEA Objectives 5 and 10). By decreasing reliance on car use, Policy TC9 may also help reduce congestion in the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA, thus improving local air quality (SEA Objective 8). Town centre housing is also more likely to be near to health services and facilities, such as doctor's surgeries, pharmacies and leisure centres (SEA Objective 14).

Objective C: Improving the Visitor Experience in the Town Centre

Policy TC10 Promoting a Cultural and Learning Quarter

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biodiv	Flood	Climte cont rb	Climte plan	Resrce	Polln	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	+	0	+	0	+	++	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	++

5.4.51 Promotion of cultural and learning activities is expected to further enhance access and understanding of the historic context of Stratford-upon-Avon. Requiring large developments to produce a masterplan or design brief for the quarter may help protect historic features, such as listed buildings. That, in turn, protects the townscape of the Stratford-upon-Avon conservation area and as such this will have positive implications for the historic environment and townscape (SEA Objectives 1 and 2).

5.4.52 This area lies in Flood Zone 1 and contains no recognized green infrastructure assets, thus is at low risk of flooding (SEA Objectives 4 and 6).

5.4.53 This policy is expected to enhance culture and learning in Stratford-upon-Avon, which in turn is expected to attract more visitors. A greater number of visitors in the area may correlate to a greater number of cars on the road, thus increasing the plan area's contribution to climate change and potentially exacerbating air quality issues in the Stratford AQMA. It is expected that other parts of this plan, particularly Infrastructure Projects, will ensure that development does not increase the carbon footprint of Stratford-upon-Avon or exacerbate air quality issues in the AQMA (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

- 5.4.54 As this area is already developed, there are no anticipated impacts on access to natural resources or integrity of the countryside (SEA Objectives 7 and 12).
- 5.4.55 There are a number of bus stops within 400m of the proposed Cultural and Learning Quarter, which are served by a range of services, including moderate frequency services to and from the rail station, as well as services that bring visitors to and from further afield. This area is also well connected to other areas of the town centre and will be linked to the Birmingham Road, Arden Street and Windsor Street Environmental Improvement Area, as described in Policy TC7, thus having positive implications for local transport (SEA Objective 10).
- 5.4.56 This site is within easy access of Stratford-upon-Avon Hospital. It is also within 300m of the Stratford Canal, which provides a nearby recreational resource (SEA Objective 14).
- 5.4.57 This policy is expected to enhance visitor attraction to Stratford-upon-Avon, bringing more people to the area, which may lead to increased spending and a stronger local economy (SEA Objective 15).

Policy TC11 Promoting New Conference Facilities in the Town Centre

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biodiv	Flood	Climte cont rb	Climte plan	Resrce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	+	+/-	+/-	0	+/-	+	0	0	+	0	+	0	+	+

- 5.4.58 This policy promotes new conference facilities in the Bridgeway area or the Rother Triangle. Both areas are within the Stratford-upon-Avon conservation area and are in proximity to listed buildings, including the Grade II listed Grosvenor House Hotel and the Coach House Hotel. As Policy BE10 protects listed buildings, conservation areas and their surroundings, the historic environment is not likely to be affected (SEA Objective 1). Likewise, policies to maintain and enhance sense of place and local character (Policies BE1 and BE2) are expected to protect the local landscape and any new buildings for conference facilities should reflect this (SEA Objective 2).

- 5.4.59 Development in the Bridgeway area is likely to be adjacent to the existing leisure centre and is expected to be on greenfield land either to the east of the leisure centre main building, or to the north of the car park. These areas contain habitats that could support a high level of biodiversity, including wooded areas, scrub and rough grassland. This has potential to support bats, birds, reptiles and invertebrates. The implications of development on biodiversity remain uncertain, as this depends on the exact location of development and requires further information on the species that the site may support. The greenspace in the Rother Triangle may be of values to biodiversity, but the extent of this is uncertain without further surveys (SEA Objective 3).
- 5.4.60 Rother Triangle is within Flood Zone 1, which is at low risk of flooding. Much of the Bridgeway area lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3, thus development at this location is likely to be at risk of flooding, especially as development on greenfield may reduce the natural drainage capabilities of this land (SEA Objectives 4 and 6).
- 5.4.61 Whilst the presence of a conference centre may bring more people to the area, other policies in this plan, e.g. INF Projects 6, 8 and 9 are likely to prevent this from increasing the per capita carbon footprint of the plan area, resulting in an overall neutral effect on climate change mitigation (SEA Objective 5).
- 5.4.62 The Rother Triangle consists of developed land and the Bridgeway area consists of Grade 4 Agricultural Land. As such, this development is not considered to lead to loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (SEA Objectives 7 and 12).
- 5.4.63 Both the Rother Triangle and the Bridgeway area are within 400m of bus stops. The areas are well-connected by footpaths, which along with public transport links allow the areas to be accessed by sustainable modes of transport (SEA Objective 10).
- 5.4.64 Potential future conference facilities at the Rother Triangle or Bridgeway would be within 1km of a GP, 8km of a hospital and have access to nearby green space (SEA Objective 14).
- 5.4.65 Promoting development of a conference centre may encourage new businesses to the area and will generate employment (SEA Objective 15).

Objective D: Protecting the town's heritage

Policy TC12 Shop Fronts

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.4.66 In ensuring shop front development is in keeping with existing development and the guidelines in the Stratford-upon-Avon high street study and design guidance, this policy is expected to maintain townscape character and local distinctiveness. This, along with the requirement for shop fronts to be sympathetic with any heritage designation, is expected to help maintain both the historic environment and local townscape (SEA Objectives 1 and 2).

TC Project 4 Shop Front Schemes

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.4.67 Policy TC3 promotes a scheme to supporting owners or lessees of shops with architectural advice and funding to ensure design consistent with the historic character of the town. This is likely to contribute to ensuring shop fronts are in keeping with the townscape and respect the sensitivities of the historic environment (SEA Objectives 1 and 2).

Objective E: Improving access and movement within the Town Centre

TC Project 5 Improving the Balance between Vehicles, Pedestrians and Cyclists

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	++	0	+/-	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	+	0

5.4.68 Whilst there are a number of historic features in the areas affected by this policy, these should be protected through Policy BE10, thus maintaining the historic environment (SEA Objective 1). In addition, this policy requires landscaping and an improved public realm for TC13a and TC13b, which is expected to enhance the local townscape (SEA Objective 2).

- 5.4.69 Parts of Bridge Street lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Although this is not expected to be exacerbated by development, regular flooding could reduce the accessibility of this route, and its suitability for walking and cycling (SEA Objectives 4 and 6).
- 5.4.70 This project is expected to encourage walking and cycling by offering a road infrastructure more suited to, and safer for these. This may reduce car use, thus reducing the contribution of the plan area to climate change (SEA Objectives 5 and 10). This may also help reduce congestion and reduce air quality issues in the AQMA (SEA Objective 8).
- 5.4.71 Encouraging walking and cycling may also improve health, as residents will be more active. This project may also improve access to and pedestrian and cyclist access to health services, including doctor's surgeries and pharmacies, as well as access to open space. This project is also likely to increase safety of pedestrians and cyclists, for example by introducing a 20mph speed limit and redesigning the Bridge Street roundabout. (SEA Objective 14).

TC Project 6 Cycling in the Town Centre

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0

- 5.4.72 This project aims to encourage safer cycling networks, which is expected to encourage more people to cycle. If more people cycle as an alternative to taking the car, traffic and congestion is likely to decrease, leading to a decrease in greenhouse gas emissions associated with car use (SEA Objective 5). This is also likely to reduce emissions of pollutants associated with car use, thus reducing air pollution issues in the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA (SEA Objective 8).
- 5.4.73 Increasing the safety of cycle routes, thus encouraging more people to use them has positive implications for SEA Objective 10, as services and facilities, including schools, are likely to be more accessible by bike. Safer cycle routes are also expected to reduce the number of accidents involving cyclists and contribute to resident and visitor wellbeing in Stratford-upon-Avon (SEA Objective 14).

TC Project 7 Coaches in the Town Centres

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.4.74 This project aims to reduce congestion in the town centre, thus it is likely to reduce total waiting time of vehicles through the centre. This is likely to lead to a reduction in greenhouse gases and pollutants associated with vehicle exhaust fumes (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

5.4.75 This project is assessed as having neutral effects with regards to transport, as it does not promote or encourage use of sustainable modes of transport, rather it aims to control traffic in the town centre.

TC Project 8 Alleviation of Congestion on the Tramway Bridge

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0

5.4.76 The Tramway Bridge is Grade II listed. Proposals to reduce congestion may improve the setting of the bridge by reducing traffic, associated noise and associated emissions. In addition, listed buildings (which includes listed features, such as this bridge) are protected under Policy BE10 (SEA Objective 1).

5.4.77 Reducing congestion is likely to reduce greenhouse gas and pollutant emissions associated with vehicle exhaust fumes (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

5.4.78 Increasing pedestrian safety has positive implications for transport (SEA Objective 10) and health and wellbeing (SEA Objective 14), by reducing accidents and injuries as well as encouraging walking.

TC Project 9 Parking in the Town Centre

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+

5.4.79 Permitting new parking facilities, where this will reduce congestion, is likely to reduce the amount of greenhouse gases and pollutants generated by vehicles in the plan area. This should be monitored to ensure new car parks are reducing congestion, and increasing accessibility to the town centre, rather than encouraging people to drive to the town. The provision of electric charging points would be expected to encourage the use of electric cars. This would contribute to reducing the carbon footprint of the area and reducing pollution associated with conventional car fuels (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

5.4.80 This policy is assessed as having neutral effects with regards to SEA Objective 10, as it does not promote or encourage use of sustainable modes of transport, rather it aims to control traffic in the town centre.

5.4.81 This policy is expected to support the visitor economy, by retaining existing car parks in order to provide suitable access for those visitors who may find it difficult to visit the town by bus or public rights of way (SEA Objective 15).

5.5 Built Environment and Design

Objective A: Promoting High Quality Sustainable Design

Policy BE1 Creating a Strong Sense of Place

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0

5.5.1 This policy encourages developments to enhance landscape character and local distinctiveness, through creating attractive and legible developments (SEA Objective 2).

- 5.5.2 This policy states that developments should be accessible ‘by a choice of access routes’, which suggests accessibility via a variety of modes of transport. For example, the developments are likely to be accessible by footpaths and cycle routes as well as road travel (SEA Objective 10). Accessibility is also a consideration for SEA Objective 11. This policy requires a high level of accessibility and a variety of uses and activities, which, if in a rural area, is expected to provide additional facilities and increase accessibility to these.
- 5.5.3 High quality design, access to a variety of activities and encouraging community cohesion is expected to increase health and wellbeing of residents. This is due to the fact that health can be maximized through good design, for example by creating attractive places and encouraging social interaction¹⁹ (SEA Objective 14).

Policy BE2 Responding to Local Character

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Coun tr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

- 5.5.4 This policy is expected to have positive implications for the historic environment as historic features, such as listed buildings and scheduled monuments, form an important part of local character. This is particularly true of the neighbourhood plan area, due to the Alveston and Stratford-upon-Avon conservation areas, the designation of which reflects the strong historic character of the area (SEA Objective 1).
- 5.5.5 This policy is expected to retain and enhance local character, thus contributing to local distinctiveness and ensuring that the plan area retains its identity (SEA Objective 2).

¹⁹ RIBA (2013) City health check: How design save lives and money

Policy BE3 Master Planning

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	0	+	0

5.5.6 By requiring master plans or contextual plans for developments, this policy suggests that a certain level of design and appropriate layout is required, as per Policy BE2 (SEA Objective 2).

5.5.7 This policy requires larger developments to carry out a Transport Assessment and mitigate any impacts on highways. This is expected to ensure that the plan does not increase local contribution to climate change (SEA Objective 5). It also encourages maximization of accessibility to the site and integration with existing infrastructure, which is expected to reduce the need for residents to travel by car (SEA Objective 10).

5.5.8 One of the major barriers to those living in rural areas is difficulty in accessing key services and facilities, such as healthcare and education. This policy may help address this by ensuring suitable infrastructure, with capacity, is accessible from new developments (SEA Objectives 11 and 12).

Policy BE4 Design Review Panels

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0

5.5.9 This policy requires design review panels to consider applications for developments of a significant or sensitive nature. Policy BE4 and the accompanying explanatory text suggest that this is to ensure suitable design of development, particularly in relation to landscape and sensitive historic and biodiversity features (SEA Objectives 1, 2 and 3).

5.5.10 The explanation for this policy identifies exposed edge of settlement locations as a key sensitivity, which is expected to ensure that development on the urban fringe will safeguard local distinctiveness and identity, thus contributing positively to SEA Objective 12.

Policy BE5 Designing out crime

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0

5.5.11 This policy is expected to benefit local health (SEA Objective 14), as reducing crime has positive implications for resident safety. Reducing the fear of crime also has positive implications for community wellbeing through ensuring piece of mind.

Policy BE6 Design Quality

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	0

5.5.12 This policy requires major developments to provide a high quality public realm with hard and soft landscaping, which is expected to contribute positively to the local landscape (SEA Objective 2).

5.5.13 Policy BE6 requires development to include measures to encourage biodiversity. Providing any valuable habitat is protected, for example through policies NE1, NE2 and NE3, and there is no net loss in biodiversity, this is expected to have positive implications for local biodiversity (SEA Objective 3).

5.5.14 This policy requires developments to include appropriate measures to plan for future climate change, including the use of sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) to reduce flood risk (SEA Objectives 4 and 6). Buildings meeting requirements of BREEAM 'Excellent' standard will also contribute to planning for climate change as this standard requires homes to maximize efficient use of energy, water and minerals among other environmental measures (SEA Objectives 6, 7, 8 and 9).

5.5.15 This policy is expected to lead to provision of a range of homes to meet needs of all residents (SEA Objective 13), as Lifetime Homes and Building for Life standards aim to meet the needs of all age groups and community demographics. This is likely to contribute to health and wellbeing of residents by ensuring needs, including social and mobility needs are met through housing (SEA Objective 14).

Policy BE7 Effective and Efficient Use of Land

1 Hist or	2 Land s	3 Biod iv	4 Flood	5 Clim te cont rb	6 Clim te plan	7 Resr ce	8 Poll n	9 Was te	10 Tran sp	11 Rura l Barri er	12 Cou ntr	13 Hou se	14 Heal th	15 Econ
0	+	0	+/-	+	+/-	++	+	0	+	0	+	0	0	0

5.5.16 Policy BE8 promotes development at a density to enhance the character and quality of the local area and bringing empty properties back into use, which are expected to protect and enhance the current townscape (SEA Objective 2).

5.5.17 This policy promotes higher density development towards the centre and lower density towards the periphery of the plan area. This needs some flexibility as there is a corridor of Flood Zones 2 and 3 alongside the River Avon, which passes through a fairly central part of the town. Increasing development in this area would mean that more development is at risk of flooding, rather than if density were increased at another locations, resulting in uncertain effects on flood risk and climate change adaptation (SEA Objectives 4 and 6).

5.5.18 The explanation of this policy states that housing density will be higher on sites with a high level of accessibility, close to the centre and close to public transport. This is expected to ensure that most residents are within walking distance of key amenities or public transport links (SEA Objective 10). This is also expected to reduce the level of car use from residents, as they should be able to access key amenities without the need to travel far or in places not served by public transport. This will reduce the plan area’s contribution to climate change and air pollution associated with vehicle exhaust fumes (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

5.5.19 By prioritizing brownfield land and making efficient use of land, developments are less likely to disperse into the countryside and less agricultural land will be required to fulfil development needs. This policy also protects best and most versatile agricultural land (SEA Objectives 7 and 12).

Policy BE8 Advertisements

1 Hist or	2 Land s	3 Biod iv	4 Flood	5 Clim te cont rb	6 Clim te plan	7 Resr ce	8 Poll n	9 Was te	10 Tran sp	11 Rura l Barri er	12 Cou ntr	13 Hou se	14 Heal th	15 Econ
+	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0

5.5.20 This policy protects listed buildings and conservation areas by ensuring strict controls on advertisements that may affect these historic features (SEA Objective 1).

5.5.21 This policy is expected to protect the visual amenity and character of the town by controlling the style and location of advertisements, as well as enhancing this by replacing dilapidated signage. In requiring signage in the area to be consistent, this policy may enhance sense of place (SEA Objective 2).

5.5.22 By preventing signage that may obstruct pedestrian movement or affect highway safety, this policy is expected to contribute to the safety and wellbeing of residents (SEA Objective 14).

Policy BE9 Supplementary Guidance

1 Hist or	2 Land s	3 Biod iv	4 Flood	5 Clim te cont rb	6 Clim te plan	7 Resr ce	8 Poll n	9 Was te	10 Tran sp	11 Rura l Barri er	12 Cou ntr	13 Hou se	14 Heal th	15 Econ
+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	0	+	0	+	0

5.5.23 The documents referred to in this policy include numerous safeguards for the historic environment and requirements to ensure that development is in keeping with the local character and contributes to local distinctiveness (SEA Objectives 1 and 2). In addition, these documents aim to protect the boundary between rural and urban, thus protecting the integrity of the surrounding countryside (SEA Objective 12).

5.5.24 Some supplementary planning guidance, especially the Stratford-upon-Avon Town Design Statement, include safeguards for biodiversity, thus having positive implications for SEA Objective 3.

5.5.25 The Stratford-upon-Avon Town Design Statement also stresses that the River Avon and its floodplain should be protected and development should not increase risk of flooding (SEA Objectives 4 and 6).

5.5.26 These documents aim to reduce congestion and discourage increases in traffic in the area, which is likely to lead to improvements in other modes of transport (SEA Objective 10) and prevent increases in greenhouse gas and air pollutant emissions, associated with vehicle use (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

5.5.27 Some of these documents support the retention of current, and introduction of new public open space, which is likely to benefit mental and physical wellbeing of residents²⁰ (SEA Objective 14).

Objective B: Preserving and enhancing the historic environment

Policy BE10 Designated Heritage Assets

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.5.28 This policy is expected to lead to the preservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings and archaeological features, which will have strong positive implications for SEA Objective 1. This is also expected to have positive implications for the local townscape, as the historic environment is an important part of the townscape character and distinctiveness of Stratford-upon-Avon.

Objective C: Promoting urban renewal and regeneration

Policy BE12 Replacement Dwellings

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	+	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	+	0	0

5.5.29 This policy ensures that replacement dwellings are likely to be in line with the historic environment or the local townscape character (SEA Objectives 1 and 2).

²⁰ Ian Douglas for UK MAB Urban Forum (2004) Urban Greenspace and mental health

- 5.5.30 This policy requires replacement dwellings to meet at least BREEAM 'Excellent' standard, which will reduce contributions to climate change and plan for future climate change through energy, water and minerals use efficiency among other sustainability measures (SEA Objectives 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9).
- 5.5.31 Replacement dwellings are likely to improve living standards and contribute to a more suitable mix of housing than the dwelling they are replacing, thus having positive implications for the local housing stock (SEA Objective 13).

Policy BE13 Conversion and Reuse of Buildings

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	0	0	0	0	++	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0

- 5.5.32 This policy is expected to enhance the attractiveness of the townscape, as derelict and unused buildings are often unsightly. In addition, the explanatory text of this policy requires conversion and reuse of buildings to assist in regeneration of the built environment (SEA Objective 2).
- 5.5.33 Whilst this development does not directly promote use of recycled materials, bringing empty properties back into use prevents new building materials being used to build new homes, thus reducing waste (SEA Objective 9).
- 5.5.34 By re-using existing buildings, this policy reduces the need to build on agricultural or greenfield land, thus having positive implications for resource use and waste (SEA Objectives 7 and 12).

