

## Stratford on Avon Site Allocations Plan (SAP): SA Report

### Appendix VIIa: Strategic Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of Scenarios X & Y for the Numbers for Housing Reserve Sites

| Categories of Significance   |                |  |
|--|----------------|--|
| Symbol   | Meaning        | Sustainability Effect  |
| ++   | Major Positive | Proposed development would resolve existing sustainability problem                                       |
| +  | Minor Positive | No sustainability constraints and proposed development acceptable in principle                           |
| 0  | Neutral        | Neutral effect   |
| ?  | Uncertain      | Uncertain or Unknown Effects   |
| -  | Minor Negative | Likely sustainability issues: mitigation and/or negotiation possible                                     |
| --   | Major Negative | Problematical because of known sustainability issues; mitigation likely to be difficult and/or expensive |
| N/A  | Not Applicable | Used where SA Objectives are no longer applicable  |
| <p>Note 1: SA Objectives 7 (Minerals &amp; Agricultural Land) and 8 (Air quality &amp; Water Quality) are split into 2 columns, with the specific topic for each column outlined in the Objective heading.</p>   |                |  |
| <p>Note 2: SA Objective 13 (Housing) divided into two objectives to reflect the particular issue identified as the SAP has developed for delivery of affordable housing in the district area:<br/>13A (overall potential housing capacity) &amp; retaining thresholds of significance &gt;50 dwellings major positive &amp; &lt;50 dwellings minor positive<br/>13B (potential affordable housing numbers) with thresholds identified for &gt;18 dwellings major positive (approximates to 35% of 50 dwellings cf CS Policy CS.18) &amp; &lt;18 dwellings minor positive; the absence of any affordable housing is considered to be a minor negative as it represents the loss of opportunities to deliver affordable housing &amp; this is significant with regard to this plan</p> |                |  |
| <p>Note 3: For certain SA Objectives – No1 Heritage, No 2 Landscape &amp; No 3 Housing - both positive &amp; negative effects are likely depending upon those categories of settlements that are excluded. This is explained in the commentary text, shown with symbols &amp; coloured in split cells according to the most likely predominant effect predicted initially for the settlements excluded &amp; secondly for the other settlements that development would be apportioned amongst.</p>   |                |  |

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <b>Scenario X</b> | 2,920 dwellings on reserve sites<br>Calculated as 20% of the total housing requirement to 2031 as set out in the adopted Core Strategy Policy CS.16 Housing Development |
| <b>Scenario Y</b> | 2,352 dwellings on reserve sites<br>Calculated as 20% of Local Housing Need (LHN) as identified through the LHN Standard Methodology                                    |

|   | <b>SAP Scenarios for Identifying Housing Numbers for Reserve Sites</b>   | <b>X</b>               | <b>Y</b>               |
|---|--|------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>SA Objective</b>   | <p><b>Assessment of Effects:</b></p> <p><b>Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty</b></p>  | <b>2,920 dwellings</b> | <b>2,352 dwellings</b> |
| <p><b>1 Heritage</b><br/>To conserve designated &amp; non-designated heritage assets &amp; their surroundings</p> | <p>Core Strategy Policy CS.8 Historic Environment provides protection and seeks enhancement for heritage assets &amp; their settings, including archaeological heritage, supported by the CS Area Strategies (AS.1-AS.11) that provide more specific spatial guidance with Principles that address any specific considerations for the historic environment of each AS. Further protection &amp; enhancement is provided through design guidance, for example, through Conservation Area management plans. Where proposals are likely to affect a historic asset, proportionate historic impact assessments are required by CS.8 such that at least insignificant/neutral effects should be secured through appropriate site-specific mitigation measures. Cumulative effects are not specifically referred to in Policy CS.8, nor in the ASs – although particular historic assets/areas for protection are stated.</p> <p>It may be assumed that policies should provide mitigation measures to minimise any likely negative effects on the historic environment to insignificant/neutral effects – but this may be less certain for the higher quantum of development proposed in Scenario X.</p> | <b>0?</b>              | <b>0</b>               |

|  |   |   |    |
|--|---|---|----|
| <p><b>2 Landscape</b><br/>To protect, enhance &amp; manage the character &amp; appearance of the landscape &amp; townscape</p> | <p>Core Strategy Policy CS.5 seeks to minimise &amp; mitigate impacts on the landscape, and where possible, incorporate measures to enhance the landscape. The cumulative impact of development proposals on the quality of the landscape will be taken into account. Policy CS.9 on design and distinctiveness seeks to ensure that development respects local distinctiveness; it sets out the factors that contribute to high quality design. Policy CS.12 Special Landscape Areas protects high quality landscape, including historic/cultural features, with cumulative impacts being taken into account. Further guidance is provided through the Council's Design Guide (2018).</p> <p>It is likely that proposed development overall will have cumulative minor negative effects on the rural landscapes &amp; historic townscapes that characterise the District.</p> <p>It is assumed that the lower quantum of proposed development in Scenario Y would have reduced effects indicating some uncertainty to the significance, as it comprises some 80% of the housing numbers of Scenario X.</p> | - | -? |
| <p><b>3 Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity</b><br/>To protect, enhance &amp; manage</p>   | <p>Core Strategy Policy CS.6 Natural Environment expects development proposals to minimise impacts on biodiversity &amp; where possible to secure a net gain; it includes specific guidance on adverse effects on Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs), so there should be adequate mitigation through policy – and therefore, overall neutral effects. However, the revised NPPF (2019<sup>1</sup>) is stronger than the previous NPPF with regard to requirements and para 170 (d) requires plans to minimise impacts on biodiversity &amp; to provide net gains. In general, currently, brownfield land may be rich in biodiversity whilst greenfield land may be limited in biodiversity.</p> <p>The new commitment from national planning policy that all new development should provide net gains indicates that both scenarios could have likely positive effects.</p>  | + | +  |
| <p><b>4 Flooding</b></p>   | <p>National policy &amp; Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment &amp; Flood Risk provide strong mitigation to ensure that there will be no significant adverse effects from development on flood risk. The SHLAA &amp; sites assessment process exclude site options that are within a flood zone of high risk.</p> <p>Both scenarios are likely to have neutral effects due to strong policy requirements.</p>  | 0 | 0  |

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

|   |  |    |  |    |  |
|---|--|----|--|----|--|
| <p><b>5 Traffic</b><br/>Minimise contribution to climate change</p>                               | <p>The Core Strategy recognised that the level and distribution of development growth would exacerbate traffic congestion in Stratford and suggested a package of town centre initiatives as mitigation for cumulative impacts to be funded through CIL – as set out in Policy CS.26. The Core Strategy also noted high traffic volumes adversely affecting settlements along the A435, particularly north of Alcester. The A46 is a key strategic route through the District &amp; the 2 safeguarded sites at junctions will help to mitigate congestion in the longer term.</p> <p>Highway capacity is one factor in the SHLAA process, identifying constraints that would exclude an individual site progressing – reducing the likelihood of significant negative effects. Thus, potentially significant negative effects are avoided through the SHLAA testing process that will minimise effect to insignificant for individual sites. Overall, cumulative effects may arise for certain settlements and/or the District as a whole – these will be mitigated somewhat by the lower quantum of proposed development in Scenario Y, thus leaving some uncertainty of comparative insignificance for Scenario X.</p> | 0? |  | 0  |  |
| <p><b>6 Green Infrastructure</b><br/>Plan for climate change</p>                                  | <p>Core Strategy CS.7 Green Infrastructure requires that the existing GI in the District will be promoted through the principles of protection, enhancement, restoration and creation. CS.7 clearly recognises the multifunctionality of GI including for a low carbon economy &amp; human health/well-being. Development proposals must demonstrate how they contribute to the GI network – and including neighbouring authority areas thus clearly recognising also that GI &amp; ecosystems extend beyond administrative boundaries.</p> <p>It may be assumed that both scenarios could provide minor positive effects for green infrastructure but with some uncertainty of comparative significance for Scenario Y due to the lower quantum of development, some 80% of that proposed for Scenario X.</p>   | +  |  | +? |  |
| <p><b>7<sup>2</sup> Minerals; Agriculture</b><br/>To protect &amp; conserve natural resources</p> | <p>All proposals must comply with the Core Strategy &amp; the Minerals Local Plan<sup>3</sup>. It is assumed that land safeguarded for minerals could be avoided or minimised for all sites &amp; thus for both scenarios – indicating neutral/insignificant effects.</p> <p>As to be expected in a rural area such as Stratford District, there are limited opportunities available to develop brownfield sites and there is good quality agricultural land with</p>  | 0  |  | 0? |  |
|   |  |    |  |    |  |

<sup>2</sup> Please note that first cell refers to minerals & second cell to agricultural land