Policy BE14 Empty Homes and Spaces

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	0	0	0	0	++	0	+	0	0	+	+	0	0

5.5.35 Bringing empty homes back into use is likely to have positive implications for landscape, particularly as this policy requires re-use of empty spaces to be compatible with the surrounding area. This is expected to contribute positively to the vitality and character of Stratford-upon-Avon, which may otherwise be compromised by empty properties (SEA Objective 2).

5.5.36 Whilst this development does not directly promote use of recycled materials, bringing empty properties back into use prevents new building materials being used to build new homes, thus reducing waste (SEA Objective 9).

5.5.37 Re-using empty spaces can provide housing within existing buildings, which may minimize the amount of agricultural land required for development (SEA Objectives 7, 12 and 13).

5.6 Natural Environment

Objective A: Preserving and enhancing local biodiversity

Policy NE1 Local Nature Reserves

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	++	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.6.1 This policy is expected to have strong positive implications for biodiversity, as it would lead to creation of new local nature reserves (LNRs). This is expected to give the identified sites (Bridgetown Woodland and Meadow) higher levels of protection and will also bring the sites under active management to maintain their ecological quality (SEA Objective 3).

5.6.2 Bridgetown Woodland and Meadow lies partially in Flood Zone 3. Although not designated as flood protection, protecting these sites from development may allow them to function as floodplains and slow flooding from the Rush Brook, thus continuing to provide some protection to the surrounding development (SEA Objectives 4 and 6).

Policy NE2 River Avon Biodiversity Corridor

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	+	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.6.3 This policy has positive implications for biodiversity, as it aims to protect the river corridor and its supporting habitat (SEA Objective 3).

5.6.4 This policy is assessed as positive against SEA Objectives 4 and 6, as it aims to protect the functional flood plain around the River Avon. The explanation of this policy states that development in Flood Zone 3 will be restricted to ‘water compatible uses’ and that other development on Flood Zone 3 will be resisted. This is expected to ensure that development is at lower risk of flooding than Flood Zone 3.

Policy NE3 Trees and Hedges

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.6.5 This policy requires large-scale developments to demonstrate that they have been landscape led, which is likely to lead to a better quality of landscaping in developments, which take into account and aim to preserve current landscape features, such as hedges, wooded areas and tree lines (SEA Objective 2).

5.6.6 Policy NE3 is expected to maintain biodiversity by protecting hedgerows, which are BAP priority habitats, and encouraging development proposals to incorporate tree and hedge planting. The environmental credentials of this policy could be further improved by ensuring wildlife dependent on trees and hedgerows are also protected (SEA Objective 3).

5.6.7 Features such as trees and hedgerows are likely to form part of, or link to, the green infrastructure network of Stratford-upon-Avon. In protecting these features, the plan also protects the ecosystem services they provide, such as local climate regulation, which contribute to mitigating the effects of climate change²¹.

Policy NE4 Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.6.8 This policy is likely to protect biodiversity and geodiversity by restricting development within and adjacent to the Race Course Meadow SSSI, which is designated for its biological value (SEA Objective 3).

NE Project 1 Neighbourhood Area Biodiversity Action Plan

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.6.9 In proposing creation of a Neighbourhood Area Biodiversity Action Plan (NABAP), this project is expected to have positive implications for biodiversity. This is because an NABAP would set out aims and targets to achieve an increase in priority species within the plan area (SEA Objective 3).

²¹ Forest Research (2010) Benefits of Green Infrastructure. Available at: [http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/\\$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf)

5.7 Infrastructure

Objective A: Improving access to learning opportunities

Policy INF1 Protecting and Enhancing Education Facilities

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0

5.7.1 This policy requires high quality design of educational facilities, which is expected to maintain and enhance the visual quality of the area (SEA Objective 2).

5.7.2 This policy has potential to reduce barriers for those living in rural areas, by ensuring there is sufficient provision of educational facilities across the plan area and that these are accessible to pupils (SEA Objective 11).

Policy INF2 Provision of New Educational Facilities

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	+	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	+/-	+	0	+	++	+/-	0	0	0

5.7.3 By promoting links between education, heritage and tourism, Policy INF2 is expected to broaden access to and understanding of the historic environment and cultural features of Stratford-upon-Avon, such as its links to Shakespeare (SEA Objective 1).

5.7.4 Without further details of location of development, it remains uncertain as to whether biodiversity assets and green infrastructure will be affected by development (SEA Objectives 3 and 6).

5.7.5 Without further details of potential locations for development, implications of this policy on flood risk and agricultural land remain uncertain (SEA Objectives 4, 6, 7 and 12).

5.7.6 It is anticipated that the local landscape and townscape would be protected and enhanced, due to the protection afforded in Policies BE1 and BE2 (SEA Objective 2).

5.7.7 Provision of a school south of the river could reduce cross-town trips for those pupils who currently travel into or through the centre of the town to get to school. This could contribute to reducing the need to travel, resulting in a lower carbon footprint and lower levels of pollution in the town (SEA Objectives 5, 8 and 10).

5.7.8 This policy is expected to reduce barriers for those living in rural areas, as it aims to ensure school provision is available and accessible to all pupils in the plan area, by creating new facilities. This includes new schools with provision for special educational needs; further ensuring that education is available for all children in the plan area (SEA Objective 11).

Objective B: Promoting a healthy community

Policy INF3 Protecting and Enhancing Existing Healthcare Provision

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0

5.7.9 Protection and enhancement of existing health facilities had been assessed as positive with regards to local health (SEA Objective 14), as this should ensure that health facilities have sufficient capacity for all residents in the plan area.

Policy INF4 Promoting New Health Care Provision

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	++	++	0	0	++	0

5.7.10 Provision of new healthcare facilities is expected to increase the accessibility of facilities for residents. The explanatory text of this policy explains that new health care facilities south of the river will be promoted. This is expected to reduce barriers to those in more rural parts of the plan district, such as Tiddington and Alveston, by increasing the accessibility of key services as these will be located nearer to residents of these villages (SEA Objectives 11 and 14).

5.7.11 In addition, having more accessible health care facilities is likely to reduce the need for residents to travel to facilities in the town centre of Stratford-upon-Avon, thus reducing car use (SEA Objective 10). By reducing car use, this policy is expected to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and pollutant emissions associated with vehicle exhausts, in the plan area (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

Objective C: To prepare a Strategic Roads and Transport Strategy to serve the growing town and district in which through and peripheral traffic is taken off Town Centre routes

INF Project 1 Initiatives to Reduce Through Traffic

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.7.12 Traffic and congestion can lead to increased emissions of carbon dioxide and air pollutants associated with traffic, as vehicles spend time with their engines on, burning fuel but not moving towards their destination. Reducing congestion is likely to reduce carbon and pollutant emissions per capita in the plan area, as vehicles will spend less time with their engines running and less time in Stratford-upon-Avon overall (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

Objective D: To redistribute traffic destined for the Town Centre with appropriately sited car parking which avoids congested routes and cross town trips

INF Project 2 Redistribution of Traffic within the Town

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0

5.7.13 Traffic and congestion can lead to increased emissions of carbon dioxide and air pollutants associated with traffic, as vehicles spend time with their engines on, burning fuel but not moving towards their destination. Reducing congestion is likely to reduce carbon and pollutant emissions per capita in the plan area, as vehicles will spend less time with their engines running and less time in Stratford-upon-Avon overall (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

5.7.14 This project aims to improve links across the river for pedestrians and cyclists, which is expected to resulting in greater use of these sustainable modes of transport and potentially reducing car use (SEA Objectives 5 and 10).

INF Project 3 Car Parking

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.7.15 This project aims to redistribute traffic through siting of car parks. Traffic and congestion can lead to increased emissions of carbon dioxide and air pollutants associated with traffic, as vehicles spend time with their engines on, burning fuel but not moving towards their destination. Reducing congestion is likely to reduce carbon and pollutant emissions per capita in the plan area, as vehicles will spend less time with their engines running and less time in Stratford-upon-Avon overall (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

INF Project 4 Promoting and Enhancing Park and Ride Opportunities

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0

5.7.16 This project is expected to reduce traffic congestion in the town centre by promoting park and ride as an alternative to several cars driving around the town. This is likely to reduce carbon and pollutant emissions per capita in the plan area, as vehicles will spend less time with their engines running and less time in Stratford-upon-Avon overall (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

5.7.17 This project is expected to maintain the park and ride bus link, which may be used by both those parking in the park and ride, and those living near to these car parks. This is expected to maintain and promote these sustainable transport links in the town (SEA Objectives 5 and 10). Whilst this policy supports creation of a new southern park and ride facility, it does not specify how this would be actioned, although such a facility is likely to have positive implications for sustainable transport.

5.7.18 Reduction in congestion in the town centre is expected to reduce emissions of pollutants, as well as making roads quieter and consequently safer. This is likely to have positive implications for human health due to increased safety and air quality in the town (SEA Objective 14).

Objective E: To calm traffic on access roads in the interests of safety, convenience and environmental improvement

INF Project 5 Birmingham Road and Guild Street

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.7.19 This policy is expected to ensure that a new canal bridge would be constructed using high quality materials and include sensitive landscaping and tree planting. This is expected to result in attractive development that would maintain and enhance local character (SEA Objective 2).

5.7.20 Traffic and congestion can lead to increased emissions of carbon dioxide and air pollutants associated with traffic, as vehicles spend time with their engines on, burning fuel but not moving towards their destination. Reducing congestion is likely to reduce carbon and pollutant emissions per capita in the plan area, as vehicles will spend less time with their engines running and less time in Stratford-upon-Avon overall (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

Objective F: Improving pedestrian and cycle connectivity

INF Project 6 Dedicated Pedestrian and Cycle Routes

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ

0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	+	0
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	---	---

- 5.7.21 This project is assessed as having positive implications for climate change mitigation and air quality (SEA Objectives 5 and 8). Enhancing pedestrian and cycle route quality and connectivity is likely to encourage more people to travel by these sustainable modes of transport, rather than travelling by car. By reducing car use, this policy is expected to minimize carbon emissions and emissions of air pollutants associated with vehicle exhaust fumes.
- 5.7.22 This project will lead to creation of new pedestrian and cycle routes, which will increase the connectivity of the plan area and make it easier for residents to travel from one place to another by sustainable modes of transport (SEA Objective 10).
- 5.7.23 By reducing air pollution and encouraging residents to cycle and walk more, this policy is expected to improve the overall health of residents in the plan area (SEA Objective 14).

INF Project 7 Replacement Bridge at Lucy's Mill

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0

- 5.7.24 Replacing Lucy's Mill Bridge is likely to contribute more positively to the parkland riverside to the northeast and result in a structure that is more in keeping with the more distinctive bridges upriver, such as Tramway Bridge and Clopton Bridge (SEA Objective 2).
- 5.7.25 Whilst a replacement bridge is likely to make it easier for cyclists and pedestrians to cross the river at this point, it is not expected to encourage people to travel by bike or foot as it primarily improves the convenience of this crossing, rather than wider improvements to the pedestrian and cycle networks. This policy is assessed as having neutral effects regarding SEA Objective 5.

5.7.26 This policy is assessed as having positive effects with regards to transport and health (SEA Objectives 10 and 14), as it will improve the safety of this river crossing point. Those with pushchairs, bikes or wheelchairs may currently choose to cross the river by the Seven Meadows Bridge, which is potentially more dangerous as it is a vehicle bridge, instead of Lucy’s Mill Bridge. A replacement bridge at Lucy’s Mill, with accessibility for pushchairs, bikes and wheelchairs, will create a safer crossing at this point.

Objective G: To improve public transport opportunities

Policy INF5 Honeybourne Rail Link

1 Hist or	2 Land s	3 Biod iv	4 Flood	5 Clim te cont rb	6 Clim te plan	7 Resr ce	8 Poll n	9 Was te	10 Tran sp	11 Rura l Barri er	12 Cou ntr	13 Hou se	14 Heal th	15 Econ
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	+	0

5.7.27 This policy safeguards the disused Honeybourne rail link in order to retain the possibility of re-opening the line, should the need arise in the future. This has positive implications for SEA Objective 10, as it retains possible future public transport routes.

5.7.28 Parts of the disused Honeybourne rail link are currently in use as public rights of way, including Monarch’s Way and the Greenway. In safeguarding the route, whilst not actively promoting reinstatement of the railway, this policy may help to protect these rights of way. This could have positive implications for health, as both the Monarch Way and the Greenway are popular for recreation (SEA Objective 14).

INF Project 8 Preserving and Enhancing Rail Links and Services

1 Hist or	2 Land s	3 Biod iv	4 Flood	5 Clim te cont rb	6 Clim te plan	7 Resr ce	8 Poll n	9 Was te	10 Tran sp	11 Rura l Barri er	12 Cou ntr	13 Hou se	14 Heal th	15 Econ
0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	0	0

5.7.29 Enhancing rail links and services is expected to promote rail as an attractive form of transport and a suitable alternative to car use. This is expected to reduce car use in the plan area, thus reducing greenhouse gas and pollutant emissions associated with vehicle exhaust fumes (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

5.7.30 Enhancement and expansion of railway facilities, as well as linking rail with other modes of transport, particularly walking, cycling and bus services, is expected to maximize efficiency of the transport network in the plan area and promote use of sustainable transport, thus contributing positively to local transport (SEA Objective 10).

INF Project 9 Promoting Enhanced Bus and Coach Facilities

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	+	0	0	0	0	0

5.7.31 This project is expected to reduce carbon and pollutant emissions by encouraging a greater proportion of buses to be hybrid or start/stop vehicles. Restricting town centre streets for pick up and drop off, and promoting the use of the leisure centre (or nearby site) for an extended and improved terminus and layover facility, is expected to reduce traffic and congestion in the town, which will allow buses to pass through more quickly (SEA Objectives 5 and 8). This may allow public transport to operate more efficiently (SEA Objective 10).

5.8 Community, Leisure and Wellbeing

Objective A: Promoting a strong and healthy community

Policy CLW1 Protecting and Enhancing Existing Community Facilities

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0

5.8.1 This policy is assessed as having positive implications for local health (SEA Objective 14), as it aims to protect and enhance community facilities, which are important for social cohesion, physical recreation, and the mental health benefits of socializing and feeling part of a community²².

²² DCLG (2014) Planning Practice Guidance: Health and wellbeing

Policy CLW2 Promoting Leisure, Entertainment and New Community Facilities

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biodiv	Flood	Climte cont rb	Climte plan	Resrce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	+	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	+/-	+

- 5.8.2 The explanatory text suggests four potential sites for evening leisure; land near the leisure centre, Cox’s Yard, the Recreation Ground and within the Canal Regeneration Zone. Cox’s Yard includes the Grade II listed timber warehouse and tramway house buildings, as well as being adjacent to the listed Tramway bridge and the scheduled ancient monument, Clopton Bridge. It is expected that these features and their settings would be protected by Policy BE10 (SEA Objective 1).
- 5.8.3 Landscape impacts are dependent on details of location and design of development. This policy is not expected to impact landscape, as Policies BE1 and BE2 require development proposals to maintain and enhance sense of place and local character in the plan area (SEA Objective 2).
- 5.8.4 Implications of this policy on biodiversity (SEA Objective 3) remain uncertain without further details of location. Much of the land adjacent to the leisure centre includes habitats with high biodiversity potential, thus building on this site could lead to loss of valuable habitats and declines in species populations.
- 5.8.5 Land adjacent to the leisure centre, Cox’s Yard and the Recreation Ground are all located in Flood Zones 2 and 3, therefore at medium to high risk of flooding, although the Canal Regeneration Zone lies within Flood Zone 1 (SEA Objective 4).
- 5.8.6 This policy has the potential to increase traffic in and around the plan area, as more people may travel by car to use leisure and entertainment facilities in the town, particularly as this is likely to be in the evening when bus services are less frequent. This could increase car use in the plan area, leading to an increase in carbon emissions (SEA Objective 5) and exacerbation of air quality issues in the AQMA. Policy CLW9 states that developments expected to degrade air quality will not be permitted, thus no residual impacts remain with regards to local air quality (SEA Objective 8).

- 5.8.7 The Recreation Ground and the land adjacent to the leisure centre consist of recognised green infrastructure assets in the plan area. Development at these sites may lead to loss of green infrastructure and its associated benefits for adaptation to climate change, such as local cooling and wildlife corridors²³. Implications of this policy on GI remain uncertain, as some potential development sites, particularly the Recreation Ground, have been suggested for development despite being designated as Local Green Space under Policy CLW3 (SEA Objective 6).
- 5.8.8 The majority of sites suggested for development in the explanatory text of Policy CLW2 are located on Grade 3 agricultural land, although it is not known if this is Grade 3a (best and most versatile) or 3b (not best and most versatile). Implications of development of leisure, entertainments and community facilities on natural resources cannot be known without further details of location of these facilities and without soil testing to determine whether land is Grade 3a or 3b (SEA Objective 7).
- 5.8.9 New leisure and entertainment facilities are likely to generate waste, thus increasing waste production per capita in the plan area. This may be mitigated if such developments include measures to minimize waste or include recycling initiatives. Without knowing details of potential developments and waste handling procedures, assessment of this policy in relation to waste (SEA Objective 9) remains uncertain.
- 5.8.10 Whilst the proposed areas for leisure and entertainment development are largely accessible by public transport, most bus services stop in the early evening. In order for evening leisure facilities to be successful and accessible, public transport operating times may need to be extended (SEA Objective 10).
- 5.8.11 This policy is assessed as having uncertain implications for SEA Objective 14. Community facilities are important for social cohesion, physical recreation, and the mental health benefits of socializing and feeling part of a community²⁴, but the explanatory text indicates the Recreation Ground as a potential location for development, which would lead to loss of recreational land. It is not known whether Policy CLW2 will lead to an overall increase or decrease in health and wellbeing of local residents.

²³ Forest Research (2010) Benefits of Green Infrastructure. Available at:

[http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/\\$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf)

²⁴ DCLG (2014) Planning Practice Guidance: Health and wellbeing

5.8.12 This policy is likely to encourage new leisure developments, which will provide additional employment and lead to additional spending in the plan area (SEA Objective 15).

CLW Project 1 Preventing Isolation of Elderly People

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0

5.8.13 This policy has been assessed as having positive impacts against SEA Objective 13, as it will contribute to ensuring an appropriate mix of housing types in the plan area, including provision for the ageing population of Stratford-upon-Avon.

5.8.14 Positive impacts have also been identified against SEA Objective 14, as reducing isolation of older members of the community is likely to improve mental health and general wellbeing.

Objective B: Provide green spaces and exercise facilities for the enjoyment of residents and to promote an active community

Policy CLW3 Protecting and Enhancing Existing Open Spaces

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	0

5.8.15 Some areas identified as satisfying the criteria for Local Green Space and protected through Policy CLW3 are part of the settings of historic features, such as the setting of the Grade II listed Clopton Tower at Rowley Fields. Protecting these areas through a green space designation may also help to conserve the historic environment (SEA Objective 1).

5.8.16 Protecting green spaces can have positive implications for landscape, as the areas of Local Green Space sites designated in the plan contribute to local distinctiveness. Green spaces also contribute positively to local visual amenity (SEA Objective 2).

- 5.8.17 Sites to be protected through this policy include designated wildlife sites, such as the Racecourse Meadow SSSI and Bordon Hill Local Wildlife Site. Whilst these designations afford the sites protection in their own right, designation in the Neighbourhood Plan reinforces the importance of these and contributes additional protection to the biodiversity at these sites. Habitats of river corridor also have high biodiversity potential, which would be protected by this policy (SEA Objective 3).
- 5.8.18 Whether recognized in the Green Infrastructure Study²⁵ or not, this policy protects large amounts of green space in the plan area. Benefits of green space in relation to climate change include local temperature regulation, provision of shade and surface water infiltration²⁶ (SEA Objective 6).
- 5.8.19 Protection of green space on the edge of the urban area may protect the integrity of the countryside by preventing urban sprawl and maintaining an attractive green edge to the town (SEA Objective 12).
- 5.8.20 Protection of green space has positive implications for health, as green space provides an outdoor recreation resource for residents, thus improving health through opportunities for physical recreation and the mental wellbeing benefits of having attractive outdoor spaces (SEA Objective 14).

Policy CLW4 Open Space and Play Areas within New Development

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biodiv	Flood	Climte cont rb	Climte plan	Resrce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	+	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	++	0

- 5.8.21 Open space can also have positive implications for landscape, as it improves visual amenity and local distinctiveness (SEA Objective 2).
- 5.8.22 Provision and improvement of open space may have positive implications for biodiversity, particularly if these are connected in green corridors or green infrastructure networks, as this can provide biodiversity corridors. Biodiversity corridors are areas of connected habitat that are beneficial to wildlife, as they allow animal species to move from place to place (SEA Objective 3).

²⁵ UE Associates (2011) Stratford-on-Avon Green Infrastructure Study

²⁶ Forest Research (2010) Benefits of Green Infrastructure. Available at: [http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/\\$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf)

5.8.23 Benefits of green space in relation to climate change, include local temperature regulation, provision of shade and surface water infiltration²⁷. In addition, this policy promotes extensions to the green infrastructure network (SEA Objective 6).

5.8.24 Provision of open space has positive implications for health (SEA Objective 14), as this is likely to provide or improve outdoor recreation resources for residents, thus improving health through opportunities for physical recreation and the mental wellbeing benefits of having attractive outdoor spaces and places to play and socialise.

Policy CLW5 Walking and Cycling Routes

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	+	0

5.8.25 Provision of safe walking and cycling routes to and from developments is likely to encourage more people to travel using these routes and reduce the number of people travelling by car. Reduced car use is expected to lead to a reduction of greenhouse gas and pollutant emissions, which may help to reduce air quality issues in the AQMA (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

5.8.26 This policy is expected to lead to developments that incorporate walking and cycling routes, as well as improvements to existing routes. This is likely to improve sustainable transport routes in the plan area (SEA Objective 10).

5.8.27 If this policy encourages more people in the plan area to travel by foot or bike, this will increase levels of physical activity, thus having positive implications for health (SEA Objective 14). The explanatory text for this policy suggests improving road safety through introducing lower speed limits, which is likely to reduce accidents and injuries on the road, which will further improve wellbeing of people in the plan areas.

²⁷ Forest Research (2010) Benefits of Green Infrastructure. Available at: [http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/\\$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf)

Policy CLW6 Stratford Leisure Centre

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	+	+

5.8.28 Expansion and enhancement of the leisure centre has potential to attract more visitors to the town. The explanatory text states that new or enhanced facilities must include a separate high quality tourist arrivals facility, which may further increase visits to the town. This could lead to an increase in car travel in and around the neighbourhood area, which may lead to an associated increase in emissions of carbon and pollutants (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).

5.8.29 Protecting the leisure centre will continue to ensure a formal leisure facility for exercise and socializing. Enhancements to the leisure centre may encourage more people to participate in sport, thus boosting physical health and fitness (SEA Objective 14).

5.8.30 Enhancements and expansions to the leisure centre may result in a requirement for more staff, thus increasing employment opportunities in the plan area. If more people visit the leisure centre, there may also be a greater level of spending in the area as people may come from further afield to use the leisure facilities (SEA Objective 15).

Policy CLW7 Allotments and Growing Space

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	++	0

5.8.31 This policy requires proposals for new allotments to ensure there are no adverse impacts on landscape, thus protecting the visual and landscape character of the plan area (SEA Objective 2).

- 5.8.32 Allotments are generally considered good for wildlife, particularly when this provides a refuge from an urban area or farmland, as surrounds much of Stratford-upon-Avon²⁸. As such, this policy is expected to have positive implications for SEA Objective 3, providing allotments do not remove habitats and features protected under Policies NE1, NE2 or NE3.
- 5.8.33 Protecting and increasing provision of allotments may contribute to minimizing the plan area's contribution to climate change (SEA Objective 5). Growing food locally, albeit at a small scale, is expected to reduce the average food miles in the plan area, thus reducing carbon emissions from vehicles used to transport food to supermarkets and grocer's shops.
- 5.8.34 Growing food on allotments reduces food bought from shops and supermarkets, which may contribute to reducing food packaging (SEA Objective 9).
- 5.8.35 Allotments are considered beneficial to health, as they provide an opportunity for people to get outside and do some exercise²⁹. They also provide opportunities for socializing, which is likely to improve mental wellbeing and community cohesion³⁰ (SEA Objective 14).

CLW Project 2 Promoting New Strategic Green Open Spaces

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	+	0	+	++	0	+	0	++	0	0	0	++	0

- 5.8.36 Green open space can have positive implications for landscape, as it improves visual amenity and local distinctiveness, especially in creating a town-wide feature in terms of a 'green necklace' (SEA Objective 2).
- 5.8.37 Provision and improvement of open space may have positive implications for biodiversity, particularly given the green corridors and extensions to green infrastructure that this policy promotes, as this can provide biodiversity corridors. Biodiversity corridors are areas of connected habitat that are beneficial to wildlife, as they allow animal species to move from place to place (SEA Objective 3).

²⁸ Natural England (2007) Wildlife on allotments

²⁹ Natural England (2007) Wildlife on allotments

³⁰ Forest Research (2010) Benefits of Green Infrastructure. Available at:

[http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/\\$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf)

- 5.8.38 The creation of a green necklace incorporating footpath and cycle routes is expected to improve the cycle and footpath network in the plan area (SEA Objective 10). This creation of greater opportunities for walking and cycling is expected to encourage residents to travel via foot and bicycle, thus reducing car use. Reductions in car use would lead to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and emissions of air pollutants associated with vehicle exhaust fumes (SEA Objectives 5 and 8).
- 5.8.39 Benefits of green open space and enhanced green infrastructure in relation to climate change, include local temperature regulation, provision of shade and surface water infiltration³¹. In addition, this policy promotes extensions to the green infrastructure network (SEA Objective 6).
- 5.8.40 Provision of open space has positive implications for health (SEA Objective 14). A green necklace with footpaths and cycle routes is likely to encourage outdoor recreation. In addition, attractive outdoor spaces are likely to improve mental health, through both visual amenity and opportunities for socializing.

Objective C: Promoting a healthy community

Policy CLW8 Reducing Air, Noise and Water Pollution

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	+	0	0	++	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

- 5.8.41 This policy aims to reduce air, water and soil pollution issues in the plan area (SEA Objective 8). This policy advocates reducing pollution associated with traffic, which may include minimizing town centre traffic and in turn reducing the carbon footprint of the plan area, which will minimize contribution to climate change (SEA Objective 5).

³¹ Forest Research (2010) Benefits of Green Infrastructure. Available at: [http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/\\$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf)

Policy CLW9 Encouraging Local Generation of Renewable and Low Carbon Energy

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	+/-	+/-	++	0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.8.42 This policy requires proposals for renewable energy installations to ensure there are no adverse impacts on landscape, thus protecting the visual and landscape character of the plan area (SEA Objective 2).

5.8.43 Implications of Policy CLW9 on biodiversity (SEA Objective 3) and flooding (SEA Objective 4) remain uncertain, as potential development sites are unknown. Whilst other policies in the NDP protect various aspects of biodiversity, some renewable energy installations require careful siting and design to minimize impacts on wildlife. For example, wind turbines can cause bat and bird strike if located too near to a roost or nesting area and hydropower can alter flow and connectivity of river systems (SEA Objective 3).

5.8.44 Renewable energy generation will help reduce the carbon footprint of the plan area by reducing the need to use energy generated from fossil fuels (SEA Objective 5).

5.8.45 Without specified areas for renewable energy installations, the impact of Policy CLW9 on natural resources cannot be known. Depending on the location and nature of any installations, this policy may lead to loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (SEA Objective 7).

5.9 Site Specific Briefs

5.9.1 Proposals for the Canal Quarter Regeneration Zone adds further detail on the proposal included in Policy SUA.1 of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy. Policy SUA.1 has been subject to SA, the results of which were presented in the SA of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy³². SSBs do not represent a policy as such; they seek to influence the design of the Regeneration Zone proposed by the Core Strategy. In order to ensure consistency of assessment, all SSBs have been assessed below.

Policy SSB1 Canal Quarter Regeneration Zone

³² Lepus Consulting (2014) Sustainability Appraisal of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	++	++	0	+	0	++	+	0	++	0	0	++	++	+

- 5.9.2 This SSB is assessed as having strong positive impacts with regards to landscape, as it proposes creation of a 5m landscaped corridor either side of the canal as well as utilizing previously developed and derelict land (SEA Objectives 2 and 7).
- 5.9.3 This SSB is expected to have strong, positive implications for biodiversity (SEA Objective 3). The Core Strategy Policy SUA.1 includes provision of a park alongside the canal and environmental enhancements to the corridor. This is reinforced by SSB1 in specifying at least a 5m corridor of landscaping and pedestrian and cycle access, which is likely to create a valuable GI asset, particularly when combined with the green corridor along the canal proposed in CLW Project 1.
- 5.9.4 Creation of new parkland, pedestrian and cycle routes are expected to encourage more residents to travel by foot or by bike as an alternative to car travel. This is likely to reduce greenhouse gases and pollution associated with car exhaust fumes (SEA Objectives 5 and 8). In addition, if residents in the plan area walk and cycle more, this will have positive implications for health (SEA Objective 14).
- 5.9.5 This SSB promotes pedestrian and cycle access to the regeneration zone, and the explanatory text promotes priority of these modes of access. SSB1 also promotes connectivity of access routes throughout the regeneration zone, and aims to make walking and cycling safer by requiring new development to face onto the canal, thus increasing visibility of the routes (SEA Objectives 10 and 14).
- 5.9.6 By promoting the redevelopment of this area to be primarily residential, the development will contribute to meeting local housing demand, and is likely to be of a sufficient quantity to include affordable housing (SEA Objective 13).

5.9.7 As a mixed-use development, the regeneration zone would include employment land, thus providing more jobs in the plan area (SEA Objective 15). Whilst the regeneration zone is currently used as employment land, these are due to be relocated to Land South of the Alcester Road and West of the Wildmoor Roundabout, which is incorporated into the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy and supported in the Stratford-upon-Avon NDP via Policy E2.

Policy SSB2 Stratford-upon-Avon Employment Allocation – Land South of the Alcester Road (A46) and West of the Wildmoor Roundabout

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land	Biodiv	Flood	Climate	Climate	Resrce	Polln	Waste	Transp	Rural	Countr	Hou	Heal	Econ
or	s	iv	d	te	te	ce	n	te	sp	Barri	nr	se	th	
-	+	0	+	+	+	-	+	0	++	+	+/-	0	0	++

5.9.8 The SA of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy³³ states that the proposed development of Land South of the Alcester Road may have negative effects on the historic environment, due to the presence of archaeological remains and ridge and furrow³⁴ (SEA Objective 1).

5.9.9 SSB2 requires development at this site to follow a high quality layout that accounts for the high landscape sensitivity of the site and to minimize light pollution. This is expected to minimise immediate landscape and visual impacts of development at the site and to avoid negative impacts of development on the wider landscape character (SEA Objectives 2 and 12).

5.9.10 The SA of the Core Strategy also highlights that there are hedgerows on the site south of Alcester Road, which are a priority habitat as listed in the 2010 UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP). Policy NE3 lends protection to trees and hedgerows, thus biodiversity is expected to be unaffected by development at this site (SEA Objective 3).

5.9.11 Land South of Alcester Road lies in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding and it will not remove any recognized green infrastructure assets (SEA Objectives 3 and 6).

³³ Lepus Consulting (2014) Sustainability Appraisal of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy

³⁴ Warwickshire County Council (2008) Historic Environment Assessment of Proposed Strategic Sites

- 5.9.12 SSB2 requires proposals to provide green travel measures, including improving links with existing public transport. In improving the accessibility of this site by sustainable modes of transport, less people are likely to drive to work thus reducing the per capita contribution of the plan area to climate change (SEA Objectives 5, 10 and 11).
- 5.9.13 Land South of the Alcester Road consists mainly of Grade 3b agricultural land, which is not considered to be best and most versatile. There is an area of Grade 3a agricultural land in the southeastern part of the site, which is considered to be best and most versatile land. Development at this site would sterilize this resource, which is expected to have negative implications for SEA Objective 7, unless it can be demonstrated that sufficient suitable land exists nearby.
- 5.9.14 Implications of this policy on SEA Objective 12 have been assessed as uncertain. Whilst development at Land South of Alcester Road is not expected to negatively impact the wider landscape, it does represent development on the urban edge. In addition, it may lead to loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, although this is a small part of the entire site.
- 5.9.15 Development of employment opportunities at the Land South of Alcester Road site is expected to provide better links to employment and business sites from the strategic road network. This may reduce the number of HGVs passing through the town, thus reducing traffic volume overall and reducing congestion due to HGVs slowing overall traffic flow. This is likely to lead to improvements in the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA, due to the reduction of pollutants associated with vehicle exhaust fumes (SEA Objective 8).
- 5.9.16 This policy is likely to lead to an increase in employment and office developments, which will be accessible by sustainable modes of transport. This is expected to have positive implications for the local economy, as it will create jobs and increase the number of businesses operating in the plan area (SEA Objective 15).

Policy SSB3 Tiddington Fields

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
-	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	+	+	++	+	0

- 5.9.17 The Historic Environment Assessment identified potential presence of Roman archaeological features on this site³⁵. If this is not investigated prior to development, construction works at this site could potentially damage historic and archaeological features. The HEA classifies this site as having high archaeological sensitivity as it lies in an area of likely Iron Age, Roman and / or medieval activity. Policy BE10 requires new development to take account of sub-surface archaeology, which may contribute to minimising loss of such features (SEA Objective 1).
- 5.9.18 This site is in an area of medium landscape sensitivity, as identified in the 2012 Landscape Sensitivity Study³⁶. SSB3 requires dwellings to be restricted to 2 storeys and for layout and design to be sensitive to the village setting. It is expected that, in conjunction with Policy BE1 and Policy BE2, development at this site would maintain landscape character (SEA Objectives 2 and 12).
- 5.9.19 This site is in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding (SEA Objective 4) and does not include any recognized green infrastructure assets (SEA Objective 6).
- 5.9.20 Bus stops served by a range of services lie within 400m of the site. These services are low to moderate frequency at approximately 2 buses (from all services) per hour. Whilst development at this location is not anticipated to increase carbon emissions per resident, it is unlikely to reduce this, as residents are expected to rely largely on car use due to the low frequency of bus services. The roads in the area have pedestrian footpaths but there are few traffic-free routes or dedicated cycle routes. The site is within 600m of local shops in Tiddington but it is expected that residents will travel further afield for additional services, such as doctor's surgeries and larger retail centres (SEA Objectives 5, 10 and 11).
- 5.9.21 This site is Grade 4 agricultural land, which is not considered best and most versatile and it is currently kept as grassland. For this reason housing development at this site is not likely to lead to a loss of natural resources (SEA Objective 7).

³⁵ AOC on behalf of Stratford-on-Avon District Council (2012) Historic Environment Assessment of Local Service Villages, Stratford-on-Avon District, County of Warwickshire

³⁶ White Consultants (2012) Stratford-on-Avon District: Landscape Sensitivity Study for Local Service Villages

5.9.22 This site lies within the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA. Residents of any new development are expected to own cars and consequently lead to an increased volume of traffic in the AQMA. Policy CLW9 states that developments expected to degrade air quality will not be permitted, thus no residual impacts remain with regards to SEA Objective 8.

5.9.23 This site generally has good access to health and leisure facilities. Whilst the nearest GP is over 2.5km away in Stratford-upon-Avon town, the site is within 8km of Stratford Hospital, within 2km of existing sports facilities of the HGC, as well as being within easy access of the Stratford-upon-Avon Golf Club (SEA Objective 14).

5.10 Assessment of in-combination effects

5.10.1 As required by the SEA Regulations, cumulative, synergistic and indirect effects have been identified and evaluated during the assessment of the policies included in the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan (see **Table 5.1**). An explanation of indirect, cumulative and synergistic is as follows:

- Indirect effects are effects that are not a direct result of the plan, but occur away from the original effect or as a result of a complex pathway;
- Cumulative effects arise where several developments each have insignificant effects but together have a significant effect, or where several individual effects of the plan have a combined effect; and
- Synergistic effects interact to produce a total effect greater than the sum of the individual effects.

5.10.2 In preparing an assessment of in-combination effects, consideration has been given to the adopted Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy. Consideration has also been given to other neighbourhood plans in the area. Of the surrounding parishes, Snitterfield, Bearley, Hampton Lucy and Wilmcote are currently in the process of currently preparing neighbourhood plans. Due to the limited publically available information regarding these plans, any in-combination effects between these and the Stratford-upon-Avon neighbourhood plan cannot be determined at this stage.