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/environment/planning/policy/mineralslocalplan/mineralsLocalPlan.aspx>

|  |   |    |   |   |   |
|--|---|----|---|---|---|
|  | <p>concentrations of Grade 2 BMVL<sup>4</sup> to the south and east of Stratford-Upon-Avon and surrounding Bidford-on-Avon &amp; Wellesbourne, as well as to the south-east of the district bordering Oxfordshire. Loss of BMVL is permanent and irreversible – and the Core Strategy seeks to redevelop previously used land, where possible, &amp; minimise loss of BMVL with guidance provided in the Area Strategies (AS.1-AS.11).</p> <p>It is assumed that identification/selection of sites could avoid BMVL with likely insignificant/neutral effects but that this would be less certain for the higher quantum of development proposed in Scenario X at some 20% more housing.</p>  |    |   |   |   |
| <p><b>8 Air Quality (AQ);<br/>Water Quality (WQ)</b><br/>To reduce pollution</p> | <p>The district has very good air quality; however, there are issues in Studley and Stratford-upon-Avon. Both have AQMA zones due to levels of NO<sub>2</sub> exceeding the annual mean. Transport is the highest emitting sector for air pollution in the district. Core Strategy Policy AS.1 requires new development to apply measures relating to the AQMA for the town; similarly, CS Policy AS.8 for Studley &amp; CS Policy CS.26 provides further guidance. Overall, air quality likely to be neutral but depends on precise scale &amp; location. Some concern for cumulative effects in Stratford. It may be more difficult to avoid/limit cumulative effects for the higher quantum of development in Scenario X, and therefore some uncertainty for neutral effects.</p> <p><b>Water Quality:</b> Severn Trent Water is the main supplier of water in the district, with a small amount supplied by South Staffordshire Water Plc, and water resources in the area are under 'moderate stress' with some areas under 'serious stress – and there are predicted supply-demand deficits. The chemical water quality in the district is generally favourable. Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment requires all proposals to take into account the predicted impact of climate change, the sustainable use of water, protection &amp; improvement of water quality. Therefore, overall, for each scenario, potential for neutral effects.</p> | 0? | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <p><b>9 Waste</b></p>  | <p>It was determined at the revised SA scoping for the SAP that all new development has the potential for neutral effects on waste.</p>   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <p><b>10 Accessibility &amp; Transport</b></p>                                   | <p>Core Strategy CS.2 Climate change &amp; Sustainable Construction requires that new development should be located in a manner that minimises the need to travel &amp; encourages sustainable transport such as cycling &amp; walking. Further guidance on sustainable transport is provided</p>   | 0? | 0 | 0 | 0 |

<sup>4</sup> Best and most versatile land (BMVL grades 1-3a)

|   |  |    |    |
|---|--|----|----|
| Increase sustainable transport & reduce need to travel                    | through the Area Strategies AS.1 – AS.11, including the inter-relationships with other factors such as green infrastructure & health/well-being.<br><br>It may be more difficult to avoid/limit cumulative effects for the higher quantum of development in Scenario X, and therefore some uncertainty for neutral effects.  |    |    |
| <b>11 Rural Communities</b><br>To reduce barriers                         | Whilst it is assumed that any proposal for development can make appropriate & timely provision for supporting infrastructure in line with the Core Strategy & meet requirements for affordable housing (AH) as set out in CS.18 & the Position Statement (September 2019) <sup>5</sup> , there may be significant potential cumulative effects for the rural areas.<br><br>It is assumed that the higher quantum of development in Scenario X would be more able to provide for the rural areas than the lower quantum proposed in Scenario Y, and thus some uncertainty for the latter with positive effects. | +  | +? |
|   |  |    |    |
| <b>12 Settlement Identity</b><br>To protect character & separate identity | Core Strategy Area Strategies SA.1-AS.11 provide guidance to protect the character & identity of key settlements.<br><br>It may be more difficult to avoid/limit cumulative effects for the higher quantum of development in Scenario X, and therefore some uncertainty for neutral effects.   | 0? | 0  |
|   |  |    |    |
| <b>13A Housing – overall capacity</b>                                     | Both scenarios have the potential for major positive effects through delivery of environmentally sound & good quality housing in accordance with the Core Strategy Policies CS.15 & CS.16.   | ++ | ++ |
| <b>13B Housing – affordable</b>   | Core Strategy Policy CS.18 Affordable Housing sets out how all new residential development is required to contribute to the provision of affordable housing (AH) in accordance with specified thresholds & taking into account the distributional strategy set out in Policy CS.15 that addresses the likelihood of smaller sites coming forward & depletion of stock of AH especially in the rural locations.   | ++ | +  |
|   |  |    |    |

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.stratford.gov.uk/doc/208689/name/CS18%20AH%20Position%20Statement%20Sept%2019%20.pdf>

|                                    |   |   |    |
|------------------------------------|---|---|----|
|                                    | It may be more difficult to achieve the overall objectives for affordable housing with the lower quantum of development in Scenario Y, and therefore significance of positive effects is reduced.   |   |    |
| <b>14 Community &amp; Health</b>   | It was determined at the revised SA scoping for the SAP that any proposal for new development can make appropriate & timely provision for necessary supporting infrastructure, or contributions towards it - Core Strategy Policy CS.16 Housing & CS.27 Developer Contributions. All sites have the potential for long term positive effects on health through provision of good quality housing and this will be cumulative. | + | +  |
| <b>15 Economy &amp; Employment</b> | The scenarios investigated are to inform the development of a strategy for reserve housing and therefore neutral effects are indicated - although it is acknowledged that provision of good quality housing will have positive effects towards sustaining the local economy & employment.   | + | +? |
|                                    | It may be more difficult to achieve these accompanying benefits for the local economies with the lower quantum of proposed development, indicating some uncertainty for the overall significance of effects.  |   |    |

**Appendix VIIb:**

**SA of Scenarios A-H to develop a strategy for identifying reserve sites and including Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA), where possible**

| <b>Categories of Significance</b>  |                |  |
|--|----------------|--|
| <b>Symbol</b>  | <b>Meaning</b> | <b>Sustainability Effect</b>   |
| <b>++</b>  | Major Positive | Proposed development would resolve existing sustainability problem                                       |
| <b>+</b>   | Minor Positive | No sustainability constraints and proposed development acceptable in principle                           |
| <b>0</b>   | Neutral        | Neutral effect   |
| <b>?</b>   | Uncertain      | Uncertain or Unknown Effects   |
| <b>-</b>   | Minor Negative | Likely sustainability issues: mitigation and/or negotiation possible                                     |
| <b>--</b>  | Major Negative | Problematical because of known sustainability issues; mitigation likely to be difficult and/or expensive |
| N/A  | Not Applicable | Used where SA Objectives are no longer applicable  |
| <p>Note 1: SA Objectives 7 (Minerals &amp; Agricultural Land) and 8 (Air quality &amp; Water Quality) are split into 2 columns, with the specific topic for each column outlined in the Objective heading.</p>   |                |  |
| <p>Note 2: SA Objective 13 (Housing) divided into two objectives to reflect the particular issue identified as the SAP has developed for delivery of affordable housing in the district area:<br/>13A (overall potential housing capacity) &amp; retaining thresholds of significance &gt;50 dwellings major positive &amp; &lt;50 dwellings minor positive<br/>13B (potential affordable housing numbers) with thresholds identified for &gt;18 dwellings major positive (approximates to 35% of 50 dwellings of CS Policy CS.18) &amp; &lt;18 dwellings minor positive; the absence of any affordable housing is considered to be a minor negative as it represents the loss of opportunities to deliver affordable housing &amp; this is significant with regard to this plan</p> |                |  |
| <p>Note 3: For certain SA Objectives – No1 Heritage, No 2 Landscape &amp; No 3 Housing - both positive &amp; negative effects are likely depending upon those categories of settlements that are excluded. This is explained in the commentary text, shown with symbols &amp; coloured in split cells according to the most likely predominant effect predicted initially for the settlements excluded &amp; secondly for the other settlements that development would be apportioned amongst.</p>   |                |  |



## Base Scenario

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Base Scenario<sup>6</sup></b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>South of Alcester Road, Stratford</b></li> <li>■ <b>Land at Rother Street/Grove Street, Stratford</b></li> <li>■ <b>Gateway Quarter, Stratford</b></li> <li>■ <b>Land at Stratford-upon-Avon College, Alcester Road, Stratford</b></li> <li>■ <b>Atherstone Airfield</b></li> <li>■ <b>Land east of Shipston Road, Stratford</b></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Bidford Centre, Bidford-on-Avon</b></li> <li>■ <b>Land at High Street, Studley</b></li> <li>■ <b>Studley Enterprise Centre</b></li> <li>■ <b>Land at Napton Brickworks</b></li> <li>■ <b>University of Warwick, Wellesbourne Campus</b></li> <li>■ <b>Quinton Rail Technology Centre</b></li> <li>■ <b>A46 Safeguarding sites – A422 Wildmoor, A3400 Bishopston</b></li> <li>■ <b>Former Long Marston Depot Phase 5<sup>7</sup></b></li> <li>■ <b>Long Marston Airfield Phase 1b<sup>8</sup></b></li> <li>■ <b>Employment Enabling Sites Policy</b></li> </ul> |
|---|---|--|

<sup>6</sup> Please note that each of the emerging draft policies and proposals was subject to individual SA and reported in the SA Reports (December 2017 & February 2019); the initial cumulative or composite assessment was undertaken in May 2019 with the other Site Proposals & Policies still at an early draft stage. Details were provided in Appendices IV & IX of SA Report (June 2019) and subject to public consultation alongside the draft SAP (July 2019). Amendments were made to the Base Scenario in May 2020 to reflect the changes to the emerging draft SAP, including SA testing of the 3 significant changes (Land east of Shipston Road, former Long Marston Depot & the Long Marston Airfield) & the SA was updated (please see SA Appendix IV).