Table 5.1: Assessment of in-combination effects

SEA Objectives	Proposals which bring in-combination effects	Significance
1. Protect, enhance and manage sites, features and areas of archaeological,	Policies CS.8 and AS.1 of the Core Strategy are expected to work alongside NDP Policy BE10 to provide a strong basis for both conserving and enhancing the historic environment.	Likely positive effect

historical and cultural heritage importance.	<p>Policies to conserve the historic environment (CS.8 and BE10) are likely to have a positive cumulative impact when considered alongside landscape policies, as maintenance and enhancement of landscape and townscape often correlates to maintenance and enhancement of the setting of historic assets, particularly in conservation areas. Proposal that are likely to contribute to these positive in-combination effects include Policies CS.5 and AS.1 of the Core Strategy and Policies BE1, BE2, BE3, BE4, BE10 and CLW3.</p> <p>These policies are also likely to minimise landscape impacts of any allocated sites, along with the additional design details included in the specific briefs.</p>	Likely positive effect
	<p>Policies H3 and E2 may have cumulative negative impacts with regards to archaeological heritage, as all three are identified as having potentially important archaeology. The loss of one of these sites may be insignificant, but the loss of all three would lead to a potential greater loss of historic data and artefacts in Stratford.</p>	Likely negative effect
2. Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities	<p>Landscape enhancements to individual sites and areas, including those detailed in the housing and town centre policies, alongside the specific briefs, are likely to have positive cumulative effects of improving the overall landscape and townscape value of Stratford-upon-Avon, Alveston and Tiddington.</p>	Likely positive effect
	<p>Policies aimed directly at conserving landscape and townscape value, as well as those promoting green infrastructure, are likely to have cumulative effects to improve the landscape and townscape value of Stratford-upon-Avon.</p>	Likely positive effect
3. Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity	<p>Core Strategy policies CS.6, CS.7 and AS.1 are expected to work alongside Policies NE1, NE2 and NE3 in order to conserve and enhance biodiversity in the plan area. Elements of good design, such as design codes required by Policies BE3 and BE4 are also likely to contribute positively to the conservation of biodiversity across the plan area, as it the provision of open space (Policies CLW3 and CLW4).</p>	Likely positive effect
	<p>By reducing the amount of resources needed for development, in terms of building materials and land, the following policies may work together to indirectly protect biodiversity in the plan area: Core Strategy Policy CS.19, NDP Policies H4, H5, E4, BE6, BE7, BE14, BE13 and BE14.</p>	Likely positive effect
	<p>There are a number of proposals that relate to land around the existing leisure centre. Much of this land has potential biodiversity value including an extant Local Wildlife Site designation and a proposed Local Nature Reserve designation. It is likely that the more development there is in this area (INF9, CLW2,</p>	Likely negative effect

	CLW6 and TC11), the greater the potential loss of biodiversity through land take and/or disturbance.	
4. Reduce the risk of flooding	No in-combination effects were identified against this objective	
5. Minimise the plan area's contribution to climate change	The NDP contains several policies that may individually contribute to minimising the area's contribution to climate change through reducing the need to travel, promoting sustainable travel and promoting renewable energy generation. In combination, such policies are likely to lead to an overall reduction in carbon footprint of Stratford-upon-Avon. These policies include H1, E4, various town centre and infrastructure policies, CLW5 and CLW9 and Core Strategy Policies CS.3, CS.25 and AS.1.	Likely positive effect
	The NDP sets out a series of policies aimed to accommodate the future population of Stratford-upon-Avon, Tiddington and Alveston but also aims to make the town a more attractive place in itself (e.g. see SEA Objective 2). In making Stratford-upon-Avon a more attractive place, the NDP may result in a town that attracts more visitors, or that more people want to live in. As such, more people may drive to and from the town as a result of this plan, thus car use may increase leading to an increase in associated carbon emissions.	Likely negative effect
6. Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change	Protecting and creating GI in the plan area is likely to have positive effects in combination with designing places and buildings that are adapted to climate change (Core Strategy Policies CS.2 and NDP Policy BE6).	Likely positive effect
7. Protect and conserve natural resources	The following policies all contribute to minimisation of resource use, in terms of both building materials and land take: Core Strategy Policy CS.19, NDP Policies H4, H5, E4, BE6, BE7, BE12, BE13 and BE14. These Policies are expected to act cumulatively to protect natural resources in the plan area.	Likely positive effect
8. Reduce air, soil and water pollution	Policies that are likely to reduce traffic movements, through promoting sustainable transport or reducing the need to travel, are likely to work in combination to minimise impacts of development on the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA.	Likely positive effect
9. Reduce waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste	No in-combination effects were identified against this objective	
10. Improve the efficiency of transport networks by increasing the proportion of travel by sustainable modes and by promoting	The NDP includes a range of improvements and provisions across several modes of sustainable transport. By improving several modes of transport, rather than just one, the NDP is expected to lead to greater uptake of sustainable modes of transport as they have the choice of which mode suits them best. Policies	Likely strong positive effect

policies which reduce the need to travel	leading to this synergistic effect include TC Project 5, TC Project 7, TC Project 6, INF Project 6 and INF Project 8 and Core Strategy Policy AS.1.	
11. Reduce barriers for those living in rural areas	The NDP includes improvements to sustainable transport (TC Project 5, TC Project 7, TC Project 6, INF Project 6 and INF Project 8), as well as retention and development of new key facilities, such as education facilities (Policies INF1 and INF2) and community facilities (Policies CLW1 and CLW2). These policies are likely to act in combination to reduce barriers to those in rural areas by improving accessibility to amenities and facilities.	Likely positive effect
12. Protect the integrity of the countryside	See in-combination effects for SEA Objective 2.	Likely positive effect
13. Provide affordable, environmentally sound and good quality housing for all	Provision of housing via Policy H3 works synergistically with policies that require an adequate mix and standard of housing, such as Policies H7 and SSB3.	Likely strong positive effect
14. Safeguard and improve community health, safety and well being	Improving connections to health services and facilities, as well as providing additional facilities is likely to have a cumulative positive effect for health in the plan area, as detailed in the cumulative effects assessment of SEA Objective 11.	Likely positive effect
15. Develop a dynamic, diverse and knowledge-based economy that excels in innovation with higher value, lower impact activities	By both protecting existing employment opportunities and promoting new employment opportunities, policies within the NDP are likely to contribute to ensuring sufficient employment land in the area (Policies E1, E2, E3, E4, TC1 and TC11 and Core Strategy Policy AS.1). Proposed improvements to sustainable transport (Policies TC Project 5, TC Project 7, TC Project 6, INF Project 4, INF Project 6 and INF Project 8) are likely to have synergistic effects in ensuring that there is both sufficient employment opportunities and that these are accessible.	Likely strong positive effect

6 Significant effects and mitigation

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 The following chapter further explores uncertain and negative effects identified in Chapter 5.

6.1.2 These are presented under the relevant SEA Objective. The following objectives are not discussed as no uncertain or negative effects were identified against them:

- SEA Objective 2 (Landscape and Townscape);
- SEA Objective 8 (Pollution);
- SEA Objective 11 (Rural Barriers);
- SEA Objective 13 (Housing) and
- SEA Objective 15 (Economy).

6.2 Significant effects, mitigation and uncertainty

6.2.1 This chapter considers significant potential adverse effects that have been identified through the assessment process and recorded as uncertain using the assessment classification in **Table 4.1**. Where possible, mitigation has been prescribed. The effects are described as potential adverse since any policy categorised as uncertain may also have positive effects and the nature of the effects might be only partially known.

6.2.2 The mitigation hierarchy is a sequential process that operates in the following way: firstly, if possible, adverse effects should be avoided. Failing this, the nature of the effect should be reduced, if possible, so that it is no longer significant. If neither avoidance nor reduction is feasible, mitigation measures should be considered. Mitigation prescriptions might include changes to policy wording, advocating design guides, offsetting biodiversity effects or provision of new supporting green infrastructure. In the case of this SEA Report, mitigation has been supplied to help address negative effects so that, if possible, no residual affects remain.

6.3 SEA Objective 1 (Historic and cultural features)

6.3.1 Policies H3, E2 and their relative SSBs (SSB2 and SSB5) were identified as having negative effects with regards to SEA Objective 1. This is due to the fact that these sites lie on sites of potential archaeological importance, including ridge and furrow.

6.3.2 The DAMs produced for these policies show that further investigation of these sites is necessary and any artefacts found could be extracted prior to development. Some sites may be degraded if not preserved in-situ. This could be discussed with Historic England in order to determine the magnitude of any loss. Loss of ridge and furrow should be avoided if possible, as any loss will be permanent.

6.3.3 No strong negative effects or uncertain effects were identified against SEA Objective 1.

6.4 SEA Objective 3 (Biodiversity and geodiversity)

6.4.1 No negative effects were identified for SEA Objective 3.

6.4.2 Uncertain effects on SEA Objective 3 related to policies, TC6, TC9, TC11, INF2, CLW2 and CLW 9. This was largely due to uncertainty of where development would be located and thus it cannot be known if development would lead to direct loss of biodiversity or have potential to degrade local habitats. With regards to TC6, SEA Objective 3 is assessed as uncertain as the biodiversity value of the present green space is unknown and it is unknown whether or not this will be retained.

6.4.3 Mitigation against potential negative effects includes avoiding development in areas of high biodiversity value, which may only be possible if ecological surveys are carried out on potential development sites to determine their value. Where potential damage to biodiversity is unavoidable, such damage should be minimised and compensatory habitat of at least the same size and standard should be provided elsewhere.

6.5 SEA Objective 4 (Flooding)

6.5.1 No negative effects were identified for SEA Objective 4.

6.5.2 Uncertain effects were identified against SEA Objective 4 for policies H1, H3, H4, H5, TC9, TC11, TC Project 5, BE7, INF2, CLW2 and CLW9 due to potential development in Flood Zones 2 and 3.

6.5.3 In accordance with the mitigation hierarchy, development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 should be avoided where possible. If this is not possible, it is recommended that a sequential approach is taken to development, i.e. prioritizing development in Flood Zone 1, if this is not possible in Flood Zone 2 and if this is not possible in Flood Zone 3a. All development in Flood Zone 3b, with the exception of water-compatible uses as described in policy NE2 should be avoided, as this is functional floodplain. Development in Flood Zones 2 and 3 could include SUDS, or other drainage systems where this is not possible, in order to reduce flood risk.

6.6 SEA Objective 5 (Minimise climate change)

6.6.1 With regards to SEA Objective 5, negative effects were identified against policies CLW2 and CLW6. This is due to potential increased car use in the plan area from improved leisure provision and measures to promote leisure and entertainment facilities that may encourage more visitors travelling to Stratford-upon-Avon by car.

6.6.2 These negative effects could be mitigated if sustainable transport modes were an accessible and convenient alternative to car travel. This could include improving and extending bus services to serve new developments, as well as ensuring safe and connected rights of way for pedestrians and cyclists.

6.7 SEA Objective 6 (Plan for climate change)

6.7.1 No negative effects were identified against SEA Objective 6.

6.7.2 Uncertain effects were identified against policies TC6, TC11, BE7, INF2 and CLW2. Uncertain effects relate to loss of GI, open green space and potential increases in flood risk.

6.7.3 Negative impacts could be mitigated by avoiding development that would lead to loss of GI assets and green space in the first instance. Where there is no alternative option, green infrastructure of a similar type should be created adjacent to, or linking to the site. Such GI assets should be at least equivalent quality and size as the asset that was lost. Flood risk should be addressed by avoiding development on land most at risk of flooding and providing suitable SUDS infrastructure.

6.8 SEA Objective 7 (Natural resources)

6.8.1 Policy E2 and the corresponding SSB2 were identified as having negative effects with regards to SEA Objective 7 due to the potential loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 3a).

6.8.2 Uncertain impacts were identified against the following policies: INF2, CLW2 and CLW9, as the location of potential development is unknown and may result in loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.

6.8.3 The environmental credentials of the plan would be maximised by requiring development to prioritise use of brownfield or Grades 3b and 4 agricultural land, as these are not considered to be best and most versatile. An unavoidable loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land would be permanent but may be acceptable if it is outweighed by the sustainability benefits for the local area.

6.9 SEA Objective 9 (Waste)

6.9.1 No negative effects were identified against SEA Objective 9.

6.9.2 Uncertain effects were identified against policies TC6, TC7 and CLW2, as these developments have potential to generate more waste than the current uses on the sites. Where development potentially involves demolition of existing buildings, this may lead to waste materials going to landfill.

6.9.3 Increased waste production may be mitigated by including a requirement for developers to demonstrate how waste will be managed, including minimisation and sustainable disposal (reuse, recycling or composting). Planning permission could be restricted to developments that will not lead to a net increase in waste production and encourages waste minimisation and recycling. Existing materials and buildings should be re-used where possible and recycled if reuse is not possible. Sending waste to landfill should be considered a last resort.

6.10 SEA Objective 10 (Transport)

6.10.1 An uncertain effect was identified against policy CLW2, as it is uncertain whether bus services would stop running before visitors to leisure attractions would want to catch a bus.

6.10.2 As with SEA Objective 5, these negative effects could be mitigated if sustainable transport modes were an accessible and convenient alternative to car travel. This could include improving and extending bus services to serve new developments and to run later, as well as ensuring safe and connected rights of way for pedestrians and cyclists.

6.11 SEA Objective 12 (Countryside)

6.11.1 No negative effects were identified against SEA Objective 12.

6.11.2 Uncertain effects were recorded against policies E2 and the associated SSB2 and INF2. Uncertain effects related to potential loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. A loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land would be permanent but may be acceptable if it is outweighed by the sustainability benefits for the local area.

6.12 SEA Objective 14 (Health)

6.12.1 Uncertain effects were identified against policies TC6 and CLW2 with regards to SEA Objective 14 as both may lead to loss of recreational space.

6.12.2 Issues regarding inaccessibility of health services could be mitigated by provision of new, accessible services or by improving sustainable transport links to existing services that have capacity for new patients.

6.12.3 Green space and recreational space should be retained if possible and enhancing its role for both people and nature. If loss of recreational space is inevitable, alternative recreational space and facilities could be provided nearby, of at least an equal size and quality. Loss of recreational space could be permitted if it can be demonstrated that the new development would improve health and wellbeing of residents in other ways or if sufficient recreational opportunities are available nearby.

7 Recommendations to enhance environmental performance

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 This chapter provides recommendations for maximising the environmental opportunities presented in the NDP.

7.2 Recommendations for enhancement

7.2.1 The SEA has suggested measures to prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse effects of implementing Stratford-upon-Avon NDP throughout **Chapter 6**. These measures are collectively referred to as 'mitigation measures'.

7.2.2 Whilst the NDP as it stands brings a range of positive environmental effects, **Chapter 6** has addressed where the effects are adverse or uncertain. A number of strategic proposals have been suggested to help the NDP further improve its environmental performance throughout its implementation. These recommendations for enhancement are summarised below:

- The policies should aim to improve access by a range of sustainable transportation modes, including bus travel. This includes improved provision, capacity and connectivity of sustainable transport.
- Areas of green space should be created, retained and improved where possible.
- Sustainable corporate waste management should be encouraged with incentives or local programmes to reduce the amount of waste sent to landfill.
- Development will need to ensure that services, facilities and suitable employment opportunities are accessible for new residents and have capacity to meet the needs of all residents.
- The effect of development on historic features can be mitigated up to a point through careful design and siting, with development being located in such a way as to avoid impacts on the most sensitive features.
- Proposals in proximity to listed buildings and other historic features should consider how to mitigate effects on the settings of these features.
- The best and most sensitive areas of development sites should be maintained with strong landscape infrastructure. All important landscape and townscape features should be retained and be enhanced where possible. Considerate design and landscaping should be carried out to integrate the development into the area.
- Any development that takes place should take into account the size, scale, shape and character of the area. All development should be

designed sympathetically and not harm the character of the area or detract from its surroundings, particularly in conservation areas.

- Housing development should aim to meet additional Buildings Regulations standards and contribute towards achieving Zero Carbon Homes.
- Those effects identified as uncertain should be monitored in order to establish early on in the process whether they will become negative, as well as provide time to compensate for and mitigate these potential negative effects. Together they represent opportunities to help address any potential adverse effects and simultaneously serve to maximise environment performance of the policy. Details on monitoring are discussed further in **Chapter 8**.

8 Monitoring

8.1 Monitoring proposals

8.1.1 The SEA Directive states that ‘member states shall monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of plans and programmes... in order, inter alia, to identify at an early stage unforeseen adverse effects, and to be able to undertake appropriate remedial action’ (Article 10.1). In addition, the Environmental Report should provide information on a ‘description of the measures envisaged concerning monitoring’ (Annex I (i)). This represents Stage E of SA, according to the DCLG (2015) Guidance on SEA for NDPs.

8.1.2 The monitoring requirements typically associated with the SEA process are recognised as placing heavy demands on authorities with SEA responsibilities. For this reason, the proposed monitoring framework should focus on those aspects of the environment that are likely to be negatively impacted upon, where the impact is uncertain or where particular opportunities for improvement might arise.

8.1.3 The SEA process has identified some areas that would benefit from being monitored due to their uncertain effects. The areas specified for monitoring include:

- Capacity of services and facilities;
- Accessibility of services and facilities;
- Ecological value of greenfield sites;
- Number of developments in Flood Zones 2 or 3;
- Green space to resident ratio;
- Rate of loss of and demand for best and most versatile agricultural land;
- Waste generation; and
- Alignment of bus services with demand.

8.1.4 Monitoring is particularly useful in answering the following questions:

- Were the assessment’s predictions of environmental effects accurate?
- Does the NDP contribute to the achievement of desired SEA objectives?
- Are mitigation measures performing as well as expected?
- Are there any unforeseen adverse effects? Are these within acceptable limits, or is remedial action required?

- 8.1.5 The purpose of monitoring is to measure the environmental effects of a plan, as well as to measure success against the plan's objectives. It is therefore beneficial if the monitoring strategy builds on monitoring systems that are already in place. It should also be noted that monitoring could provide useful information for future plans and programmes.

Table 8.1: Discussion of effects to be monitored

Potential adverse effect, or area to be monitored	Indicator	Frequency of monitoring and scale	Trigger
Capacity of services and facilities	Number of services and facilities (e.g. schools, GP surgeries) that are oversubscribed	Annually, all essential services and facilities	No change or year on year increase
Accessibility of services and facilities	Proportion of residents with key services and facilities within walking distance or on a bus route that stops within 400m of their house	Annually, entire plan area	No change or decrease year on year
Ecological value of greenfield sites	Condition of designated sites	Annually, designated wildlife sites (LNR, SSSI, LWS')	Decline year on year
	Area of land managed for nature conservation	Annually, entire plan area	Year on year decrease
Loss of green space	Green space to resident ratio	Annually, entire plan area	No change or year on year decrease
Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land	Rate of loss of best and most versatile agricultural land	Annually, entire plan area	Year on year increase
	Demand for best and most versatile agricultural land	Annually, entire plan area	Year on year increase
Waste generation	Weight of landfill waste collected per resident	Annually, entire plan area	No change or year on year increase
Suitability of bus services	Proportion of residents who travel by bus	Annually, entire plan area	No change or year on year decrease

8.2 Links with the Annual Monitoring Report

8.2.1 SEA monitoring and reporting activities can be integrated into the regular planning cycle. As part of the monitoring process, Stratford-on-Avon District Council currently prepare an annual Authorities Monitoring Report. It is anticipated that the NDP Steering Group could work with Stratford-on-Avon District Council to incorporate elements of the SEA monitoring programme for the NDP into this process.

- 8.2.2 Details of any monitoring programme are, at this stage, preliminary and may evolve over time based on the results of consultation and the identification of additional data sources (as in some cases information will be provided by outside bodies). The monitoring of individual schemes/proposals should also be addressed at project level.

9 Next Steps

- 9.1.1 The Submission NDP will be submitted to the local planning authority, Stratford-on-Avon District Council. Once the District Council are satisfied that the NDP complies with all statutory requirements, it will be published for consultation for a minimum of six weeks, in particular inviting representations from any consultation body referred to in the consultation statement. The Neighbourhood Plan will also be sent to an independent examiner who will test whether or not the plan meets the basic conditions³⁷.
- 9.1.2 Formal representations made through the consultation process will be submitted to the Independent Examiner for Independent Examination alongside the draft NDP and this SEA Report. This represents Stage D of the SEA, according to the DCLG (2015) guidance. If the inspector is satisfied that the basic conditions have been met, the NDP will be subject to local referendum. If over 50% of votes at the referendum are in favour of the NDP, the NDP will become adopted as part of the statutory local development framework.
- 9.1.3 SEA Regulations 16.3(c)(iii) and 16.4 require that a 'statement' be made available to accompany the plan, as soon as possible after the adoption of the plan or programme, known as a post-adoption statement. The purpose of the SEA Statement is to outline how the SEA process has influenced and informed the NDP development process and demonstrate how consultation on the SEA has been taken into account.
- 9.1.4 As the regulations outline, the statement should contain the following information:
- The reasons for choosing the preferred policies for the NDP as adopted in the light of other reasonable alternatives dealt with;
 - How environmental considerations have been integrated into the NDP;
 - How consultation responses have been taken into account; and
 - Measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental effects of the NDP.
 - To meet these requirements, following any further changes before adoption, a Post Adoption Statement will be published with the adopted version of the NDP.

³⁷ Town and Country Planning Act as amended, Schedule 4B

9.2 Commenting on the Environmental Report

- 9.2.1 Any comments on this SEA Report should be directed through Stratford-upon-Avon District Council or the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.

10 References

AOC on behalf of Stratford-on-Avon District Council (2012) Historic Environment Assessment of Local Service Villages, Stratford-on-Avon District, County of Warwickshire

Barton, H., Grant, M. and Guide, R. (2010) Shaping Neighbourhoods for local health and global sustainability

Buglife (2009) Planning for Brownfield Biodiversity: A best practice guide

Department for Communities and Local Government (2012) National Planning Policy Framework. Available at:
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf

DEFRA (2009) Climate Change Projections. Available at:
<http://ukclimateprojections.defra.gov.uk/>

Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG; 2013) National Planning Practice Guidance - Strategic environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal; web based guidance to accompany the National Planning Policy Framework. Available at:
<http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/>

Ian Douglas for UK MAB Urban Forum (2004) Urban Greenspace and mental health

English Heritage (2012) National Heritage List for England. Available at: <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx>

Environment Agency (2014) What's in your backyard? (Map): Flood Map for Planning, Available at: http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?topic=floodmap&layerGroups=default&lang=_e&ep=map&scale=9&x=326995.3020833335&y=125994.2500000007#x=114331&y=125523&lq=1.&scale=11

Forest Research (2010) Benefits of Green Infrastructure. Available at:
[http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urqp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/\\$file/urqp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urqp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/$file/urqp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf)

Gaston, K. J., Warren, P. H., Thompson, K. and Smith, R. (2004) Urban domestic gardens (IV): the extent of the resource and its associated features

Lepus Consulting (2013) Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan: Screening Document

Lepus Consulting (2014) Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Plan: Final Scoping Report

Lepus Consulting (2014) Sustainability Appraisal of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy

Natural England (2013) Nature on the Map. Available at:

<http://www.natureonthemap.naturalengland.org.uk/map.aspx?m=bap>

Natural England (2007) Wildlife on allotments

NHS (2015) NHS Choices Website, 'Services near you', available at:

<http://www.nhs.uk/Service-Search/GP/BB4/Results/4/-2.29234647750854/53.7102699279785/4/0?distance=10>

PAS (2015) Changes to government policy (incorporating Nov 14 and Mar 15 changes)

RIBA (2013) City health check: How design save lives and money

Save Historic Newmarket v. Secretary of State and Forest Heath District Council. Case Number: co/6882/2010

Smith et al (2005) Urban domestic gardens (IX): Composition and richness of the vascular plant flora, and implications for native biodiversity

Stratford-on-Avon (2014) Core Strategy: Proposed Submission Version

Stratford-on-Avon District Council (2015) Core Strategy as submitted September 2014 showing subsequent proposed modifications

Stratford-on-Avon District Council (2014) PSCS Appendix 1: Schedule of Infrastructure Projects

Stratford-on-Avon District Council (2013) Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan

SQW (2013) Coventry and Warwickshire Economic Review – Strand 2: Productivity Analysis

UE Associates (2011) Stratford-on-Avon Green Infrastructure Study

Warwickshire County Council (2008) Historic Environment Assessment of Proposed Strategic Sites

White Consultants (2012) Stratford-on-Avon District: Landscape Sensitivity Study for Local Service Villages

Appendix A: SEA Framework

Stratford-upon-Avon Neighbourhood Development Plan SEA Framework

	SA Objective	Decision making criteria: Will the option/proposal...		Indicators	Targets
1	Protect, enhance and manage sites, features and areas of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.	Q1a	Will it preserve buildings of architectural or historic interest and, where necessary, encourage their conservation	Number of Grade I and Grade II* buildings at risk.	None (English Heritage)
				Number of Grade II and locally listed buildings at risk.	None (English Heritage)
		Q1b	Will it preserve or enhance archaeological sites/remains?	Proportion of scheduled monuments at risk from damage, decay or loss	None (English Heritage)
				Number/proportion of development proposals informed by archaeological provisions, including surveys	All (English Heritage)
		Q1c	Will it improve and broaden access to, understanding, and enjoyment of the historic environment?	Annual number of visitors to historic attractions	
Q1d	Will it preserve or enhance the setting of cultural heritage assets?	Proportion of conservation areas covered by up-to-date appraisals (less than five years old) and published management plans.			
2	Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities.	Q2a	Will it safeguard and enhance the character of the landscape and local distinctiveness and identity?	Application of detailed characterisation studies to new development	
				avoid development in the Green Belt (as suggested in the NPPF)	
		Q2b	Will it preserve or enhance the setting of cultural heritage assets?	Proportion of conservation areas covered by up-to-date appraisals (less than five years old) and published management plans.	
		Q2c	Will it help limit noise pollution?	Tranquillity assessments	
		Q2d	Will it help limit light pollution?	Tranquillity assessments	
Q2e	Will it encourage well-designed, high quality developments that enhance the built and natural environment?	% development meeting Building for Life standards.			
3	Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity.	Q3a	Will it lead to a loss of or damage to biodiversity interest?	Extent (and condition) of priority habitats	there should be 20 standard plots of 250 square metres per 1,000 households (NSALG)
				Extent of priority species	
				Area and condition of nationally designated sites in appropriate management	By 2010, to ensure that 95% of SSSIs are in favourable or recovering condition (target to directly reflect the national PSA target)
		Q3b	Will it lead to habitat creation, matching BAP priorities?	Area of Nature Conservation designation per 1,000 population (ha). Area of new habitat creation reflecting Warwickshire, Coventry and Solihull BAP priorities	At least 1ha of Local Nature Reserve per 1,000 population (Natural England)

	SA Objective	Decision making criteria: Will the option/proposal...		Indicators	Targets
				Extent and condition of key habitats for which Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) have been established	
		Q3c	Will it maintain and enhance sites nationally designated for their biodiversity interest and increase their area?	Number, area and condition of nationally designated sites in appropriate management	
		Q3d	Will it increase the area of sites designated for their geodiversity interest?	Area designated for geological interest	
		Q3e	Will it maintain and enhance sites designated for their geodiversity interest?	Condition of geological SSSIs	By 2010, to ensure that 95% of SSSIs are in favourable or recovering condition (target to directly reflect the national PSA target)
		Q3f	Will it link up areas of fragmented habitat?	Extent (and condition) of priority habitats	
		Q3g	Will it increase awareness of biodiversity and geodiversity assets?	Number of school trips to Stratford-on-Avon's Nature Reserves	suggested distances from residential areas to assets shown in Shaping Neighbourhoods (Barton et al 2010): 300m to a local park/green space 1km to playing fields 2km major natural green space
				Number of accessibility improvements to nature reserves and local sites (including geodiversity sites)	
				Number of interpretation improvements (including information boards etc) in nature reserves and local sites	
4	Reduce the risk of flooding.	Q4a	Will it help prevent flood risk present in the district from fluvial flooding?	Amount of new development (ha) situated within a 1:100 flood risk area (Flood Zone 3), including an allowance for climate change	Zero (Environment agency)
		Q4b	Will it help prevent flood risk present in the district from surface water flooding?	Number of properties at risk of flooding	
		Q4c	Will it help limit potential increases in flood risk likely to take place in the district as a result of climate change?	Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on flood defence grounds	Zero (Environment agency)
5	Minimise the district's contribution to climate change.	Q5a	Will it help reduce Stratford-on-Avon's carbon footprint?	Proportion of electricity produced from renewable resources	UK Government renewable energy target: 15% of electricity to be produced from renewable sources by 2020.
				Proportion of new homes achieving a four star or above sustainability rating for the "Energy/CO ₂ " category as stipulated by the Code for Sustainable Homes	All new homes to be carbon neutral by 2016 (DCLG target)
				Per capita greenhouse gas emissions	
				Emission by source	

	SA Objective	Decision making criteria: Will the option/proposal...		Indicators	Targets
				Percentage of people aged 16-74 who usually travel to work by driving a car or van	
				CO ₂ , methane and nitrous oxide emissions per sector	UK Government targets: 80% reduction of carbon dioxide emission by 2050 and a 26% to 32% reduction by 2020
		Q5b	Will it help raise awareness of climate change mitigation?	Number of initiatives to increase awareness of energy efficiency	
6	Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change.	Q6a	Will it help limit potential increases in flood risk likely to take place in the district as a result of climate change?	Amount of new development (ha) situated within a 1:100 flood risk area, including an allowance for climate change	Zero (Environment agency)
				Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on flood defence grounds	Zero (Environment agency)
				Number of properties at risk of flooding.	
		Q6b	Will it encourage the development of buildings prepared for the impacts of climate change?	% of developments meeting the minimum standards for the "Surface Water Run-Off" and "Surface Water Management" categories in the Code for Sustainable Homes	
				Thermal efficiency of new and retro fitted development; % planning permissions for projects designed with passive solar design, building orientation, natural ventilation	
				No. of planning permissions incorporating SUDS	
Q6c	Will it retain existing green infrastructure and promote the expansion of green infrastructure to help facilitate climate change adaptation?	Amount of new greenspace created per capita			
7	Protect and conserve natural resources.	Q7a	Will it include measures to limit water consumption?	Average domestic water consumption (l/head/day)	
		Q7b	Will it safeguard the district's minerals resources for future use?	Area of land with potential for minerals use sterilised	
		Q7c	Will it utilise derelict, degraded and under-used land?	% of dwellings built on previously developed land	
				Previously developed land that has been vacant or derelict for more than five years	

SA Objective		Decision making criteria: Will the option/proposal...		Indicators	Targets
		Q7d	Will it lead to the more efficient use of land?	Housing density in new development: average number of dwellings per hectare	
		Q7e	Will it lead to reduced consumption of materials and resources?	Percentage of commercial buildings meeting BREEAM Very Good Standard or above or equivalent	
				Percentage of housing developments achieving a four star or above sustainability rating as stipulated by the Code for Sustainable Homes	
		Q7f	Will it lead to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land?	Area of Grades 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land lost to new development	planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality (NPPF)
8	Reduce air, soil and water pollution.	Q8a	Will it lead to improved water quality of both surface water groundwater features?	% of watercourses classified as good or very good biological and chemical quality	All inland water bodies to reach at least "good status" by 2015 (Water Framework Directive)
				% change in pollution incidents	
		Q8b	Will it lead to improved air quality?	Number and area of Air Quality Management Areas	To meet national Air Quality Standards
				No. of days when air pollution is moderate or high for NO ₂ , SO ₂ , O ₃ , CO or PM ₁₀	To meet national Air Quality Standards
		Q8c	Will it maintain and enhance soil quality?	Area of contaminated land (ha) % of projects (by number and value) involving remediation of any kind	
Q8d	Will it reduce the overall amount of diffuse pollution to air, water and soil?	% change in pollution incidents			
9	Reduce waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste.	Q9a	Will it provide facilities for the separation and recycling of waste?	Type and capacity of waste management facilities	
				Household waste (a) arisings and (b) recycled or composted	
		Q9b	Will it encourage the use of recycled materials in construction?	Reuse of recycled materials from former building stock and other sources	
10	Improve the efficiency of transport networks by increasing the proportion of	Q10a	Will it reduce the need to travel?	Percentage of completed significant local service developments located within a defined centre	

	SA Objective	Decision making criteria: Will the option/proposal...		Indicators	Targets
	travel by sustainable modes and by promoting policies which reduce the need to travel.			Average distance (km) travelled to fixed place of work	suggested distances from residential areas to assets shown in Shaping Neighbourhoods (Barton et al 2010): 600m to the local centre 2km to industrial estate 5km to a major employment centre
				Percentage of new residential development within 30 minutes public transport time of a GP, hospital, primary and secondary school, employment and major health centre.	
				Percentage of residents surveyed finding it easy to access key local services.	
		Q10b	Will it encourage walking and cycling?	Percentage of people aged 16-74 who usually travel to work by bicycle or on foot	Shaping Neighbourhoods suggests that the average cycling journey is 3km, with normal use in the 1-5km range. The normal maximum is 8km. People should not be expected to cycle further than this
				Proportion of new development providing cycle parking.	Shaping Neighbourhoods suggests that 75% of people will walk if the journey is 600m or less, 50% of people will walk if the journey is between 600m and 1km, and only 25% of people will walk if the journey is over 1km. These distances should be considered if intending to increase walking rates.
		Q10c	Will it reduce car use?	Percentage of people aged 16-74 who usually travel to work by driving a car or van	PPS 1 on ecotowns states travel plans should enable at least 50% of trips to be made by non-car means
		Q10d	Will it encourage use of public transport?	Percentage of people aged 16-74 who usually travel to work by bus or train	
				Number of journeys made by bus per annum	
				Percentage of development in urban/rural areas within 400m or 5 minutes walk of half hourly bus service	All (Shaping Neighbourhoods)
				Number of journeys made by train per annum	
	Q10e	Will it provide adequate means of access by a range of sustainable transport modes?	Distance of new development to existing or proposed public transport routes.	a compliant transport node must be via a safe and convenient pedestrian route of between 350m to 650m in an urban environment (BREEAM communities)	
			Provision of new walking and cycling links to accompany new development		
	Q10f	Will it help limit HGV traffic flows?	HGV traffic flows		
11	Reduce barriers for those living in rural areas	Q11a	Will it increase provision of local services and facilities and reduce centralisation?	Percentage of residents surveyed finding it easy to access key local services	

	SA Objective	Decision making criteria: Will the option/proposal...		Indicators	Targets
		Q11a	Will it improve accessibility by a range of transport modes to services and facilities from rural areas?	Percentage of rural households within 800m of an hourly or better bus service	
		Q11a	Will it support the provision of affordable housing in rural areas?	Affordable housing completions in rural areas	
12	Protect the integrity of the district's countryside.	Q12a	Will it prevent the degradation of land on the urban fringe?	Area of derelict or underutilised land on the urban fringe	
		Q12b	Will it lead to a loss of agricultural land?	Area of agricultural land not in use or under active management.	planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality (NPPF)
		Q12c	Will it safeguard local distinctiveness and identity?	Application of detailed characterisation studies to new development	
13	Provide affordable, environmentally sound and good quality housing for all.	Q13a	Will it ensure all groups have access to decent, appropriate and affordable housing?	Affordable housing completions	
		Q13b	Will it identify an appropriate supply of land for new housing?	Net additional dwellings for the current year.	
		Q13c	Will it ensure that all new development contributes to local distinctiveness and improve the local environment?	Number of major housing applications refused on design grounds. Accessible Natural Greenspace	100% of population with Accessible Natural Greenspace of at least 2ha within 300m (or 5 minutes of their home (Natural England) SDC targets for open space are currently being developed.
		Q13d	Will it meet the building specification guidance in the Code for Sustainable Homes? (DCLG)	Percentage of housing developments achieving a four star or above sustainability rating as stipulated by the Code for Sustainable Homes	All new homes to be carbon neutral by 2016 (UK Government target)
		Q13e	Will it reduce the number of households on the Housing Register?	Number of households on the Housing Register	To reduce the numbers of homeless households in priority need and the number of households in housing need on the housing register
14	Safeguard and improve community health, safety and well being.	Q14a	Will it improve access for all to health, leisure and recreational facilities?	Travel time by public transport to nearest health centre and sports facility.	
		Q14b	Will it improve and enhance the district's green infrastructure network?	Area of parks and green spaces per 1,000 head of population Accessible Natural Greenspace	SDC open space standards are currently being developed. 100% of population with Accessible Natural Greenspace of at least 2ha within 300m (or 5 minutes of their home (Natural England) SDC standards are currently being developed.
				Area of playing fields and sports pitches.	2.83 hectares per 1,000 population for playing field provision (National Playing Fields Association Standard) SDC open space standards are currently being developed.

	SA Objective	Decision making criteria: Will the option/proposal...		Indicators	Targets
				Amount of land needed to rectify deficiencies in Open Space Standards	
				Percentage of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award standard	
				Percentage of residents that are satisfied with the quantity/quality of open space	
		Q14c	Will it improve long term health?	Life expectancy at birth	
				Standardised mortality rates	
		Q14d	Will it ensure that risks to human health and the environment from contamination are identified and removed?	Area of contaminated land (ha)	
		Q14e	Will it encourage healthy and active lifestyles?	% of adults (16+) participating in at least 30 minutes of moderate intensity sport and active recreation (including recreational walking) on three or more days of the week	To increase participation by 1% year-on-year until 2020 to achieve target of 50% of population participants in 30 mins activity, three times a week by 2020 (The Framework for Sport in England)
				The number of sports pitches available to the public per 1,000 population	
		Q14f	Will it reduce obesity?	Percentage of adult population classified as obese	By 2010, stabilise incidences of obesity in children by 2010 (DoH)
		Q14g	Does it consider the needs of the district's growing elderly population?	Percentage of older people being supported intensively to live at home	Increasing the proportion of older people being supported to live in their own home by 1% annually (DoH PSA)
		Q14h	Will it enable communities to influence the decisions that affect their neighbourhoods and quality of life?	Percentage of adults surveyed who feel they can influence decisions affecting their own local area	
		Q14i	Will it improve the satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods as a place to live?	% respondents very or fairly satisfied with their neighbourhood	
		Q14j	Will it reduce crime and the fear of crime?	Indices of Multiple Deprivation: Crime domain	
		Q14k	Will it reduce deprivation in the district?	Indices of Multiple Deprivation	
		Q14l	Will it improve road safety?	Number of people killed or seriously injured on the roads per year	

	SA Objective	Decision making criteria: Will the option/proposal...		Indicators	Targets
15	Develop a dynamic, diverse and knowledge-based economy that excels in innovation with higher value, lower impact activities.	Q15a	Will it ensure that new employment, office, retail and leisure developments are in locations that are accessible to those who will use them by a choice of transport modes?	Proportion of residential development within 30 minutes public transport time of key services	
		Q15b	Will it help ensure an adequate supply of employment land?	Ha of new employment land provision	
		Q15c	Will it support or encourage new business sectors?	No. of start-up businesses in the environmental and social enterprise sector	
				Expenditure on R&D as the proportion of GVA	
		Q15d	Will it support the visitor economy?	Visitor numbers	

Appendix B: Assessment Protocol

SA Objectives with assessment protocol criteria	
1. Historic and cultural features: Protect, enhance and manage sites, features and areas of archaeological, historical and cultural heritage importance.	
++	<p>Conservation and renewal of buildings or features of architectural or historic interest</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Protection or enhancement of listed buildings and/or scheduled monuments</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Protection of archaeological sites/remains</p>
+	<p>Potential to protect and enhance the setting of heritage assets and/or historic townscapes</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Broadens access to and understanding of the historic environment</p>
-	<p>Potential negative impact on the setting of heritage assets and/or historic townscapes</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Reduces access to and understanding of the historic environment</p>
--	<p>Loss of or damage to a listed building and/or scheduled monument, in whole or in part</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Damage to buildings or features of architectural or historic interest</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Damage to archaeological sites/remains</p>
2. Landscape and townscape: Protect, enhance and manage the character and appearance of the landscape and townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities	
++	<p>Potential to re-use degraded landscape/townscape</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development enhances landscape character of landscape and local distinctiveness</p>
+	<p>Development will maintain landscape character and local distinctiveness</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development will meet Building for Life Standards</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development will not exacerbate noise and/or light pollution</p>
-	<p>Development is not in keeping with local development style</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development will exacerbate noise and/or light pollution</p>