<sup>7</sup> Previously included as a potential reserve site (LMD.A) – part of a wider large rural brownfield site identified under CS Policy AS.11.

<sup>8</sup> New site for the SAP but part of CS Proposal LMA for new settlement of 3,500 homes. Phase 1 for 400 homes & local centre has consent & construction has just commenced; recent transport modelling suggests that 400 plus around 550 could be built before a relief road is required.

| SAP Base Scenario (All Other Site Proposals & Policies)  |   |                                    |
|--|---|------------------------------------|
| SA Objective   | Assessment of Effects:<br><br>Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative and synergistic); Uncertainty  | Known suitable & deliverable Sites |
| <b>1 Heritage</b><br>To conserve designated & non-designated heritage assets & their surroundings          | Most of the sites were found in the initial SAs to be neutral with regard to heritage assets & settings. Minor negative effects were identified for Rother St/Grove St and Gateway Quarter sites in Stratford. These two sites are in the town centre and there are heritage assets within, adjacent and nearby <sup>9</sup> . The extent of effects and the possibilities for mitigation are not known precisely at this stage but Core Strategy Policy CS.8 provides protection and seeks enhancement for the historic and cultural resource; proportionate historic impact assessments are required such that at least neutral effects should be secured. Cumulative effects are not specifically referred to in the CS Policy and as these 2 sites are nearby to each other, it may be useful to consider site specific requirements in any allocations to address such inter-relationships.<br>Potential major negative effects were indicated for safeguarding the A46 at Marraway with regard to the setting of the Grade II listed farm buildings and therefore, site specific requirements for mitigation will need to be considered –however, this site has not been included within the draft SAP in 2020, thus removing earlier concerns. | 0                                  |
| <b>2 Landscape</b><br>To protect, enhance & manage the character & appearance of the landscape & townscape | 7 of the 15 sites in this scenario were found to have likely positive effects on landscape/townscape objectives. 3 sites are located in medium/high landscape sensitivity with the potential for minor negative effects; 2 are on the outskirts of Stratford to the east and south whilst Atherstone Airfield is some 6km further to the south. One site at Napton Brickworks was considered to be in high/medium sensitivity with potential major negative effects due to the slope/orientation of the land. Another site – Former Long Marston Depot – was found to have potential minor negative effects due to changes in landscape character including views from the Cotswolds AONB.<br>The Built-Up Area Boundaries policy contributes to maintaining settlement identities including that provided through landscape character - with at least neutral effects.   | +                                  |

<sup>9</sup> <https://magic.defra.gov.uk/MagicMap.aspx>

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  | <p>Core Strategy Policy CS.5 seeks to minimise &amp; mitigate adverse impacts, and CS.9 on design seeks to ensure that development respects local distinctiveness. These 2 policies should ensure that these sites could approach neutral effects; further studies and site-specific requirements will need to be considered for mitigation measures at the Napton site &amp; the Former Long Marston Depot site. Uncertainty of effects were found by the SA for the A46 safeguarding site at Bishopton due to its' location within the Arden Special Landscape Area; further studies will be needed in due course and include possibilities for mitigation through design and screening of the roundabouts/access roads.</p> <p>The sites are dispersed across the district, and with mitigation, no significant negative effects are indicated individually - overall minor positive effects.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>3 Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity</b><br/>To protect, enhance and manage</p> | <p>8 of the 15 sites were found to have neutral effects and 2 to have minor positive; minor negative effects were indicated for the site at Napton Brickworks and the two A46 safeguarding sites due to potential loss of Deciduous Woodland Priority Habitat. Core Strategy Policy CS.6 requires protection and enhancement of biodiversity, with the mitigation hierarchy to be applied to adverse effects and allows for offsetting such that there should be adequate mitigation to ensure residual effects to at least neutral.</p> <p>However, in consideration of the net gains sought by the revised NPPF, it is suggested that site-specific requirements should be prepared for these 3 sites if progressed. Overall, at least neutral for this objective &amp; some minor positive effects but with some uncertainty at this stage as depends upon details of site-specific mitigation measures &amp; biodiversity gain.</p>  | <p style="text-align: center; background-color: #92d050;">+?</p>              |
| <p><b>4 Flooding</b><br/>To reduce risk of flooding</p>                            | <p>All sites were found to be neutral or minor positive for flood risk; overall neutral.</p>   | <p style="text-align: center; background-color: #2e5496; color: white;">0</p> |
| <p><b>5 Traffic</b><br/>To minimise climate change</p>                             | <p>The 2 sites for safeguarding A46 at roundabouts to the west &amp; north of SUA were found to have major positive effects since these proposals will reduce congestion in areas that have existing sustainability problems; reduced congestion will have positive effects for reducing emissions (air quality addressed in SA No 8) that contribute to climate change.</p> <p>6 of the other sites were found to be neutral &amp; 2 minor positive. Potential minor negative effects identified for Quinton Rail Technology Centre (located in Vale of Evesham Control Zone), and the 2 sites in Studley with known congestion problems. It is suggested that site-specific requirements should be considered for these 3 sites to investigate mitigation possibilities; also potential for cumulative effects for the 2 sites in Studley – however, these are redevelopments so further studies may not be needed. Potential minor negative effects for the site at the Former Long Marston Depot, particularly for cumulative effects given the constraints of the highway network south of SUA. However, it is considered that a modest scale of development could be accommodated – with neutral effects.</p> <p>There is the potential for synergistic effects that could be positive with SA Nos 8 &amp; 10. Overall, neutral to positive effects indicated.</p> | <p style="text-align: center; background-color: #92d050;">+</p>               |

|   |  |     |     |
|---|--|-----|-----|
| <b>6 Green Infrastructure</b>   | <p>11 of the 15 sites were found by the initial SAs as likely to have minor positive effects; the other 4 sites were found to be neutral. Therefore, overall likely minor positive effects as there will be no loss of public open space or green infrastructure with its role in climate change adaptation.</p>   | +   |     |
| <b>7 Minerals; Agriculture</b><br>To protect & conserve natural resources | <p>12 of the 15 sites were found to have neutral effects since they are not within or adjacent to land that is allocated or safeguarded for minerals. 2 sites are within areas safeguarded as Mineral Consultation Zone - (Atherstone Airfield &amp; East of Shipston Road Stratford) are at least some 6km distance from each other and therefore unlikely for any cumulative effects on minerals safeguarding. Overall, neutral effects indicated. 8 of the 15 sites were found to be positive for soils/agricultural land quality as these sites are on brownfield (major positive) or less than the best &amp; most versatile land (BMVL grades 1-3a) (minor positive). 4 of the sites are minor negative (partly within BMVL 1-3a) and 1 site (East of Shipston Rd Stratford) is major negative being entirely within BMVL. Such loss of BMVL will be permanent and irreversible; however, if taken forward, these sites are a small proportion of the proposed land for development and significant cumulative effects are not likely on good quality agricultural land. Nonetheless, and as with all development, there will be some permanent loss of the soils resource that is important for ecosystem functioning. Therefore, both positive and negative effects overall.</p>   | 0   | +/- |
| <b>8 Air Quality; Water Quality</b><br>To reduce air & water pollution    | <p>Air quality (AQ): 6 sites were found to have minor positive effects for air quality through improving traffic and reducing congestion with associated emission of pollutants. 3 sites were found to be neutral. 3 sites minor negative (AQMA in Studley &amp; Stratford) and uncertainty for one site (South of Alcester Rd Stratford and the AQMA covering the town). These negative effects could be reduced through promoting more sustainable transport – and see SA No 10. It is suggested that site specific requirements could be considered for the sites in Studley to help mitigate for cumulative effects. Overall, neutral to minor positive.<br/>Water quality (WQ): 5 sites neutral; 5 potential minor negative effects due to location in groundwater vulnerability zone – Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Environment and Flood Risk encourages sustainable drainage systems to also improve WQ, not affect ability to water to meet objectives in the Severn RBMP, and development must avoid pollution to water. Thus, mitigation measures through CS policy will ensure that new development will not result in any negative effects on WQ. The proposed sites in this scenario are dispersed through the area of the district such that cumulative effects on WWTW capacities are unlikely. Overall, neutral effects.</p> | 0/+ | 0   |
| <b>9 Waste</b><br>To reduce waste & promote waste hierarchy               | <p>All sites have the potential for neutral effects through development management policies in the Core Strategy and the Warwickshire Waste Local Plan.</p>  | 0   |     |
| <b>10 Accessibility &amp; Transport</b><br>To increase sustainable        | <p>8 of the 15 sites were found by the SA to have likely positive effects, with major positive effects indicated for the Gateway Quarter and the Rother/Grove Street sites due to their location in the centre of Stratford upon Avon with good access to services/facilities and walking/public transport. The other 7 sites were found to have potential negative effects that could be major for Atherstone Airfield, the Quinton Rail Technology Centre, the</p>   | +/? |     |