--	<p>Potential negative impact in an area of high landscape value or distinctiveness</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development is at odds with existing townscape, particularly if the area has a distinctive style or many listed and historic buildings</p>
<p>3. Biodiversity and geodiversity: Protect, enhance and manage biodiversity and geodiversity</p>	
++	<p>Potential for a significant net increase in biodiversity by an increase in the population size, extent, quality and connectivity of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK BAP priority species • UK BAP priority habitats • European Protected Species <p>OR</p> <p>Potential for an increase in the number, extent and/or quality of SSSIs</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Habitat creation or designation of a new wildlife site</p>
+	<p>Development will maintain and increase in biodiversity by increasing the size, extent quality and connectivity of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SINC • SLINC • LNR • Habitats identified in the Stratford-upon-Avon HBA <p>OR</p> <p>Development will protect existing areas of high biodiversity value</p>
-	<p>Development may decrease biodiversity by fragmenting or reducing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SINC • SLINC • LNR • Habitats identified in the Stratford-upon-Avon HBA <p>OR</p> <p>Development will degrade existing areas of high biodiversity value</p>
--	<p>Development may decrease biodiversity by fragmenting or reducing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK BAP priority species • UK BAP priority habitats • European Protected Species <p>OR</p> <p>Potential for an decrease in the number, extent and/or quality of SSSIs</p>
<p>4. Flooding: Reduce the risk of flooding</p>	

++	<p>Development in flood zone 1</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Will incorporate flood reduction measures, such as Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) OR development is not at known risk of surface water flooding</p>
+	<p>Development in flood zone 1</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development will incorporate flood reduction measures, such as Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development is not at known risk of surface water flooding</p>
-	<p>Development in flood zone 2</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development is expected to exacerbate existing flood risk</p>
--	<p>Development in flood zone 3a or 3b</p>
5. Minimise Climate Change: Minimise the plan area's contribution to climate change	
++	<p>Development will reduce Stratford-upon-Avon's carbon footprint (including energy and gas consumption)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Will increase energy efficiency</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Will provide renewable energy generation</p>
+	<p>Development will reduce Stratford-upon-Avon's carbon footprint (including non-renewable energy consumption and greenhouse gas generation)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development will increase energy efficiency</p>
-	<p>Development has poor potential for renewable energy provision</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development is likely to increase the carbon footprint of Stratford-upon-Avon</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development is likely to decrease energy efficiency</p>
--	<p>Development is likely to increase the carbon footprint per resident of Rossendale AND has poor potential for renewable energy provision</p>
6. Plan for Climate Change: Plan for the anticipated levels of climate change	
++	<p>More than one of the following will apply to development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development provides green infrastructure • Development will prevent potential increases in flood risk

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Homes will exceed Level 4 standards for Code for Sustainable Homes
+	Development protects existing green infrastructure OR Development will help limit potential increases in flood risk
-	Development has poor access to existing green infrastructure OR Development will not meet minimum standards for Code for Sustainable homes
--	Development removes or fragments existing green infrastructure OR Development may increase flood risk
7. Natural Resources: Protect and conserve natural resources	
++	Development is on previously developed land or non-agricultural land OR Development will re-use derelict, degraded and under-used land
+	Development is on Grade 4 or 3b agricultural land OR Protection of mineral deposits OR Development will lead to more efficient use of land OR Development will lead to reduced consumption of water, materials and resources
-	Development is on Grade 3a agricultural land OR Development will lead to less efficient use of land OR Development will increase consumption of water, materials and resources
--	Development is on Grade 1 or 2 agricultural land OR Development will sterilise known mineral deposits
8. Pollution: Reduce air, soil and water pollution	
++	Development will improve air, water and soil quality OR Development will actively remediate or prevent environmental pollution

+	<p>Development will improve one or more of air, water or soil quality</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development will maintain air, water and soil quality where this is already good</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development will reduce congestion and associated pollutants</p>
-	<p>Development will reduce one or more of air, water or soil quality</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development will increase congestion and associated pollutants</p>
--	<p>Development will reduce air, water and soil quality</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development is likely to lead to environmental pollution</p>
<p>9. Waste: Reduce waste generation and disposal, and achieve the sustainable management of waste</p>	
++	<p>Development encourages recycling AND waste minimisation</p>
+	<p>Development encourages recycling</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development encourages waste minimisation</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development encourages use of recycled materials</p>
-	<p>Development will lead to a decrease in recycling rates</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development is likely to use materials that cannot be recycled</p>
--	<p>Development will lead to an increase in waste production per capita</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Development is likely to use materials that cannot be recycled AND come from unsustainable sources</p>
<p>10. Transport: Improve the efficiency of transport networks by increasing the proportion of travel by sustainable modes and by promoting policies which reduce the need to travel</p>	
++	<p>Development will include provision of key services that would not otherwise be available to residents</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development is within 400m of a high frequency (More than 2 buses per hour) bus route</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development will incorporate new pedestrian, cycling and bus routes</p>

	<p>OR</p> <p>Development is within 600m of a local centre</p>
+	<p>Development will increase accessibility to local services and amenities</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development within 400m of a moderate frequency bus service (1 or 2 buses per hour)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development is accessible by existing pedestrian and cycling routes</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development is within 800m of a local centre</p>
-	<p>Development is within 400m of a low frequency bus service (fewer than 1 bus per hour)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development site is not currently accessible by pedestrian and cycling routes</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development is further than 800m from a local centre, but facilities are accessible by bus</p>
--	<p>Development with a very poor level of accessibility to basic facilities and amenities that is likely to rely on journeys by car</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development is further than 400m from a bus stop</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Key services and facilities are not accessible by walking, cycling or public transport</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development is likely to increase congestion</p>
11. Rural barriers: Reduce barriers for those living in rural areas	
++	<p>Development will provide essential services and facilities in rural areas</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development is within 400m of a high frequency (More than 2 buses per hour) bus route that serves key services (e.g. local shops, medical centres)</p>
+	<p>Development within 400m of a moderate frequency bus service (1 or 2 buses per hour)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development will provide affordable housing in rural areas</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development within 800m of the local centre</p>
-	<p>Development is within 400m of a low frequency bus service (fewer than 1 bus</p>

	per hour) OR Development will remove affordable housing in rural areas OR Development is further than 800m from the local centre
--	Development will lead to a loss of essential services and facilities in rural areas OR Development is further than 400m from a bus stop
12. Countryside: Protect the integrity of the countryside	
++	New uses for derelict / underused land on the urban fringe OR Bringing agricultural land that is not in use into active management OR Development will enhance local distinctiveness and identity
+	Prevent land on the urban edge from becoming derelict or underused OR Development protects best and most versatile agricultural land OR Development on the urban fringe or in the countryside will safeguard local distinctiveness and identity
-	Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land OR Development on the urban fringe or in the countryside will not safeguard local distinctiveness and identity
--	Increase in the area of derelict / underused land on the urban fringe OR Increase in the area of agricultural land not in use or under active land management
13. Housing: Provide affordable, environmentally sound and good quality housing for all	
++	Development will contribute to local housing demand, including affordable housing AND Reduction in the number of households on the housing register
+	Development will contribute to local distinctiveness and improve the local environment OR Development will contribute to delivering an appropriate mix of housing for

	<p>the plan area</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development will contribute to local housing demand</p>
-	<p>Development will reduce local distinctiveness</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development will reduce the mix of housing in the plan area</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development will lead to a loss of current housing stock</p>
--	<p>Development will reduce the availability of affordable housing</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Increase in the number of households on the housing register</p>
14. Health: Safeguard and improve community health, safety and well being	
++	<p>Provision of the new and accessible facilities that will help meet the needs of the immediate and wider community, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doctor's surgery or hospital • Sports and recreation facilities • Amenity green space • Allotments and community gardens <p>Other Green Infrastructure</p>
+	<p>Existing health AND community facilities, with capacity, are accessible by public transport or within close proximity of the site i.e.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hospital within 8km • Leisure centre within 2km • GP within 1km • Local green space within 600m • Allotments within 300m <p>(Distances taken from Barton, 2010)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development will reduce crime and the fear of crime and road safety</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Provision for an ageing population</p>
-	<p>The site is located further than the distances stated above, but facilities have capacity</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Existing facilities are within the above distances but do not have capacity (where new facilities are not proposed)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development will increase crime and decrease road safety</p>

--	<p>The site is located further than the distances stated above AND these facilities do not have capacity.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development is likely to decrease the average level of physical activity for residents</p>
<p>15. Economy: Develop a dynamic, diverse and knowledge-based economy that excels in innovation with higher value, lower impact activities</p>	
++	<p>Increase in employment, office, retail and leisure developments</p> <p>AND</p> <p>These new developments are accessible by a range of transport modes</p>
+	<p>Development supports new business sectors</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Development supports the visitor economy</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Provision of new employment land</p>
-	<p>Barriers to new business sectors</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Barriers to growth of the visitor economy</p>
--	<p>Loss of existing employment, office, retail and leisure floorspace</p>

Appendix C: Alternatives Assessment

Policy H1 Built Up Area Boundary

The purpose of the BUAB is described as by the SADC as:

‘The purpose of settlement boundaries is to distinguish land within the boundary where new development is acceptable ‘in principle’, from land outside the boundary where, subject to certain exemptions, development is not acceptable. Settlement boundaries therefore help prevent encroachment into the countryside... Boundaries would be drawn around the existing extent of the built-up area of the settlement but would also need to include any land allocated for development’.³⁸ (emphasis added).

Alternative A: Business as usual (No BUAB defined)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/-	0	0	0

The Built Up Area Boundary for Stratford-upon-Avon (the town) is defined in the Core Strategy. The NDP replicates this therefore it would not be considered a reasonable alternative to alter the definition of this boundary.

Higher level policy defined in the Core Strategy requires BUABs to perform a development management function. The SACS defines a BUAB for Stratford on Avon and states that BUABs for Local Service Villages will be defined in the forthcoming Site Allocations SPD.

The BUAB for Stratford-upon-Avon (the town) is defined in the Core Strategy. The NDP replicates this therefore the reasonable alternative of ‘business as usual’ would fall back on the adopted Local Plan policy, which defines the same boundary.

³⁸ Stratford-on-Avon District Council (2014 p3) Site Allocations Regulation 18 Consultation Document.

The BUAB for the two Local Service Villages within the parish, Tiddington and Alveston, are not defined in the SACS. Core Strategy Policy CS.15 and CS.16 describe that in Local Service Villages; 'development may occur on sites identified in a neighbourhood plan; and small-scale schemes on unidentified but suitable sites within the built up area boundaries where defined or otherwise within their physical confines'. (p84). The business as usual approach would therefore expect development to occur within the 'physical confines' (CS.15) of the settlements.

However Policy CS16 of the Local Plan (which indicates a maximum number of homes for each settlement over the plan period, delivered through windfall) cannot be delivered within the existing physical confines of the villages. Therefore windfall development proposals would be expected to come forward, which may happen prior to the adoption of the Site Allocation DPD. Applications would then be judged in accordance with the other policies contained within the Core Strategy. The policies in the adopted Core Strategy have been subject to an SEA themselves.

In the absence of BUABs, there would be a neutral effect the majority of the SEA Objectives as the policies within the Core Strategy would be in place. "Unrestricted expansion of the village into the countryside"

In the absence of the BUAB there may be an uncertain effect on 'landscape' and 'protecting the integrity of the districts countryside' (Objectives 2 and 12). Windfall development is expected to come forward over the plan period in these Local Service Villages, but there is no guarantee against encroachment on the local countryside. It would be uncertain where the development for the housing numbers based on CS16 would be located in the absence of a defined BUAB, until the Site Allocations DPD is adopted.

The policies contained in the Core Strategy (such as CS.6 CS.9, CS.15) aim to direct the location of development towards sustainable locations which protect the character and distinctiveness off the local area.

Other policies within the Stratford NDP (such as Policy H2 Strategic Gap and Policy BE7 Effective use of land) may be expected to encourage a more neutral impact toward Objectives 2 and 12 in the absence of Policy H1.

However, Policy H3 (discussed below) and Policy H4 are reliant on Policy H1 and the BUAB concept for their clarity, and to not include Policy H1 would make the NDP polices incoherent. If the alternative of 'business as usual' was taken forward, Policy H3 and H4 would require rewording.

Reasonable Alternative B: Tiddington larger boundary.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	--	0	--	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	+/-	0	0

Reasonable Alternative B was considered by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group and is discussed in the NDP evidence paper ‘Reasonable Alternatives Evidence – 14 January 2017’. The exact boundary has not been defined on a map and this assessment is based on the concept of a larger boundary rather than a fully defined area.

The land to the north of the current built up area of Tiddington is in Flood Zone 3 and is adjacent to the River Avon. This would have a negative effect on Flooding (SEA Objective 4).

A larger built up area to the north west and south would lead to the coalescence of Tiddington with Stratford-on-Avon, which would have a negative impact on landscape (SEA Objective 2). To the north this would conflict with the Local Plan policy CS.13 ‘Area of restraint’ which aims to protect the open nature of a place due to its contribution to the character and physical form of the settlement. To the south the a larger BUAB would similarly have a negative impact on character through settlement coalescence as has been identified through the appeal dismissal on this land, in part on the grounds of negative impact on the landscape character through coalescence (Appeal reference APP/J3720/W/153017900). See discussion of NDP Policy H2 Strategic Gap.

A larger boundary would provide more housing for the district (SEA Objective 13). However the Local Plan sets out the strategic spatial distribution of development for the district in order to direct the required level of development to the most sustainable locations and to set a strategy for the District's communities to become more sustainable over time. A larger BUAB (within which development is to be generally permitted) to the east would extend to cover land that is both allocated and unallocated for development. The NDP has allocated housing to largely meet its housing contribution set in the Local Plan (Policy CS.16), by allocating approximately 100 dwellings out of the approximately 113 dwellings required. It is considered that to include a larger of land within the BUAB it would undermine the district strategy for sustainable development by increasing the amount of land that development would be generally permitted within. The effect on housing has uncertain effects as it would provide more housing but there would be uncertain if there would be infrastructure to support a greater level of development in this area.

Reasonable Alternative C: Tiddington smaller boundary.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biodiv	Flood	Climte cont rb	Climte plan	Resrce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0

Reasonable Alternative C was considered by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group and is discussed in the NDP evidence paper 'Reasonable Alternatives Evidence - 14 January 2017'. The exact boundary has not been defined on a map and this assessment is based on the concept of a smaller boundary rather than a fully defined area.

A smaller BUAB around Tiddington would have largely neutral effects as it would limit the area within which development would be expected to take place. To make the boundary smaller would conflict with CS.16 as it may restrict the ability of Tiddington to reach its housing number requirement through windfall on infill, as the area available for infill would be reduced - to reduce the BUAB further than the proposed NDP policy would possibly require removing the housing allocation sites or by removing parts of the already built up area from the BUAB. Whilst this would mean that any infill would have to come forward closely around the existing form of the village and thus have a lower environmental impact, it is not a feasible proposal due to conflict with the Local Plan.

Alternative D: Alverston larger boundary

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Floo d	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	-	-	--	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	+	0	0

Reasonable Alternative D was considered by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group and is discussed in the NDP evidence paper 'Reasonable Alternatives Evidence - 14 January 2017'. The exact boundary has not been defined on a map and this assessment is based on the concept of a larger boundary rather than a fully defined area.

A larger BUAB for Alverston would expand the settlement limits considerably further than the existing built form of Alverston. This may have the effect of encouraging dispersed and unconnected locations for the development of the approximately 32 dwellings required to come through as windfall over the plan period.

A larger boundary would provide more housing for the district (SEA Objective 13). However the Local Plan sets out the strategic spatial distribution of development for the district in order to direct the required level of development to the most sustainable locations and to set a strategy for the District's communities to become more sustainable over time. A larger BUAB (within which development is to be generally permitted) to the east would extend to cover land that is both allocated and unallocated for development. It is considered that to include a larger area of land within the BUAB it may conflict with the district strategy for sustainable development by increasing the amount of land that development would be generally permitted within. Nonetheless, it may lead to an increase in housing delivery (SEA Objective 13).

There is a local wildlife site to the North West and a larger boundary including this area would be expected to adversely affect this site.

The north-western part of the proposed BUAB is within flood zones 2 and 3. An expansion of the BUAB to the north west, north and north east would be almost entirely within flood zone 3 and would be a negative location to expect windfall development to be delivered within.

Alternative E: Alverston smaller boundary

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0

Reasonable Alternative E was considered by the Neighbourhood Plan steering group and is discussed in the NDP evidence paper 'Reasonable Alternatives Evidence - 14 January 2017'. The exact boundary has not been defined on a map and this assessment is based on the concept of a smaller boundary rather than a fully defined area.

A smaller boundary would be required to exclude some residential properties from the built up area, which is unjustifiable and would reduce the opportunities for infilling to meet the housing number requirement. The settlement pattern in Alverston is low density and dispersed. A reduction in the amount of undeveloped land may mean that a higher density of new residential properties would be required to deliver the 32 dwellings. This could have a negative effect on the character of the settlement.

Policy H2 Strategic Gap

The purpose of the Strategic Gaps is described within the NDP as required to prevent the coalescence of settlements, and to preserve the buffer or visual breaks between settlements to maintain their individual identity.

Reasonable alternative A: Do Nothing (No strategic gap policy)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/-	0	0

The 'do nothing' alternative would be to not allocate a strategic gap.

The strategic gap policy articulates the findings of the Inspector for the Knight's Lane appeal (appeal reference APP/J3720/W/153017900) which dismissed the appeal on the basis that the proposal would cause the coalescence of Stratford on Avon and Tiddington. To have no policy on a strategic gap would mean that there would be an uncertain effect on the landscape as this area of land between Tiddington and Stratford upon Avon would be protected only by strict adherence to the development boundaries in Policy H1. In turn, the effect on housing delivery would also be uncertain.

Policy H1 and H3 of the NDP and Policy CS.15 of the SACS would be expected to direct development to locations which would ensure that the character of the settlements are preserved.

Reasonable alternative B: Larger strategic gap

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

A larger strategic gap that would surround Tiddington was considered by the NDP group but was not considered necessary to achieve the aim of limiting development in non-appropriate locations. A larger strategic gap alternative would have a similar environmental affect as the original strategic gap policy, as the areas that the extended area of restraint would cover are offered protection from inappropriate development under other policies. The land to the north of Tiddington is within Flood Zone 3. The area to the North West is in the Core Strategy CS.13 'Area of restraint'. To the West the Golf Course provides a gap between the settlements of Tiddington and Stratford-on-Avon. The strategic gap to the south is at its greatest extent before reaching Stratford-on-Avon. The strategic gap could be extended as a reasonable alternative to the east of Tiddington. This land to the east of Tiddington is expected to avoid negative environmental impacts due to the policies in H1 and H3.

Reasonable Alternative C: Smaller strategic gap

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Floo d	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/-	0

A smaller strategic gap considered as an alternative by the NDP group. This smaller strategic gap removed a field running to the west of Pimlico Lane between the Croft Preparatory School entrance road and Pimlico Cottages. This alternative would have a similar environmental affect as the original strategic gap policy as the removed field does not alter the implications of the policy significantly. The removed field has a public footpath running through it and development in this area could disrupt the recreational enjoyment of the rural character of the public footpath.

Policy H3 Local Service Village Allocations

The following assessments of alternatives for Policy H3 have consistently identified neutral impacts on waste (SEA Objective 9) and economy (SEA Objective 15). Overall waste production is likely to increase by the virtue of additional residents and households producing waste additional to the current level of waste production. Waste production per capita is not expected to increase with development at the sites allocated in the plan, nor is recycling expected to decrease, as new residents will have access to the same waste facilities as current residents. For this reason, SEA Objective 9 has been assessed as neutral for all alternatives.