|  |  |           |
|--|--|-----------|
| <p>transport &amp; reduce need to travel</p>   | <p>Former Long Marston Airfield &amp; the Long Marston Airfield. The Atherstone Airfield site might increase traffic within the Stratford AQMA; however, it has been proposed as a site to relocate existing employment development from within the centre of Stratford-upon-Avon. Therefore, there is the potential for the site to reduce traffic within the AQMA, with a potential minor positive effect on air quality, but with some uncertainty. The Quinton Rail site is not close to services/facilities and the nearest bus-stop is more than 400m from the site. However, additional employment development could encourage sustainable transport and thus provide some mitigation. The Long Marston sites are similar, and some traffic from these sites will go through the town with likely adverse effects for traffic &amp; emissions.</p> <p>Minor negative effects for South of Alcester Rd Stratford, Napton Brickworks, &amp; Wellesbourne Campus due to distance from services/facilities and bus/sustainable transport. There may be opportunities to provide site-specific requirements to help mitigate effect.</p> <p>Overall, minor positive and potentially neutral effects – depending upon extent of mitigation possibilities.</p> |           |
| <p><b>11 Rural Communities</b><br/>To reduce barriers to those living in rural areas</p>                     | <p>The Base Scenario comprises larger sites that are mostly in Stratford-upon-Avon; however, others are dispersed throughout the District &amp; new development, including the safeguarding of sites for the A46, will contribute to provision of services, facilities &amp; employment land that will support some of the rural areas. Therefore, overall, likely neutral to minor positive effects but with some uncertainty at this stage.</p>  | <p>0?</p> |
| <p><b>12 Settlement Identity</b><br/>To protect the integrity of the district's countryside</p>              | <p>11 of the 15 sites were found by the SA to have likely positive effects – major for Priory Square, Studley and the Gateway/Cultural Quarter in Stratford due to their central locations. Uncertainty of effects for the two A46 safeguarding sites – Wildmoor &amp; Bishopton; minor negative effects for South of Alcester Rd Stratford &amp; Napton Brickworks.</p> <p>The Built-Up Area Boundaries contribute to maintaining settlement identities with at least neutral &amp; likely minor positive effects.</p> <p>Overall, effects on identity and protection of the integrity of the countryside are likely to be mostly positive – sites have been selected to avoid constraints and seek opportunities; they are not concentrated in any one area that might compromise the capacity of settlements to absorb development growth.</p>  | <p>+</p>  |
| <p><b>13 Housing</b><br/>To provide affordable, environmentally sound &amp; good quality housing for all</p> | <p>The initial SA findings reflect the proposed uses of the sites – those for housing were found to have positive effects with major positive effects for those with the potential to accommodate more than 50 dwellings; those for employment to have neutral effects, and non-applicable for the 2 sites for the A46 safeguarding. Therefore, overall major positive effects for those sites that promote housing use.</p>   | <p>++</p> |

|   |   |    |
|---|---|----|
| <p><b>14 Community &amp; Health</b><br/>To safeguard &amp; improve community health, safety &amp; wellbeing</p>   | <p>No conflicting land uses have been identified indicating neutral effects. Provision of good quality housing and employment land will both contribute towards health and well-being with positive effects.</p>  | +  |
| <p><b>15 Economy &amp; Employment</b><br/>To develop a dynamic, diverse &amp; knowledge-based economy that excels in innovation</p>   | <p>The initial SA findings reflect the proposed uses of the sites – those for housing were found to have neutral effects &amp; those for employment to have positive effects. Nonetheless, it is appreciated that provision of residential development may help to sustain local economy &amp; employment with further positive effects depending upon scale &amp; location.</p> <p>The 2 sites for A46 safeguarding will reduce congestion and help facilitate access to employment – with positive effects.</p> | ++ |
| <p><b>Likely Cumulative Effects:</b></p> <p>Overall, mostly positive or neutral effects. The proposed housing and employment land will contribute to their sustainability objectives, in particular SA Nos. 13 &amp; 15, with major positive effects that will be cumulative in the longer term.</p> <p>The sites are mostly dispersed through the District, minimising risk to any sensitive receptors, and with the small number and local capacities of the sites, there are no significant negative cumulative effects identified.</p> <p><b>SA Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Consider site specific requirements to ensure that the historic environment and its settings are protected/enhanced for 2 sites if progressed</li> <li>■ Further studies to investigate significance of effects on landscape &amp; mitigation possibilities for A46 safeguarding at Bishopton</li> <li>■ Consider site specific requirements for the Napton Brickworks site and the two A46 safeguarding sites to ensure that there is biodiversity net gain, particularly with regard to deciduous woodland priority habitat</li> <li>■ Further studies and site-specific requirements regarding traffic effects/climate change could be considered for the site at Napton to investigate mitigation possibilities including to encourage/maximise opportunities for provision and use of sustainable transport</li> <li>■ Site specific requirements should be considered for the sites in Studley to help mitigate for cumulative effects on air quality from traffic increases</li> </ul> |   |    |

- Site specific requirements for the Atherstone Airfield site, the Quinton Rail Technology Centre, Former Long Marston Depot & Long Marston Airfield to provide mitigation measures to provide/encourage sustainable transport and reduce the risk of increased traffic in the Stratford AQMA
- Site specific requirements could be considered to encourage sustainable transport at sites: South of Alcester Rd Stratford, Napton Brickworks & Wellesbourne Campus

## SAP Scenarios for Strategy for Identifying Reserve Sites

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Scenario A</b>                      | Do Nothing <sup>10</sup>   |
| <b>Scenario B</b><br>(5,113 dwellings) | Cumulative: Base Scenario and include all Amber Sites  |
| <b>Scenario C</b><br>(2,859 dwellings) | Base Scenario and exclude Amber Sites in Local Service Villages (LSVs) & Large Rural Sites (LRSs): Alderminster, Bishops Itchington, Clifford chambers, Ettington, Fenny Compton, Gaydon, Halford, Hampton Lucy, Harbury, Ilmington, Lighthorne, Long Itchington, Long Marston, Loxley, Mappleborough Green, Moreton Morrell, Napton-on-the-Hill, Newbold-on-Stour, Oxhill, Pillerton Priors, Priors Marston, Quinton, Salford Priors, Stockton, Tiddington, Tredington, Welford-on-Avon |
| <b>Scenario D</b><br>(3,658)           | Base Scenario and exclude Amber Sites with capacity under 30 dwellings   |
| <b>Scenario E</b><br>(2,285)           | Base Scenario and exclude Amber Sites with capacity under 100 dwellings  |
| <b>Scenario F</b><br>(2,421 dwellings) | Base scenario and exclude Amber sites that are in 13 settlements covered by made Neighbourhood Development Plans or Examiner's Report recommends proceed to Referendum:<br>Alcester, Bidford-on-Avon, Ettington, Harbury, Ilmington, Kineton, Long Compton, Long Marston, Loxley, Salford Priors, Shipston-on-Stour, Stratford-upon-Avon (including Tiddington), Welford-on-Avon, Wellesbourne   |
| <b>Scenario G</b><br>(3,833 dwellings) | Base Scenario and exclude Amber sites in LSVs that have exceeded dwelling provision in Policy CS.16 based on all commitments & completions:<br>Alderminster, Bishops Itchington, Ettington, Fenny Compton, Gaydon, Harbury, Long Itchington, Long Marston, Newbold-on-Stour, Oxhill, Salford Priors, Stockton, Welford-on-Avon   |
| <b>Scenario H</b><br>(2,920 dwellings) | Base Scenario plus Amber Sites apportioned according to the % distribution of the Core Strategy requirement – Main Town (965); Main Rural Centres (1,047); New Settlements (0); LSV1 (124); LSV2 (193); LSV3 (124); LSV4 (124); Large Rural Sites (equates to Large Rural Brownfield in the CS) (343); and rural elsewhere (0)   |

<sup>10</sup> The Council is required to plan positively for objectively identified housing and employment land needs, so it could be asserted that the Do Nothing scenario is not a reasonable alternative. Planning Practice Guidance advises that the SA “needs to consider and compare all reasonable alternatives as the plan evolves, including the preferred approach, and assess these against the baseline environmental, economic and social characteristics of the area and the likely situation if the plan were not to be adopted”

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/strategic-environmental-assessment-and-sustainability-appraisal>