All options for local service village allocations are expected to have similar impacts on the economy. Economic impacts are expected to be minimal. There may be short-term benefits to the construction industry if local firms are instructed to undertake building works. Additional residents may also support the local economy through both employment and spending. Additional residents are likely to support the local economy as Stratford-on-Avon as a District currently relies on in commuting of workers from surrounding areas³⁹. If residents of Stratford-on-Avon work in the district, it is more likely that they will spend their earnings in the district, rather than taking this money elsewhere. As housing development is unlikely to create new employment opportunities or new business sectors, all allocations have been assessed as neutral against SEA Objective 15.

Due to the nature of Policy H3, all allocation options will contribute to local housing demand. Government policy states that developments of over 10 dwellings should contribute to affordable housing⁴⁰ and the emerging Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy states that allocations of over 5 dwellings must contribute to affordable housing. Sites for more than 5 dwellings have therefore been assessed as strongly positive (++) against SEA Objective 13 as they are expected to provide affordable housing.

There is little information regarding capacity of primary health care facilities, although the Stratford-on-Avon Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan⁴¹ identifies capacity issues at Trinity Court Surgery, which is located on Arden Street in Stratford-upon-Avon. However, Appendix 1⁴² of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy indicates that approximately 2 clinical rooms and associated infrastructure will be delivered in Stratford-upon-Avon over the plan period. For the purpose of assessments below, this, along with the existing surgeries that have capacity for new patients, is assumed to be sufficient for the additional dwellings proposed by the plan.

Whilst most of the sites assessed below are within 2km of the NFU Mutual Social and Sports Club, based in Tiddington, this has not been accounted for in assessments, as this facility is restricted to use by employees of NFU Mutual and their families only.

³⁹ SQW (2013) Coventry and Warwickshire Economic Review – Strand 2: Productivity Analysis

⁴⁰ PAS (2015) Changes to government policy (incorporating Nov 14 and Mar 15 changes)

⁴¹ Stratford-on-Avon District Council (2013) Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan

⁴² Stratford-on-Avon District Council (2014) PSCS Appendix 1: Schedule of Infrastructure Projects

Alveston

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+	+	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	+/-	0	0	-	-	+/-	+	-	0

Depending on the location and design of development, heritage features in Alveston have potential to be affected, including listed buildings and the conservation area, which encompasses almost the entire village. Policies BE11 and BE12 are expected to prevent any negative impacts of development on historic features (SEA Objective 1).

The townscape and character of Alveston is expected to be protected by Policies BE1 and BE2 (SEA Objective 2). Although it cannot be known if development will impact the integrity of the countryside in and around Alveston if development locations and designs depend on the sites that come forward in future (SEA Objective 12).

Depending on the location of the any windfall sites, biodiversity features in the area may be negatively affected. Whilst there are no biodiversity designations in Alveston, there are areas of habitat with potential biodiversity value, which could be affected by development in the village (SEA Objective 3).

Part of Alveston lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3, thus windfall sites in the village could be located on this land. Whilst Policy BE7 requires all development proposals to incorporate drainage solutions, it is not known whether these will reduce flood risk to a level equivalent to Flood Zone 1 (SEA Objective 4). Likewise, it is not known whether windfall sites would protect or remove green infrastructure assets or build on best and most versatile agricultural land (SEA Objectives 6, 7 and 12).

Alveston is further than 800m from the nearest local centre (in Tiddington) and services in Tiddington and Stratford-upon-Avon are not easily accessible by bus (SEA Objectives 10 and 11). This is likely to lead to dependence on car use to access services and facilities, thus increasing the carbon footprint of Stratford-upon-Avon (SEA Objective 5).

Whilst windfall sites may contribute to local housing demand, it is not known whether these will include affordable housing or not. For this reason, SEA Objective 13 has been assessed as '+', rather than '++'.

Whilst Stratford Hospital is within 8km, Alveston is over 2km from a GP surgery and over 600m from an area of public green space, resulting in negative implications for health (SEA Objective 14).

Tiddington: Home guard club 1a and 1b

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
-	+	0	+	0	0	-	0	0	+	+	-	++	+	0

The HEA classifies this site as having high archaeological sensitivity as it lies in an area of likely Iron Age, Roman and / or medieval activity. In the absence of more detailed archaeological assessments and site design details, this site is assessed as having likely negative effects on SEA Objective 1.

This site is in an area of medium landscape sensitivity, as identified in the 2012 Landscape Sensitivity Study⁴³. Development at this site is likely to be in keeping with existing development, as landscape value of the wider countryside and local townscape character are expected to be protected by Policies BE1 and BE2. SSB4 provides additional guidance to reduce landscape and visual impacts, such as limiting dwellings to a maximum of 2 storeys and requiring building density and design to be in keeping with the rest of the village (SEA Objectives 2 and 12).

Whilst there are no designated wildlife sites in the area, there are hedgerows, a BAP priority habitat, along the northern and eastern boundaries of the site⁴⁴. This site consists largely of sports pitches which are not considered to have high value for wildlife but the area of trees in the southeastern corner of the site has potential for protected species, such as bats and reptiles, particularly as it is linked to a wider network of hedgerows. Biodiversity is likely to be protected at this site through Policy NE3 (SEA Objective 3).

This site is in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding (SEA Objective 4). It is expected that loss of green infrastructure will be neutralized by the requirement of SSB4 to provide adequate replacement sports facilities, a minimum of 70sqm outdoor amenity space per dwelling and communal open space, including play areas (SEA Objective 6).

⁴³White Consultants (2012) Stratford-on-Avon District: Landscape Sensitivity Study for Local Service Villages

⁴⁴ UE Associates (2011) Stratford-on-Avon Green Infrastructure Study

Bus stops served by a range of services lie within 400m of the site, although these services are low to moderate frequency at approximately 2 buses (from all services) per hour. Whilst development at this location is not anticipated to increase carbon emissions per resident, it is unlikely to reduce this as residents are expected to rely largely on car use due to the low frequency of bus services. The roads in the area have pedestrian footpaths but there are few traffic-free routes or dedicated cycle routes. The site is within 600m of local shops in Tiddington but it is expected that residents will travel further afield for additional services, such as doctor's surgeries and larger retail centres (SEA Objectives 5, 10 and 11).

The site is Grade 3a agricultural land and as such is considered to represent the best and most versatile agricultural land (SEA Objectives 7 and 12).

This site lies partially within the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA. Residents of any new development are expected to own cars and consequently lead to an increased volume of traffic in the AQMA. Policy CLW8 states that developments expected to degrade air quality will not be permitted, thus no residual impacts remain with regards to SEA Objective 8.

The nearest GP is over 2.5km away in Stratford-upon-Avon town, the site is within 8km of Stratford Hospital. Development at this site would remove almost half of the outdoor recreation area of the HGC, although requirements for adequate replacement sports facilities and open space in SSB4 are thought to be sufficient to neutralize this loss, resulting in overall positive implications for SEA Objective 14. The plan could provide more certainty on the delivery of replacement sports facilities by specifying where and how this alternative provision will be delivered. It has been assumed that alternative provision will be equally as accessible to residents of Tiddington as the previous provision at HGC and that HGC will be consulted on said provision.

Tiddington: Tiddington Fields 2a and 2b

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histo r	Land s	Biodi v	Flood	Climt e contr b	Climt e plan	Resrc e	Polln	Wast e	Trans p	Rural Barri er	Coun tr	Hous e	Healt h	Econ
-	+	0	+	+	+	-	0	0	+	+	+	++	+	0

The Historic Environment Assessment identified potential presence of Roman archaeological features on this site⁴⁵. If this is not investigated prior to development, construction works at this site could potentially damage historic and archaeological features. The HEA classifies this site as having high archaeological sensitivity as it lies in an area of likely Iron Age, Roman and / or medieval activity. In the absence of more detailed archaeological assessments onsite, H3f is assessed as having likely negative effects on the historic environment (SEA Objective 1).

This site is in an area of medium landscape sensitivity, as identified in the 2012 Landscape Sensitivity Study⁴⁶. Whilst development would lie alongside existing development and retain the characteristic projection of Tiddington to the south it would represent a large increase in the size of the village, in terms of both area and number of houses. It is expected that, in conjunction with Policy BE1 and Policy BE2 and SSB4, development at this site would maintain landscape character (SEA Objective 2). This site may protect the integrity of the countryside if sensitively designed and the character of the landscape and townscape are managed (SEA Objective 12) as this site location does not deviate from the existing pattern or layout of the existing village.

This site is in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding (SEA Objective 4) and does not include any recognized green infrastructure assets (SEA Objective 6).

Bus stops served by a range of services lie within 400m of the site. These services are low to moderate frequency at approximately 2 buses (from all services) per hour. Whilst development at this location is not anticipated to increase carbon emissions per resident, it is unlikely to reduce this as residents are expected to rely largely on car use due to the low frequency of bus services. The roads in the area have pedestrian footpaths but there are few traffic-free routes or dedicated cycle routes. The site is within 600m of local shops in Tiddington but it is expected that residents will travel further afield for additional services, such as doctor's surgeries and larger retail centres (SEA Objectives 5, 10 and 11).

⁴⁵ AOC on behalf of Stratford-on-Avon District Council (2012) Historic Environment Assessment of Local Service Villages, Stratford-on-Avon District, County of Warwickshire

⁴⁶White Consultants (2012) Stratford-on-Avon District: Landscape Sensitivity Study for Local Service Villages

These sites are Grade 3a agricultural land with a small amount of Grade 3b. This is considered best and most versatile land and it is currently kept as grassland. The ALC report⁴⁷ accompanying planning application for the site (Ref. 15/02057/OUT) describes that ‘the presence of such land is common in the immediate area’. The report comments that much of the land to the south of Stratford is Grade 2 and as such the loss of this site would represent the loss of poorer quality land in the area. Nonetheless, the loss of Grade 3a represents a likely adverse effect on natural resources (SEA Objective 7).

This site lies within the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA. Residents of any new development are expected to own cars and consequently lead to an increased volume of traffic in the AQMA. Policy CLW8 states that developments expected to degrade air quality will not be permitted, thus no residual impacts remain with regards to SEA Objective 8.

This site generally has good access to health and leisure facilities. Whilst the nearest GP is over 2.5km away in Stratford-upon-Avon town, the site is within 8km of Stratford Hospital, within 2km of existing sports facilities of the HGC, as well as being within easy access of the Stratford-upon-Avon Golf Club (SEA Objective 14). Replacement sports provision made through Policy H3d should be accessible to residents of this Tiddington Fields site and adequately provide for their needs with regards to leisure opportunities and open space.

Tiddington: Knight’s Lane 3a

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	--	0	+	0	+	-	0	0	-	+	-	++	+	0

The Historic Environmental Assessment identified possible archaeological features on this site, although the nature of this is not specified in the document. As this site is assessed as having low sensitivity to development with regards to the historic environment (with the exception of the southwest corner of the site), impacts of H3f on SEA Objective 1 are considered to be negligible.

⁴⁷ Agricultural Land Classification Report, Kernon Countryside Consultants Ltd (October 2015)

This site is not currently bordered by housing, thus giving it a slightly disconnected feel from existing development in Tiddington. Whilst the site is bordered by the NFU Mutual Sports and Social Club on one side and Stratford-upon-Avon Golf Course on another, these are fairly open green spaces. In terms of immediate visual impact, the site is open to the east and south, and would extend a well-defined settlement limit, which currently lies to the northeast. Whilst Policies BE1 and BE2 require development to contribute to sense of place and local character (SEA Objective 2) it is not felt that these policies would be sufficient mitigation to, nor compatible with, the impact of the development of this site on the landscape. The development of this site would lead to coalescence between Tiddington and Stratford-on-Avon along Loxley Road, particularly if the proposed Arden Heath Farm Development goes ahead (SEA Objective 2).

The development of this site was refused planning permission with an appeal dismissed⁴⁸ on the grounds of the coalescing of Tiddington and Stratford on Avon, loss of openness of character and negative effect on landscape character. The Inspector concluded that the open land and sense of separation between Tiddington and Stratford-on-Avon are features that contribute to the distinctiveness of the local area.

The site is within the Strategic Gap identified in Policy H2 of the NDP which aims to prevent the coalescence of settlements.

The southern and western perimeters of the site are lined with hedgerows and scrub that connect to hedgerows and wooded areas on the adjacent golf course. This is potentially good habitat for protected species, including reptiles, bats and breeding birds. Such hedgerows are expected to be protected through Policy NE3, thus impacts of development at this site on SEA Objective 3 are expected to be negligible.

This site is in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding (SEA Objective 4) and does not include any recognized green infrastructure assets (SEA Objective 6).

⁴⁸ Appeal reference: APP/J3720/W/15/3017900 & APP/J3720/W/15/3132950

Bus stops served by a range of services lie within 400m of the site, although these services are low to moderate frequency at approximately 2 buses (from all services) per hour. Whilst development at this location is not anticipated to increase carbon emissions per resident, it is unlikely to reduce this as residents are expected to rely largely on car use due to the low frequency of bus services. The site is within 600m of local shops in Tiddington but it is expected that residents will travel further afield for additional services, such as doctor's surgeries and larger retail centres (SEA Objectives 5 and 11). There is currently no footpath to the site or dedicated cycle routes, thus posing potential access and safety issues. Due to this lack of accessibility by existing pedestrian and cycle routes, SEA Objective 10 has been assessed as negative.

This site consists of Grade 2 agricultural land, which is considered to be best and most versatile. Development at this site would lead to loss of this resource (SEA Objectives 7 and 12).

This site lies within the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA. Residents of any new development are expected to own cars and consequently lead to an increased volume of traffic in the AQMA. Policy CLW8 states that developments expected to degrade air quality will not be permitted, thus no residual impacts remain with regards to SEA Objective 8.

This site generally has good access to health and leisure facilities. Whilst the nearest GP is over 2.5km away in Stratford-upon-Avon town, the site is within 8km of Stratford Hospital, within 2km of existing sports facilities of the HGC, as well as being near to the Stratford-upon-Avon Golf Club. The site is also adjacent to the NFU Mutual Sports and Social Club, although this is only accessible to NFU Mutual employees and their families (SEA Objective 14).

Tiddington: Knight's Lane 3b

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	--	0	+	0	+	--	0	0	+	+	-	++	+	0

The HEA does not identify any historic features on this site and classifies the majority of the site as having low sensitivity to development (SEA Objective 1).

This site is currently bordered by housing to the north and the site is open to the west, east and south. In terms of immediate visual impact, it would be a large extension to the south of Tiddington, , and would alter settlement pattern, which currently is developing to a greater extent to the east side of Tiddington, where planning permission has been granted on sites 2a and 2b (discussed above). If Sites 2a and 2b were not progressed, and this site instead taken forward, it would extend the linear projection of Tiddington to the south, rather than an eastward build back from Knights Road.

The development of this site would be expected to lead to coalescence between Tiddington and Stratford-on-Avon along Loxley Road, particularly if the proposed Arden Heath Farm Development goes ahead (SEA Objective 2). Whilst Policies BE1 and BE2 require development to contribute to sense of place and local character (SEA Objective 2) it is not felt that these would be sufficient mitigation to, nor compatible with, the impact of the development of this site on the landscape. The development of this site was refused planning permission with appeal dismissed⁴⁹ on the grounds of the coalescing of Tiddington and Stratford on Avon, loss of openness of character and negative effect on landscape character. The Inspector concluded that the open land and sense of separation between Tiddington and Stratford-on-Avon are features that contribute to the distinctiveness of the local area. This site was also rejected from the SHLAA (2012) as being unsuitable for residential development due to the unacceptable impact on the landscape character of the area.⁵⁰

The site is within the Strategic Gap identified in Policy H2 of the NDP which aims to prevent the coalescence of settlements.

The southern and western perimeters of the site are lined with hedgerows and scrub that connect to hedgerows and wooded areas on the adjacent golf course. This is potentially good habitat for protected species, including reptiles, bats and breeding birds. Such hedgerows are expected to be protected through Policy NE3, thus impacts of development at this site on SEA Objective 3 are expected to be negligible.

⁴⁹ Appeal reference: APP/J3720/W/15/3017900 & APP/J3720/W/15/3132950

⁵⁰ SHLAA Ref: TIDD705: SHLAA Review 2012 Sites Information - Appendices 1-8 available at <https://www.stratford.gov.uk/files/seealsodocs/147875/SHLAA%20Review%202012%20Sites%20Information%20%2D%20A%20ppendices%201%2D8.pdf>

This site is in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding (SEA Objective 4) and does not include any recognized green infrastructure assets (SEA Objective 6).

Bus stops served by a range of services lie within 400m of the site, although these services are low to moderate frequency at approximately 2 buses (from all services) per hour. Whilst development at this location is not anticipated to increase carbon emissions per resident, it is unlikely to reduce this as residents are expected to rely largely on car use due to the low frequency of bus services. The site is within 600m of local shops in Tiddington but it is expected that residents will travel further afield for additional services, such as doctor’s surgeries and larger retail centres (SEA Objectives 5, 11 and 10).

This site consists of Grade 1 agricultural land, which is considered to be best and most versatile. Development at this site would lead to loss of this resource (SEA Objectives 7 and 12).

Approximately half of the site has been surveyed for ALC purposes. Of the land surveyed part Grade 3a and part Grade 3b. The grade 3a land is considered to be best and most versatile. Development at this site would lead to loss of this resource (SEA Objectives 7 and 12).

Although this site is outside the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA, it is close to the boundary of this. Residents of any new development are expected to own cars and consequently lead to an increased volume of traffic in the AQMA. Policy CLW8 states that developments expected to degrade air quality will not be permitted, thus no residual impacts remain with regards to SEA Objective 8.

This site generally has good access to health and leisure facilities. Whilst the nearest GP is over 2.5km away in Stratford-upon-Avon town, the site is within 8km of Stratford Hospital, within 2km of existing sports facilities of the HGC, as well as having good access to the Stratford-upon-Avon Golf Club (SEA Objective 14).

Tiddington: Knight’s Lane 3c

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	--	0	+	0	+	--	0	0	-	+/-	--	++	+	0

The HEA does not identify any historic features on this site and classifies the majority of the site as having low sensitivity to development (SEA Objective 1).

This site is not currently bordered by housing and disconnected from existing development in Tiddington. The site is located within an open landscape, with medium landscape sensitivity. Whilst Policies BE1 and BE2 require development to contribute to sense of place and local character, this site is within the Strategic Gap identified in Policy H2 and could lead to coalescence with other development in Stratford-upon-Avon along Loxley Road, particularly if the proposed Arden Heath Farm Development goes ahead (SEA Objective 2). If the Arden Heath Farm development does not go ahead, the development of this site would be disconnected from other settlements on all sides and represent an isolated pocket of residential housing. This site is closer to Stratford-on-Avon than Tiddington and would be adjacent to, but outside of, the BUAB as defined by the NDP and the SACS and therefore not in conformity with CS.15.

This site is in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding (SEA Objective 4) and does not include any recognized green infrastructure assets (SEA Objective 6).

Bus stops served by a range of services lie within 400m of the site, although these services are low to moderate frequency at approximately 2 buses (from all services) per hour. Whilst development at this location is not anticipated to increase carbon emissions per resident, it is unlikely to reduce this as residents are expected to rely largely on car use due to the low frequency of bus services. The site is within 600m of local shops in Tiddington but it is expected that residents will travel further afield for additional services, such as doctor's surgeries and larger retail centres (SEA Objectives 5 and 11). There is currently no footpath to the site, thus posing potential access and safety issues. The national cycle route 41 runs along the southern boundary of the site on Loxley Road, although this has no dedicated cycle lane. Due to this lack of accessibility by existing pedestrian and cycle routes, SEA Objective 10 has been assessed as negative.