| SAP Scenarios for Identifying Strategy for Reserve Sites (including Base Scenario) |  | A          | B               | C                                  | D   | E  | F   | G   | H   |
|--|--|------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
| <b>SA Objective</b>  | <b>Assessment of Effects:</b><br><br>Nature of the likely sustainability effect (including positive/negative, short - medium term (5-10 years)/long term (10 - 20 years plus), permanent/temporary, secondary, cumulative, and synergistic); Uncertainty | Do Nothing | All Amber Sites | Exclude Amber sites in LSVs & LRSs | Exclude Amber Sites with Capacity <30 dwellings | Exclude Amber Sites with Capacity <100 dwellings | Exclude Amber Sites in all settlements with made NDPs | Exclude amber sites in LSVs that have exceeded dwelling provision in Policy | Amber Sites apportioned by % in Core Strategy |
| <b>1 Heritage</b><br>To conserve designated &                                      |  | --?        | --?             | + 0?                               | 0   | 0  | + 0?  | + 0?  | + -?  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>non-designated heritage assets &amp; their surroundings in a manner appropriate to their significance</p> | <p>Core Strategy Policy CS.8 Historic Environment provides protection and seeks enhancement for heritage assets &amp; their settings, including archaeological heritage, supported by the CS Area Strategies (AS.1-AS.11) that provide more specific spatial guidance with Principles that address any specific considerations for the historic environment of each AS. Further protection &amp; enhancement is provided through design &amp; characterisation guidance, for example, through Conservation Area reports. Where proposals are likely to affect a historic asset, proportionate historic impact assessments are required by CS.8 such that at least insignificant/neutral effects should be secured through appropriate site-specific mitigation measures. Cumulative effects are not specifically referred to in Policy CS.8, nor in the ASs – although particular historic assets/areas for protection are stated.</p> <p><b>Scenario A:</b> In this Do Nothing scenario, there would be no positive planning that seeks to minimise adverse effects &amp; maximise beneficial effects. There is the potential for reserve sites to accumulate in certain areas where it could be difficult to manage incremental cumulative adverse effects on the historic environment &amp; its setting. There is the risk that the wider benefits for inter-related social &amp; environmental factors from the historic assets are not appreciated as much as possible. Therefore, potential for major negative cumulative effects – this is dependent upon the precise scale &amp; location of development sites, so uncertainty at this strategic stage of assessment. Effects can be mitigated through developing a positive strategy for identifying reserve sites.</p> <p><b>Scenario B:</b> A strategy that allows all the Amber Sites would provide for dwellings in excess of the objectively identified needs – 5,113 dwellings compared to requirement of around 2,920 homes. Likely major negative cumulative effects due to overall quantum of development but some uncertainty as depends on scale &amp; location.</p> <p><b>Scenario C:</b> The Local Service Villages (LSVs) include a wide range of settlements according to the level of local services available; the scale of housing that is proportionate to each village is set out in Policy CS.16 with categories &amp; thresholds to mitigate potential negative effects. Apportioning reserve sites to higher categories of settlements (Stratford-upon-Avon SUA, the Main Rural Centres) would mitigate potential cumulative negative effects on the historic assets of the LSVs through avoidance (the highest category in the mitigation hierarchy) &amp; with likely minor positive effects for the LSVs. However, SUA &amp; the MRCs contain important historic assets &amp; settings with the risk of cumulative negative effects – mitigation measures may be possible through site-specific requirements &amp; CS Policies should ensure that there are no significant adverse effects. Therefore, overall likely neutral effects but some uncertainty at this stage as depends upon precise scale/location of sites.</p> <p><b>Scenario D &amp; E:</b> Excluding Amber Sites with capacities of &lt;30 or &lt;100 dwellings, is unlikely to affect the overall implications for effects on the historic environment as these depend upon the scale &amp; location of sites for potential cumulative negative effects. Overall, likely neutral effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario F:</b> It is considered that the communities in those settlements with made NDPs have debated &amp; agreed the specific development appropriate for each settlement – and including protection of the historic environment. A strategy that excludes these settlements will further protect heritage from any cumulative adverse effects by avoidance with minor positive effects for the NDPs. Overall likely insignificant-neutral effects for other settlements &amp; the district as a whole but uncertainty at this stage as depends upon precise scale/location of sites apportioned amongst the other categories of settlements.</p> |
|--|---|

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <p><b>Scenario G:</b> Excluding Amber Sites in LSVs that have exceeded dwelling provision in Policy CS.16 based on all commitments &amp; completions indicates that these settlements have accommodated the proportionate amount of new development. A strategy that excludes these settlements will further protect heritage from any cumulative adverse effects by avoidance with minor positive effects for these LSVs. Likely insignificant-neutral effects for other settlements &amp; the district as a whole but uncertainty at this stage as depends upon precise scale/location of sites apportioned amongst the other categories of settlements.</p> <p><b>Scenario H:</b> Apportioning the reserve sites mostly (approximately 81%) within the Main Town of Stratford-upon-Avon (SUA) (965), the Main Rural Centres (MRCs)(1,047) &amp; the Large Rural Sites (343) will reduce the likely adverse effects on the historic environment of the LSVs and the rural areas – with minor positive effects through avoidance. SUA &amp; the MRCs contain importance historic &amp; heritage assets &amp; settings – the quantum of proposed development at 2,920 dwellings could have minor negative cumulative effects for the settlements and/or the district as a whole – this depends upon precise site &amp; location, so some uncertainty at this stage of assessment.</p> |
|--|--|---|

|   |  |            |            |          |           |          |           |          |           |          |                 |          |           |
|---|--|------------|------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------------|----------|-----------|
| <p><b>2 Landscape</b><br/>                 To protect, enhance &amp; manage the</p> |  | <p>--?</p> | <p>--?</p> | <p>+</p> | <p>-?</p> | <p>-</p> | <p>0?</p> | <p>+</p> | <p>-?</p> | <p>+</p> | <p>--<br/>?</p> | <p>+</p> | <p>-?</p> |
|---|--|------------|------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------------|----------|-----------|

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>character &amp; appearance of the landscape &amp; townscape</p> | <p>Core Strategy Policy CS.5 seeks to minimise &amp; mitigate impacts on the landscape, and where possible, incorporate measures to enhance the landscape. The cumulative impact of development proposals on the quality of the landscape will be taken into account. Policy CS.9 on design and distinctiveness seeks to ensure that development respects local distinctiveness; it sets out the factors that contribute to high quality design. Policy CS.11 Cotswolds AONB protects designated landscape. Policy CS.12 Special Landscape Areas protects high quality landscape, including historic/cultural features, with cumulative impacts being taken into account. Further guidance is provided through the Council's Design Guide (2018).</p> <p><b>Scenario A:</b> In this Do Nothing scenario, there would be no positive planning that seeks to minimise adverse effects &amp; maximise beneficial effects. There is the potential for reserve sites to accumulate in certain areas where it could be difficult to manage incremental cumulative adverse effects on landscape/townscape. There is the risk that the wider benefits for inter-related social &amp; environmental factors from the landscape/townscape are not appreciated as much as possible. Therefore, potential for major negative cumulative effects – this is dependent upon the precise scale &amp; location of development sites, so uncertainty at this strategic stage of assessment. Effects can be mitigated through developing a positive strategy for identifying reserve sites.</p> <p><b>Scenario B:</b> A strategy that allows all the Amber Sites would provide for dwellings in excess of the objectively identified needs – 5,113 dwellings compared to requirement of around 2,920 homes. Potential for major negative cumulative effects but uncertainty as depends on scale &amp; location since Amber Sites do include those with medium/high landscape sensitivity.</p> <p>Mitigation measures could comprise excluding those Amber Sites that are in areas of high landscape sensitivity since it would be reasonable to assume that mitigation for major negative effects is likely to be difficult and/or expensive. Mitigation measures could comprise particular consideration of specific settlements where cumulative effects on landscape may be a particular issue through the high proportion of sites with potential major negative effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario C:</b> Apportioning reserve sites to higher categories of settlements (Stratford-upon-Avon SUA, the Main Rural Centres) would mitigate potential cumulative negative effects on the landscape quality of the LSVs through avoidance (the highest category in the mitigation hierarchy) with minor positive effects for the LSVs through avoidance. However, SUA &amp; the MRCs contain important townscapes with the risk of cumulative negative effects – mitigation measures may be possible through site-specific requirements. Potential for cumulative negative effects with uncertainty for SUA &amp; the MRCs.</p> <p><b>Scenario D:</b> Excluding Amber Sites with capacities of &lt;30 dwellings will remove those sites with likely fewer negative effects on landscape &amp; townscape due to scale - indicating potential minor negative effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario E:</b> Similarly, excluding Amber sites with capacities of &lt;100 dwellings will remove those sites that might have less adverse effects on landscape but some uncertainty since it depends on scale &amp; location of sites for potential cumulative negative effects.</p> <p>Whilst focusing on the larger sites of &gt;100 dwellings could indicate a risk of greater potential for negative effects, including cumulative, this depends upon precise scale &amp; location; also, larger development proposals may be able to better accommodate landscape enhancements with multifunctional benefits.</p> |
|--|---|