This site consists of Grade 1 agricultural land, which is considered to be best and most versatile. Development at this site would lead to loss of this resource (SEA Objectives 7 and 12).

Although this site is outside the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA, it is close to the boundary of this. Residents of any new development are expected to own cars and consequently lead to an increased volume of traffic in the AQMA. Policy CLW8 states that developments expected to degrade air quality will not be permitted, thus no residual impacts remain with regards to SEA Objective 8.

This site generally has good access to health and leisure facilities. Whilst the nearest GP is over 2.5km away in Stratford-upon-Avon town, the site is within 8km of Stratford Hospital, within 2km of existing sports facilities of the HGC, as well as having good access to the Stratford-upon-Avon Golf Club (SEA Objective 14).

Tiddington: Dispersal 4a

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	0	+	0	+	++	0	0	+	+	+	++	+	0

The HEA does not identify any historic features on this site (SEA Objective 1).

This site consists of previously developed land as it is currently in use as domestic garages (SEA Objectives 7 and 12). It is tucked within existing development, thus likely to have minimal, or positive, landscape impacts (SEA Objective 2).

This site is in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding (SEA Objective 4) and does not include any recognized green infrastructure assets (SEA Objective 6).

Bus stops served by a range of services lie within 400m of the site, although these services are low to moderate frequency at approximately 2 buses (from all services) per hour. Whilst development at this location is not anticipated to increase carbon emissions per resident, it is unlikely to reduce this as residents are expected to rely largely on car use due to the low frequency of bus services. The roads in the area have pedestrian footpaths but there are few traffic-free routes or dedicated cycle routes. The site is within 600m of local shops in Tiddington but it is expected that residents will travel further afield for additional services, such as doctor's surgeries and larger retail centres (SEA Objectives 5, 10 and 11).

This site lies within the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA. Residents of any new development are expected to own cars and consequently lead to an increased volume of traffic in the AQMA. Policy CLW8 states that developments expected to degrade air quality will not be permitted, thus no residual impacts remain with regards to SEA Objective 8.

This site generally has good access to health and leisure facilities. Whilst the nearest GP is over 2.5km away in Stratford-upon-Avon town, the site is within 8km of Stratford Hospital, within 2km of existing sports facilities of the HGC, as well as being within 2km of Stratford-upon-Avon Golf Club (SEA Objective 14).

Tiddington: Dispersal 4b

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+	+/-	+	0	+	0	0	0	+	+	+	++	+	0

The HEA does not identify any historic features on this site (SEA Objective 1).

This site is surrounded by housing and has poor accessibility from the surrounding roads. It is underused and tucked within existing development, thus likely to have minimal, or positive, landscape impacts (SEA Objective 2). Due to its secluded position within existing development, this site may reduce the need for development on agricultural land, thus protecting the integrity of the countryside (SEA Objective 12).

The site has potential biodiversity value, but it is isolated from the wider countryside by housing. Further ecological surveys would be required to determine the biodiversity value of this site, thus assessment of SEA Objective 3 remains uncertain.

This site is in Flood Zone 1, thus is at low risk of flooding (SEA Objective 4) and does not include any recognized green infrastructure assets (SEA Objective 6).

Bus stops served by a range of services lie within 400m of the site, although these services are low to moderate frequency at approximately 2 buses (from all services) per hour. Whilst development at this location is not anticipated to increase carbon emissions per resident, it is unlikely to reduce this as residents are expected to rely largely on car use due to the low frequency of bus services. The roads in the area have pedestrian footpaths but there are few traffic-free routes or dedicated cycle routes. The site is within 600m of local shops in Tiddington but it is expected that residents will travel further afield for additional services, such as doctor's surgeries and larger retail centres (SEA Objectives 5, 10 and 11).

This site lies within the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA. Residents of any new development are expected to own cars and consequently lead to an increased volume of traffic in the AQMA. Policy CLW8 states that developments expected to degrade air quality will not be permitted, thus no residual impacts remain with regards to SEA Objective 8.

This site generally has good access to health and leisure facilities. Whilst the nearest GP is over 2.5km away in Stratford-upon-Avon town, the site is within 8km of Stratford Hospital, within 2km of existing sports facilities of the HGC, as well as being within 2km of Stratford-upon-Avon Golf Club (SEA Objective 14).

Tiddington: Dispersal 4c

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+/-	+	+/-	-	0	-	+	0	0	+	+	+	++	+	0

The Elms is a Grade II listed building that lies to the west of this site. Whilst the building itself would not be affected by development, its setting would change in terms of the western aspect. To the west, the building is enclosed by trees, which are likely to be removed in the development of site 4c. This would alter views to the west for visual receptors at The Elms and bring it into a more urban setting. Policy BE11 gives protection to historic features and their settings, and the extent to which setting is important to the Elms could be discussed with Historic England in order to make a more informed decision regarding impacts of development on SEA Objective 1. The HEA identified potential historic features on the southern part of this site, although the nature of these is not specified. In the absence of further information on the nature of historic and archaeological features of the site, impacts of development on SEA Objective 1 remain uncertain.

Development at this site is not expected to affect the character of the wider settlement of Tiddington, as it is bordered by development to the southwest and close to The Elms and Riverside Park to the east. Development at this site is likely to be in keeping with the current feeling of Tiddington folding out towards the River Avon (SEA Objectives 2 and 12).

Whilst there are no designated sites in or adjacent to site 4c, the site itself and surrounds have potential biodiversity value. The group of trees in the western part of the site could provide habitat for a number of species including bats and breeding birds, particularly as it is linked to surrounding hedgerows and trees along the river. The rough grassland to the north of the site could be suitable for reptiles, butterflies and ground-nesting birds. Policy NE3 is expected to protect the trees and hedgerows, yet in the absence of ecological surveys, the biodiversity value of these areas and impact of development cannot be known (SEA Objective 3).

The northern part of this site lies in Flood Zone 2, which is at moderate risk of flooding, whilst the southern part lies in Flood Zone 1. Development on this site has potential to exacerbate flood risk as it would replace permeable land with impermeable surfaces, such as houses and roads, which could lead to flooding in the north of the site running to the south of the site and potentially to properties beyond. Whilst there are no recognised green infrastructure assets on this site, removal of the group of trees could exacerbate this as trees help slow surface water runoff and reduce risk of flooding⁵¹ (SEA Objectives 4 and 6).

Bus stops served by a range of services lie within 400m of the site, although these services are low to moderate frequency at approximately 2 buses (from all services) per hour. Whilst development at this location is not anticipated to increase carbon emissions per resident, it is unlikely to reduce this as residents are expected to rely largely on car use due to the low frequency of bus services. The roads in the area have pedestrian footpaths but there are few traffic-free routes or dedicated cycle routes. The site is within 600m of local shops in Tiddington but it is expected that residents will travel further afield for additional services, such as doctor's surgeries and larger retail centres (SEA Objectives 5, 10 and 11).

This site consists of Grade 4 agricultural land, which is not considered to be best and most versatile (SEA Objectives 7 and 12).

⁵¹ Forest Research (2010) Benefits of Green Infrastructure. Available at: [http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/\\$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf](http://www.forestry.gov.uk/pdf/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf/$file/urgp_benefits_of_green_infrastructure.pdf)

This site lies within the Stratford-upon-Avon AQMA. Residents of any new development are expected to own cars and consequently lead to an increased volume of traffic in the AQMA. Policy CLW8 states that developments expected to degrade air quality will not be permitted, thus no residual impacts remain with regards to SEA Objective 8.

This site generally has good access to health and leisure facilities. Whilst the nearest GP is over 2.5km away in Stratford-upon-Avon town, the site is within 8km of Stratford Hospital, within 2km of existing sports facilities of the HGC, as well as being within 2km of Stratford-upon-Avon Golf Club (SEA Objective 14).

Policy BE7 Sustainable Drainage

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The requirement for developments to incorporate sustainable drainage, or other drainage measures where this is not possible, will contribute towards reducing current flood risk and minimizing future risk of flooding due to climate change (SEA Objectives 4 and 6).

This policy also promotes re-use and recycling of water, which will contribute to conserving this resource (SEA Objective 7).

Appendix D: Do Nothing Assessment

Policy H4 and H5

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	0	0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Policies H4 (Development of brownfield land) and H5 (Use of garden land) seek to restrict the loss of land of high environmental value and preserve or enhance the character of the area. The ‘do nothing’ approach would not be expected to alter the types of site brought forward, however there is the potential for areas of higher environmental resource value to be developed.

Policy H6 and H7

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	+/-

Policy H6 and H7 defines the stock mix of affordable housing, based on an up to date (2015) Housing Needs Survey. This aims to provide the variety of types of housing that local people have been shown to need, and to avoid a concentration of housing type in one area. H7 gives particular focus on providing housing for the aging population.

The 'do nothing' approach would retain the Local Plan policy (CS.18) which requires the provision of affordable housing and market housing mix. However this would not address the current identified undersupply of certain dwelling types identified in the NDP Housing Needs Survey (2015). This would have a negative impact on SEA Objective 13 (housing) and SEA Objective 14 (community well-being). Failing to address the balance of housing type, both affordable and market led, could have an uncertain effect on the economy moving forward as there may not be an appropriate housing mix available to support the requirements of the employment market.

Employment E1 – E4

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/-	0	-

The baseline established in the SEA Scoping Report (2014) identified a trend in the falling number of businesses in the district as well as a trend of out commuting for higher paid jobs from the district to surrounding urban areas. The district also has a significantly higher proportion of the workforce working in tourism-related occupations. This reflects the importance of the visitor economy associated with Stratford-upon-Avon and the Shakespearian heritage. It is unlikely that the lack of a relevant policy within the NDP and following a 'business as usual' approach would adversely affect the trend of focusing on visitor economy within Stratford-upon-Avon.

The objective of the employment policies within the NDP is to promote high quality employment opportunities in appropriate locations and encouraging the retention of existing employers in the Neighbourhood Area. The NDP seeks to maintain the existing supply of employment, as well as attracting high value employment, culture, media, and tourism to relocate or start up in the town.

The 'business as usual' scenario would rely on the Core Strategy Policies CS.22 (Economic development) and CS.23 (Retail development and Main Centres) and Policy AS.1 (Stratford-upon-Avon Area Strategy), Proposal SUA1 (Canal Quarter Regeneration Zone) and Proposal SUA.2 (South of Alcester Road).

The NDP gives support for the Core Strategy employment allocation sites, but also looks to provide larger employment areas than put forward in the Core Strategy. The 'do nothing' approach would therefore see lesser levels of employment sites allocated, and NDP Policy E2 provides alternative sites to direct employment led development should the existing allocations in the Core Strategy not be delivered that are well considered in terms of access to transport networks and reducing congestion in the town centre. The business as usual approach would remove this strategic direction for locating certain types of future business growth.

Town Centre TC1 – 8

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	-

The polices in the NDP seek to promote the vitality and commercial viability of the Town Centre.

Policy TC1 (Out of Town Centre Retail) sets a considerably lower gross trading area threshold of 300 square meters than the Core Strategy. The Core Strategic requires 1,000 square meters, above which retail must be located in the Town Centre or edge of town centre. The reasons given in the NDP policy explanation are that it is considered important to retain sufficient footfall within the city centre to protect the economic viability of the independent retailers within the town centre. The ‘do nothing’ alternative approach would use the higher threshold (set on a district wide) for gross trading area.

TC 3 – 8 describe site specific expectations for the redevelopment and regeneration of certain areas of the town. The policies are explained within the NDP as necessary for strengthening and revitalising shopping, and to consolidate the visitor and tourist economy. In particular Policies TC 5-8 are described as ‘Environmental Improvement Areas’ which define the expectations for targeted improvements to the public realm. The desire for the improvements to the appearance and ambiance of these areas was identified through the NDP public consultation process. The ‘do nothing’ scenario would not.

SEA Objectives 1 and 2 call for the historic environment and the landscape and townscape to be ‘protected, enhanced and managed’. There is the potential that without the policies there would be a continuation of the trend identified in the NDP of ‘erosion of character’ of identified areas by poorer quality public realm and vacant areas in need of investment. The ‘do nothing’ approach would potentially see a continuation of this downward trend.

It is expected that the Town Centre policies will have a positive effect on the economy through providing direction for investment into these areas.

TC9-12 Town centre

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land	Biod	Flood	Clim	Clim	Resrc	Poll	Was	Tran	Rura	Cou	Hou	Heal	Econ
or	s	iv	d	te	te	ce	n	te	sp	I	ntr	se	th	
+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-

The NDP promotes an increase in the number of homes in the town centre (linked to Policy H3), Promoting a cultural and Learning Quarter, Promoting new conference facilities in the Town Centre and Shop Fronts.

The NDP suggests appropriate locations for facilities that the Core Strategy puts forward, such as for conference facilities in the town, as set out in Policies AS.1 and policies SUA.1-4 of the Core strategy.

BE1 – 10 Built Environment and design

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/-	0	-	0	+/-	0

The NDP policies relating to the built environment and design aim to create a strong sense of place respond to local character and set polies and standards to achieve this, such as BREEAM or Lifetime Homes Standards. Policies BE3 and BE4 set the expectations for master planning and design review panels.

The NPPF and Local Plan calls for consideration of ‘Local Distinctiveness’ and without these NDP policies on design, there may be a less coherent and consistent interpretation of what a suitable design of development would be. A business as usual approach would rely on the expression of design concerns to be relayed in pre-application advice, or in community consultation on proposals. The business as usual approach would remove some standards for local design quality and this may have negative consequences for the sensitive historic environment. In particular, non-designated features comprise a significant aspect of heritage which is often experienced on a daily basis by many people – whether at home, work or leisure. Whilst not listed, many buildings and other neighbourhood features are of historic interest.

The NDP seeks to front load design aspects within the planning application process and by promoting Masterplanning (BE3), Design Review Panels (BE4), Supplementary Planning Guidance (BE9) and a raft of SEA objectives such as minimizing climate change. Improving community safety and well-being and protecting character are addressed simultaneously within the design policies.

The business as usual approach may possibly see designs of lower quality come forward, as demonstrated by the explanation in the NDP at 8.16 which describes the current situation as one in which ‘many recent developments have overlooked the wider context and how they integrate with neighboring developments ... additional traffic leading to increased congestion, lack of provision of local public open space and public meeting rooms’.

BE12-14 Regeneration

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Histor	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+/-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/-	0	0

These policies encourage dwelling replacement, conversion, and empty home use to promote regeneration and area improvements. The business as usual approach would rely on Local and National planning policy to bring forward these sites. The NDP policies do not allocate development on any such sites and therefore are only policies which seek to encourage activity. The ‘business as usual’ approach may see such plots left in current state, and see housing delivery through new builds without regenerating existing areas or stock. This may lead to a negative impact on existing areas in need of investment.

NE1-4 Natural Environment

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

In Policy NE1 Local Nature Reserves are designated to protect the habitats and to give them a statutory protection. The Business as usual alternative would mean that these sites are not designated as Local Nature Reserves and not afforded statutory protection. There is the potential for loss of biodiversity in the area without this NDP policy.

NE 2 River Avon Biodiversity Corridor is protected by Core Strategy Policy CS.7 Green Infrastructure so it is not expected that there would be a negative impact in the 'business as usual' scenario. NE4 protects the SSSI at the Race Course Meadow. This is protected under National Policy and business as usual approach will continue to protect this asset.

The NDP Project to produce a Biodiversity Action Plan would seek to reduce the decline in local biodiversity. This document has not yet been produced however this policy aims to stem the decline in biodiversity. The business as usual approach would potentially see the continuation of biodiversity decline.

INF1-5 Infrastructure

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/-	0	0	0	+/-	0

The policies seek to ensure that education health care and road infrastructure are not compromised through the rising demand as a result of new development or change in population. The NDP identifies ‘south of the river’ as a preferred location for education and health facilities.

The Core Strategy has limited policy direction on the provision and locations of further health and education infrastructure. The business as usual option would see the growth of housing and an associated growth in population, and the effects on health care services and education facilities would be uncertain.

The former Honeybourne Line rail link looks to safeguard land for future potential line reopening. The do nothing option would have uncertain effects on public transport options as this policy aims for safeguarding for potential growth outside of the plan period.

CLW1 – 9 Community Leisure and Wellbeing

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	+/-	+/-	0	+/-	+/-	0	0	0	+/-	0	+/-	0	+/-	0

The Community Leisure and Wellbeing policies in the NDP place a strong emphasis on how to develop Stratford-upon-Avon as a good place to be a resident and to create a healthy community. A number of aspects are addressed around community facilities, local green spaces, spaces for recreation and play, allotments, pollution reduction and renewable energy matters. The NDP encourages development schemes to provide these aspects in some cases referring to CIL provision to deliver this community infrastructure. The ‘business as usual’ approach may mean that these community priorities would remain unidentified and resolved through the S106 / CIL process.

SSB 1-3 Site briefs

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+/-	0

Site briefs are provided with a number of requirements for their delivery. These are tied to the provision of a master plan and with reference to future design guidance that the design review panel that looks to be established as part of the NDP. Many of the requirements of the Site Briefs are also contained as policies within the NDP, however these are tied to locations in the Site Briefs. The site briefs place a particular emphasis on improving pedestrian and cycle access and providing outdoor amenity space and a safe environment. The ‘do nothing’ approach would expect to see development come forward in line with other policies contained within the plan such as providing a masterplan, which may affect the delivery of some of the objectives of the site briefs.

TC Projects 1-9 / INF Project 1-9 / NE Project 1 / CLW Project 1-2

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Hist or	Land s	Biod iv	Flood	Clim te cont rb	Clim te plan	Resr ce	Poll n	Was te	Tran sp	Rura l Barri er	Cou ntr	Hou se	Heal th	Econ
0	-	+/-	0	-	-	0	-	0	-	0	0	0	-	-

These projects are designed to support and maximise other policies within the NDP. It is acknowledged within the NDP that these are considered to be different from land use policies, and as such will not form part of the development management process. Rather they are matters that the Town Council will commit to undertake.

TC Projects 1-4 establish a Town Centre Strategic Partnership, create 2 environmental improvement areas and provide guidance on shop frontages. Under a 'do nothing' scenario, it is expected that the pedestrian and cyclist environment wouldn't benefit from the proposed improvements within the projects and the overall street scene wouldn't benefit from the projects enhance the appearance of the streets.

TC Projects 5-9 deal with improving access and movement within the Town Centre and seek to reduce the district's contribution to climate change by promoting walking and cycling, and reducing congestion. INF Projects 1-9 provide for a range of improvements to the local transport infrastructure, including initiatives to manage traffic and car parking, improve pedestrian and cycle routes and improve public transport.

The do nothing alternative would see a continuation of the base line trends and issues within the town centre. The consultation in the NDP showed that congestion and the capacities of the town centre roads to cope with vehicles was considered to be poor. Coupled with the additional growth and development expected for the town centre and the wider neighbourhood area it is expected that a business as usual approach to access and movement in the town centre would lead to an exacerbation of transport issues without projects and management plans to improve more sustainable travel options.



© Lepus Consulting Ltd

1 Bath Street Cheltenham GL50 1YE

T: 01242 525222

E: enquiries@lepusconsulting.com

www.lepusconsulting.com

CHELTENHAM



Lepus Consulting
1 Bath Street
Cheltenham
Gloucestershire GL50 1YE

t: 01242 525222
w: www.lepusconsulting.com
e: enquiries@lepusconsulting.com