|   |  |  |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |    |   |
|---|--|--|----|----|---|----|----|---|----|----|---|
|   |  | <p>Mitigation measures could include consideration of avoidance of those sites with high landscape sensitivity and/or accumulation of sites in areas with higher townscape or landscape sensitivities. Mitigation could involve a focus on sites with less capacity – assuming that this would have likely fewer negative effects, particularly with regard to cumulative effects although this does depend on sites &amp; the receiving landscape/townscape.</p> <p><b>Scenario F:</b> It is considered that the communities in those settlements with made NDPs have debated &amp; agreed the specific development appropriate for each settlement – and including protection of landscape and townscape. A strategy that excludes these settlements will further protect landscape from any cumulative adverse effects by avoidance with minor positive effects for the NDPs. Likely minor negative effects for other settlements &amp; district as a whole but uncertainty at this stage as depends upon precise scale/location of sites apportioned amongst the other categories of settlements &amp; throughout the rest of the district.</p> <p><b>Scenario G:</b> Excluding Amber Sites in LSVs that have exceeded dwelling provision in Policy CS.16 based on all commitments &amp; completions indicates that these settlements have accommodated the proportionate amount of new development. A strategy that excludes these settlements will further protect landscape from cumulative adverse effects by avoidance with neutral/minor positive effects for the LSVs. However, the dwelling numbers indicated of 3,833 are in excess of the identified need of around 2,920 dwellings, so with some uncertainty of potential cumulative negative effects at this stage as depends upon precise scale/location of sites apportioned amongst the other categories of settlements – uncertain major negative cumulative effects due to quantum of development for other settlements &amp; district as a whole.</p> <p><b>Scenario H:</b> Apportioning the reserve sites mostly (approximately 81%) within the Main Town of Stratford-upon-Avon (SUA) (965), the Main Rural Centres (MRCs)(1,047) &amp; the Large Rural Sites (343) will reduce the likely adverse effects on the landscapes of the LSVs and the rural areas – with minor positive effects through avoidance. SUA &amp; the MRCs contain importance townscapes &amp; landscapes, including those with important cultural significance – the quantum of proposed development at 2,920 dwellings could have minor negative cumulative effects for the settlements and/or the district as a whole – this depends upon the precise site &amp; location, so some uncertainty at this stage of assessment.</p> |    |    |   |    |    |   |    |    |   |
| <p><b>3 Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity</b></p> |  |  | +? | +? | + | +? | +? | + | +? | +? | + |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>To protect, enhance &amp; manage</p> | <p>Core Strategy Policy CS.6 Natural Environment expects development proposals to contribute towards a resilient ecological network throughout the District. Development that would have an adverse effect upon a site designated through the EC Habitats or Birds Directives will not be permitted. The policy seeks to minimise impacts on biodiversity &amp; where possible to secure a net gain. It provides a high degree of protection for Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) &amp; includes specific guidance on adverse effects on Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs) &amp; Local Nature Reserves (LNRs), so there should be adequate mitigation through policy – and therefore, overall neutral effects.</p> <p>However, the revised NPPF (2019<sup>11</sup>) is stronger than the previous NPPF with regard to requirements and para 170 (d) requires plans to minimise impacts on biodiversity &amp; to provide net gains. In general, currently, brownfield land may be rich in biodiversity whilst greenfield land may be limited in biodiversity. The new commitment from national planning policy that all new development should provide net gains indicates that all scenarios could have likely positive effects. However, this would be difficult to manage or implement overall without positive planning.</p> <p>Core Strategy CS.7 Green Infrastructure (GI) provides further guidance on extending the GI network for multifunctionality – wildlife, health &amp; wellbeing, landscape &amp; quality of life, sustainable transport, flood &amp; climate change management. Also, the Area Strategies (AS.1- AS.11) provide guidance on specific biodiversity/GI characteristics &amp; relevant development issues.</p> <p><b>Scenario A:</b> In this Do Nothing scenario, there would be no positive planning that seeks to minimise adverse effects &amp; maximise beneficial effects. There is the potential for reserve sites to accumulate in certain areas where it could be difficult to manage incremental cumulative adverse effects on biodiversity or geodiversity. There is the risk that the wider benefits for inter-related socioeconomic &amp; environmental factors from biodiversity &amp; ecosystems, including resilience to flood risk &amp; climate change and human health/well-being, are not appreciated as much as possible.</p> <p>Therefore, likely minor negative effects would be indicated since potential for cumulative negative effects. However, all development must provide net gain in biodiversity to comply with national policy so minor positive effects but with uncertainty as effects as not optimised through positive planning.</p> <p>Effects can be mitigated through developing a positive strategy for identifying reserve sites.</p> <p><b>Scenario B:</b> A strategy that allows all the Amber Sites would provide for dwellings in excess of the objectively identified needs – 5,113 dwellings compared to requirement of around 2,920 homes. Potential for minor negative effects, including cumulative, since net gain cannot be ensured through extant policy. However, all development will need to comply with national policy that requires net gain so minor positive effects – although this depends on scale &amp; location so some uncertainty.</p> <p><b>Scenario C:</b> Apportioning reserve sites to higher categories of settlements (Stratford-upon-Avon SUA, the Main Rural Centres) would mitigate potential cumulative negative effects on the biodiversity &amp; geodiversity of the LSVs through avoidance (the highest category in the mitigation hierarchy) with likely minor positive effects for the LSVs; excluding the LRSs would protect any extant important biodiversity on such brownfield sites.</p> <p>CS Policies should ensure that protection of biodiversity &amp; geodiversity is implemented with at least neutral effects for SUA, MRCs &amp; the 2 new settlements. Minor positive effects indicated through requirement to comply with national policy.</p> |
|---|---|

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p><b>Scenario D:</b> Excluding Amber Sites with capacities of &lt;30 dwellings will remove those sites with likely fewer negative effects on biodiversity &amp; geodiversity due to scale - indicating potential minor negative effects but CS policies should ensure neutral effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario E:</b> Excluding Amber sites with capacities of &lt;100 dwellings will remove those sites that might have less adverse effects on biodiversity but some uncertainty since it depends on scale &amp; location of sites for potential cumulative negative effects.</p> <p>Whilst focusing on the larger sites of &gt;100 dwellings could indicate a risk of greater potential for negative effects, including cumulative but this depends upon precise scale &amp; location. However, larger development proposals or more likely to be able to better accommodate biodiversity enhancements with multifunctional benefits &amp; with likely positive effects – some uncertainty of significance at this stage. Overall, minor positive effects indicated.</p> <p><b>Scenario F:</b> It is considered that the communities in those settlements with made NDPs have debated &amp; agreed the specific development appropriate for each settlement – and including protection &amp; enhancement of biodiversity &amp; geodiversity. A strategy that excludes these settlements will further protect biodiversity from any cumulative adverse effects by avoidance. Overall likely insignificant-minor positive effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario G:</b> Excluding Amber Sites in LSVs that have exceeded dwelling provision in Policy CS.16 based on all commitments &amp; completions indicates that these settlements have accommodated the proportionate amount of new development. A strategy that excludes these settlements will further protect biodiversity &amp; geodiversity from cumulative adverse effects by avoidance with neutral- minor positive effects for the LSVs. The dwelling numbers indicated of 3,833 are in excess of the identified need so with some uncertainty of cumulative effects at this stage as depends upon precise scale/location of sites apportioned amongst the other categories of settlements.</p> <p><b>Scenario H:</b> Apportioning the reserve sites mostly (approximately 81%) within the Main Town of Stratford-upon-Avon (SUA) (965), the Main Rural Centres (MRCs)(1,047) &amp; the Large Rural Sites (343) will reduce any likely adverse effects on the biodiversity &amp; geodiversity of the LSVs and the rural areas – with minor positive effects through avoidance. However, the rural areas would have less opportunities for gaining biodiversity enhancements through proposed development, so some uncertainty for their minor positive effects.</p> <p>Mitigation/enhancement measures could include identification of those settlements or areas where enhancements to biodiversity &amp; GI could be particularly promoted &amp; delivered in line with the priorities in the sub-regional GI Strategy<sup>12</sup>, including opportunities for positive synergistic and cumulative effects, for example, providing links between green spaces (and see SA No 6 Climate Change &amp; GI below).</p> |
|--|--|

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework-2>

<sup>12</sup> <https://apps.warwickshire.gov.uk/api/documents/WCCC-863-513>



|  |  |     |     |   |     |    |   |    |     |   |
|--|--|-----|-----|---|-----|----|---|----|-----|---|
| <p><b>4 Flooding</b></p>                               |  | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0   |   |
| <p><b>5 Traffic</b><br/>To minimise the district's</p> |  | --? | --? | + | --? | 0? | + | 0? | --? | + |

National policy & Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment & Flood Risk provide strong mitigation to ensure that there will be no significant adverse effects from development on flood risk. The SHLAA & sites assessment process exclude site options that are within a flood zone of high risk. Whilst a small number of sites partly lie within flood zones, the net development area in these cases will avoid flood zones.

All scenarios are likely to have neutral effects due to strong policy requirements.

|                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <p>contribution to climate change</p> | <p>The Core Strategy recognised that the level and distribution of development growth would exacerbate traffic congestion in Stratford and suggested a package of town centre initiatives as mitigation for cumulative impacts to be funded through CIL – as set out in Policy CS.26. The Core Strategy also noted high traffic volumes adversely affecting settlements along the A435, particularly north of Alcester. The A46 is a key strategic route through the District &amp; the 2 safeguarded sites at junctions will help to mitigate congestion in the longer term. Highway capacity was one factor in the SHLAA process, identifying constraints that would exclude an individual site progressing.</p> <p><b>Scenario A:</b> In this Do Nothing scenario, there would be no positive planning that seeks to minimise adverse effects &amp; maximise beneficial effects for transport-related climate change. There is the potential for reserve sites to accumulate in certain areas that might exacerbate traffic &amp; where it could be difficult to manage incremental cumulative adverse effects for traffic &amp; the road network – uncertainty at this stage as depends upon location of sites.</p> <p><b>Scenario B:</b> A strategy that allows all the Amber Sites would provide for dwellings in excess of the objectively identified needs – 5,113 dwellings compared to requirement of around 2,920 homes. Potential for major negative effects, including cumulative, on objectives to minimise the district's contribution to climate change – especially for those settlements along the A435 and A46. Uncertainty at this stage, as depends on scale &amp; location of sites. Mitigation possibilities include location of sites to avoid known areas of congestion and to focus on locations where more sustainable (non-road traffic) movement can be supported &amp; encouraged.</p> <p><b>Scenario C:</b> Apportioning reserve sites to higher categories of settlements (Stratford-upon-Avon SUA, the Main Rural Centres) could contribute more to minimising the District's contribution to climate change since the larger settlements are more likely to support sustainable transport modes &amp; there may not be so much increased traffic on the nearby road network – so likely minor positive effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario D:</b> Excluding Amber Sites with capacities of &lt;30 dwellings might indicate that smaller sites would have lesser potential effects on the highway network – but this is uncertain &amp; depends on sites &amp; locations. Likely major negative effects for this more dispersed option that excludes dwellings &lt;30.</p> <p><b>Scenario E:</b> Likely insignificant/neutral effects for &lt;100 dwellings as quantum of development is reduced to 2,285 dwellings but with uncertainty at this stage.</p> <p>Mitigation measures could include avoiding or limiting accumulation of sites in settlements along the A435 and A46 and/or encouraging more sustainable transport modes (see also SA Objective No 10).</p> <p><b>Scenario F:</b> It is considered that the communities in those settlements with made NDPs have debated &amp; agreed the specific development appropriate for each settlement – and including potential impacts on the highway network. The made NDPs are in settlements that are fairly dispersed throughout the District such that significant cumulative effects are not likely. There would be minor positive effects for the NDPs through avoidance of any further development. Apportioning amongst the other settlements would reflect a dispersed option with likely minor negative effects through more vehicular use &amp; increased emissions. However, the proposed quantum of development is less at 2,421 dwellings &amp; overall may approach insignificant effects but with some uncertainty at this stage.</p> <p><b>Scenario G:</b> Excluding Amber Sites in LSVs that have exceeded dwelling provision in Policy CS.16 based on all commitments &amp; completions indicates that these settlements have accommodated the proportionate amount of new</p> |
|---------------------------------------|--|

|                                      |   |  |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                                      |   | <p>development. A strategy that excludes these settlements will further limit potential cumulative adverse effects on the highway network by avoidance with likely neutral/minor positive effects for these LSVs. The dwelling numbers indicated of 3,833 are in excess of the identified need of around 2,920 so some uncertainty with the likely effects at this stage as depends upon precise scale/location of sites apportioned amongst the other categories of settlements. However, likely major negative effects overall as sites are dispersed &amp; with greater reliance on vehicular transport and with increased emissions.</p> <p><b>Scenario H:</b> Apportioning the reserve sites mostly (approximately 81%) within the Main Town of Stratford-upon-Avon (SUA) (965), the Main Rural Centres (MRCs)(1,047) &amp; the Large Rural Sites (343) will further limit potential cumulative adverse effects on the highway network by avoidance with reduced numbers in the rural areas and likely neutral-minor positive effects for the LSVs. Focusing on SUA &amp; the MRCs could contribute more to minimising the District's contribution to climate change since the larger settlements are more likely to support sustainable transport modes &amp; there may not be so much increased traffic on the nearby road network – so likely minor positive effects. Overall, likely positive effects for the district as a whole.</p> <p>Mitigation measures could include avoiding or limiting accumulation of sites in settlements along the A435 and A46 and/or encouraging more sustainable transport.</p> |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <p><b>6 Green Infrastructure</b></p> |   | <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1115 762 1249 916">+?</td> <td data-bbox="1249 762 1384 916">+</td> <td data-bbox="1384 762 1518 916">+</td> <td data-bbox="1518 762 1653 916">+</td> <td data-bbox="1653 762 1787 916">+</td> <td data-bbox="1787 762 1921 916">+</td> <td data-bbox="1921 762 2056 916">+</td> <td data-bbox="2056 762 2190 916">+</td> </tr> </table>  | +? | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| +?                                   | + | +  | +  | + | + | + | + |   |   |   |
|                                      |   | <p>Core Strategy CS.7 Green Infrastructure requires that the existing GI in the District will be promoted through the principles of protection, enhancement, restoration and creation. CS.7 clearly recognises the multifunctionality of GI including for a low carbon economy &amp; human health/well-being. Development proposals must demonstrate how they contribute to the GI network – and including neighbouring authority areas thus clearly recognising also that GI &amp; ecosystems extend beyond administrative boundaries.</p> <p><b>Scenarios A-H:</b> It is assumed that all proposed development will comply with CS.7 &amp; contribute GI appropriate to its size &amp; location – indicating at least minor positive effects. It could be asserted that larger sites might have more capacity to contribute GI, but this depends on location.</p> <p>Positive effects could be enhanced by identifying those settlements or areas where biodiversity &amp; GI could be particularly promoted &amp; delivered in line with the priorities in the sub-regional GI Strategy<sup>13</sup>, including opportunities for positive synergistic and cumulative effects, for example, providing links between green spaces &amp; sustainable transport routes.</p>  |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

<sup>13</sup> <https://apps.warwickshire.gov.uk/api/documents/WCCC-863-513>

|  |  |   |    |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |    |   |    |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |
|--|--|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|
| <b>7<sup>14</sup> Minerals;<br/>                 Agriculture</b> |  | 0 | -? | 0 | -? | 0 | + | - | ? | 0 | -? | 0 | 0? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0? | 0 | + | - | ? |
|--|--|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|----|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|

<sup>14</sup> Please note that first cell refers to minerals & second cell to agricultural land

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>To protect &amp; conserve natural resources</p> | <p><b>Minerals:</b> All proposals must comply with the Core Strategy &amp; the Minerals Local Plan<sup>15</sup>. It is assumed that land safeguarded for minerals could be avoided or minimised where justified for all sites; it may be that in certain cases, the mineral resource is not viable in a specific location and/or the site does not undermine its extraction. Therefore, for all scenarios – indicating likely neutral/insignificant effects.</p> <p><b>Agriculture:</b> As to be expected in a rural area such as Stratford District, there are limited opportunities available to develop brownfield sites and there is good quality agricultural land with concentrations of Grade 2 BMVL<sup>16</sup> to the south and east of Stratford-Upon-Avon and surrounding Bidford-on-Avon &amp; Wellesbourne, as well as to the south-east of the district bordering Oxfordshire. Loss of BMVL is permanent and irreversible – and the Core Strategy seeks to redevelop previously used land, where possible, &amp; minimise loss of BMVL with guidance provided in the Area Strategies (AS.1-AS.11).</p> <p><b>Scenario A:</b> In this Do Nothing scenario, there would be no positive planning that seeks to minimise adverse effects &amp; maximise beneficial effects for use of agricultural land. There is the potential for reserve sites to accumulate in certain areas where there could be significant loss of BMVL with uncertain cumulative negative effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario B:</b> A strategy that allows all the Amber Sites would provide for dwellings in excess of the objectively identified needs – 5,113 dwellings compared to requirement of around 2,920 homes. Potential for minor negative effects, including cumulative, for loss of BMVL but uncertainty at this stage as depends on site scale &amp; location.</p> <p><b>Scenario C:</b> Apportioning reserve sites to higher categories of settlements (Stratford-upon-Avon SUA, the Main Rural Centres) would mitigate any potential cumulative negative effects on BMVL of the LSVs through avoidance (the highest category in the mitigation hierarchy) with neutral/minor positive effects for the LSVs. Uncertainty for SUA &amp; the MRCs – depends on size &amp; precise location – uncertain neutral-minor negative effects. Mitigation measures could include avoidance or minimise loss of BMVL. Excluding the 2 LRSs would lose the opportunity to develop previously used land (Former Harbury Cement Works &amp; Blue Lias Works) with likely minor negative effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario D:</b> Excluding Amber Sites with capacities of &lt;30 dwellings will remove those sites with likely fewer negative effects for loss of BMVL due to scale - indicating potential minor negative with uncertainty as depends on location.</p> <p><b>Scenario E:</b> Excluding Amber sites with capacities of &lt;100 dwellings will remove those sites that might have less adverse effects on loss of BMVL but uncertainty since it depends on scale &amp; location of sites. Overall, quantum on proposed development reduced to 2,285 homes so effects could be reduced to nearer insignificant/neutral but uncertainty at this stage. Whilst focusing on the larger sites of &gt;100 dwellings could indicate a risk of greater potential for negative effects, including cumulative, this depends upon precise scale &amp; location.</p> <p><b>Scenario F:</b> It is considered that the communities in those settlements with made NDPs have debated &amp; agreed the specific development appropriate for each settlement – and including potential impacts on the loss of any BMVL. The made NDPs are in settlements that are fairly dispersed throughout the District such that significant cumulative effects are not likely. Therefore, overall neutral/insignificant effects.</p> |
|--|--|

|  |   |  |         |   |         |         |   |    |         |   |    |    |   |   |    |   |   |   |
|--|---|--|---------|---|---------|---------|---|----|---------|---|----|----|---|---|----|---|---|---|
|  |   | <p><b>Scenario G:</b> Excluding Amber Sites in LSVs that have exceeded dwelling provision in Policy CS.16 based on all commitments &amp; completions indicates that these settlements have accommodated the proportionate amount of new development. A strategy that excludes these settlements will avoid any loss of BMVL with neutral effects for the LSVs. The dwelling numbers indicated of 3,833 are in excess of the identified need so with some uncertainty with the likely neutral effects at this stage as depends upon precise scale/location of sites apportioned amongst the other categories of settlements. Mitigation measures could include avoiding or limiting those sites with significant BMVL.</p> <p><b>Scenario H:</b> Apportioning the reserve sites mostly (approximately 81%) within the Main Town of Stratford-upon-Avon (SUA) (965), the Main Rural Centres (MRCs)(1,047) &amp; the Large Rural Sites (343) will further limit potential cumulative adverse effects on the agricultural resources by avoidance with reduced numbers in the rural areas and likely neutral-minor positive effects for the LSVs. Focusing on SUA, the MRCs &amp; large rural sites could have neutral to minor negative effects – depends on site &amp; precise location so uncertainty at this stage.</p> |         |   |         |         |   |    |         |   |    |    |   |   |    |   |   |   |
| <p><b>8 Air Quality (AQ); Water Quality (WQ)</b></p> |   | <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td style="background-color: #FFD700;">--<br/>?</td> <td style="background-color: #000080;">0</td> <td style="background-color: #FFD700;">--<br/>?</td> <td style="background-color: #000080;">0</td> <td style="background-color: #90EE90;">+</td> <td style="background-color: #000080;">0</td> <td style="background-color: #FFD700;">--<br/>?</td> <td style="background-color: #000080;">0</td> <td style="background-color: #000080;">0?</td> <td style="background-color: #000080;">0</td> <td style="background-color: #000080;">0</td> <td style="background-color: #000080;">0</td> <td style="background-color: #FFFF00;">-?</td> <td style="background-color: #000080;">0</td> <td style="background-color: #90EE90;">+</td> <td style="background-color: #000080;">0</td> </tr> </table>   | --<br>? | 0 | --<br>? | 0       | + | 0  | --<br>? | 0 | 0? | 0  | 0 | 0 | -? | 0 | + | 0 |
| --<br>?  | 0 | --<br>?  | 0       | + | 0       | --<br>? | 0 | 0? | 0       | 0 | 0  | -? | 0 | + | 0  |   |   |   |

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/environment/planning/policy/mineralslocalplan/mineralsLocalPlan.aspx>

<sup>16</sup> Best and most versatile land (BMVL grades 1-3a)

|                     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| To reduce pollution |   | <p><b>Air Quality:</b> The district has very good air quality, however there are issues in Studley and Stratford-upon-Avon. Both have AQMA zones due to levels of NO<sub>2</sub> exceeding the annual mean. Transport is the highest emitting sector for air pollution in the district. Core Strategy Policy AS.1 requires new development to apply measures relating to the AQMA for the town; similarly, CS Policy AS.8 for Studley &amp; CS Policy CS.26 provides further guidance. Overall, air quality likely to be neutral but depends on precise scale &amp; location. Some concern for cumulative effects in Stratford. New development in the major town of Stratford should be able to contribute to improvements in sustainable transport that could have positive synergistic effects to reduce the negative effects to minor or negligible significance, but further studies will be needed.</p> <p><b>Scenario A:</b> Likely major negative effects without positive planning to help minimise vehicular emissions.</p> <p><b>Scenario B:</b> Likely major negative effects with all the Amber sites due to the higher quantum of development proposed at 4,375 dwellings.</p> <p><b>Scenario C:</b> Likely minor positive effects that excludes Amber sites in the LSVs &amp; thus avoids increasing vehicular traffic in the rural areas.</p> <p><b>Scenario D:</b> Major negative effects possible with increased vehicular emissions with the more dispersed development that only excludes sites with &lt;30 capacity.</p> <p><b>Scenario E:</b> Excluding sites with &lt;100 capacity reduces the dispersion of the proposed development &amp; provides mitigation measures to some extent – likely minor negative to neutral effects but depends upon precise location so uncertainty at this stage of assessment.</p> <p><b>Scenario F:</b> Likely neutral effects – although dispersed, overall numbers are less.</p> <p><b>Scenario G:</b> Possible minor negative effects on AQ as dispersed &amp; higher quantum of development at 3,833 dwellings.</p> <p><b>Scenario H:</b> Likely minor positive effects that focuses Amber sites in SUA &amp; the MRC with potential for more sustainable transport &amp; thus avoids increasing vehicular traffic &amp; emissions in the rural areas.</p> <p><b>Water Quality:</b> Severn Trent Water is the main supplier of water in the district, with a small amount supplied by South Staffordshire Water Plc, and water resources in the area are under 'moderate stress' with some areas under 'serious stress – and there are predicted supply-demand deficits. The chemical water quality in the district is generally favourable. Core Strategy Policy CS.4 Water Environment requires all proposals to take into account the predicted impact of climate change, the sustainable use of water, protection &amp; improvement of water quality. Therefore, overall, for each scenario, potential for neutral effects.</p> |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9 Waste             |   | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </table>   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0                   | 0 | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |   |   |   |

|  |  |     |     |     |     |    |    |     |    |     |
|--|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|-----|----|-----|
|  | It was determined at the revised SA scoping for the SAP that all new development has the potential for neutral effects on waste.   |     |     |     |     |    |    |     |    |     |
| <b>10 Accessibility &amp; Transport</b><br>To increase sustainable | <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td style="width: 25%;"></td> <td style="width: 10%; background-color: #FFA500;">--?</td> <td style="width: 10%; background-color: #FFA500;">--?</td> <td style="width: 10%; background-color: #669966;">++?</td> <td style="width: 10%; background-color: #FFFF00;">-?</td> <td style="width: 10%; background-color: #92D050;">+?</td> <td style="width: 10%; background-color: #4682B4;">0</td> <td style="width: 10%; background-color: #4682B4;">0?</td> <td style="width: 10%; background-color: #669966;">++?</td> </tr> </table> |     | --? | --? | ++? | -? | +? | 0   | 0? | ++? |
|  | --?  | --? | ++? | -?  | +?  | 0  | 0? | ++? |    |     |



|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>transport &amp; reduce need to travel</p> | <p>Core Strategy CS.2 Climate change &amp; Sustainable Construction requires that new development should be located in a manner that minimises the need to travel &amp; encourages sustainable transport such as cycling &amp; walking. Further guidance on sustainable transport is provided through the Area Strategies AS.1 – AS.11, including the inter-relationships with other factors such as green infrastructure &amp; health/well-being.</p> <p><b>Scenario A:</b> In this Do Nothing scenario, there would be no positive planning that seeks to minimise adverse effects &amp; maximise beneficial effects for promoting more sustainable transport – particularly with regard to cumulative effects &amp; interactions. There is the potential for reserve sites to accumulate in certain areas where there could be significant loss of sustainable transport possibilities with uncertain cumulative negative effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario B:</b> A strategy that allows all the Amber Sites would provide for dwellings in excess of the objectively identified needs – 5,113 dwellings compared to requirement of around 2,920 homes. The potential effects of this are uncertain at this stage as they depend on site scale &amp; location. Mitigation measures could include focusing new development on those settlements with good public transport &amp; opportunities for GI/sustainable transport networks &amp; linkages. It is possible that larger developments can support/promote more sustainable transport.</p> <p><b>Scenario C:</b> Apportioning reserve sites to higher categories of settlements (Stratford-upon-Avon SUA, the Main Rural Centres) could contribute more to reducing the need to travel since the larger settlements are more likely to support sustainable transport modes – so likely major positive effects. Excluding sites in LSVs &amp; the LRSs would limit opportunities for these settlements to improve their sustainable transport modes through new development.</p> <p><b>Scenario D:</b> Excluding Amber Sites with capacities of &lt;30 dwellings might indicate that the smaller sites would have lesser potential for promoting sustainable transport – uncertain minor negative overall due to the higher quantum of proposed development.</p> <p><b>Scenario E:</b> Generally, it might be assumed that larger developments have more scope for sustainable transport. However, this is uncertain &amp; depends on sites &amp; locations. Therefore, overall, there may be beneficial effects for a focus on larger sites - with uncertainty at this stage – minor positive overall due to lower quantum of proposed development. Mitigation measures could include considering those settlements or areas where the sustainable transport network could be most effectively enhanced for multifunctional benefits.</p> <p><b>Scenario F:</b> It is considered that the communities in those settlements with made NDPs have debated &amp; agreed the specific development appropriate for each settlement – and including potential impacts &amp; opportunities for enhancing the sustainable transport network. The made NDPs are in settlements that are fairly dispersed throughout the District such that significant cumulative effects are not likely. Therefore, overall neutral/insignificant effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario G:</b> Excluding Amber Sites in LSVs that have exceeded dwelling provision in Policy CS.16 based on all commitments &amp; completions indicates that these settlements have accommodated the proportionate amount of new development. A strategy that excludes these settlements from cumulative adverse effects by avoidance with neutral effects for the LSVs. The dwelling numbers indicated of 3,833 are in excess of the identified need of around 2,920 so some</p> |
|--|---|

|   |  |  |    |   |    |    |    |    |   |
|---|--|--|----|---|----|----|----|----|---|
|   |  | <p>uncertainty with the likely neutral effects at this stage as depends upon precise scale/location of sites apportioned amongst the other categories of settlements.</p> <p><b>Scenario H:</b> Apportioning the reserve sites mostly (approximately 81%) within the Main Town of Stratford-upon-Avon (SUA) (965), the Main Rural Centres (MRCs)(1,047) &amp; the Large Rural Sites (343) will focus on those settlements that are better able to support sustainable transport &amp; reduce the need to travel so likely major positive effects with some uncertainty at this stage, and overall, likely positive effects for the district as a whole. Mitigation measures could include identification of those settlements or areas where enhancements to the sustainable transport network could be most enhanced.</p> |    |   |    |    |    |    |   |
| <p><b>11 Rural Communities</b><br/>To reduce barriers for those</p> |  | -?   | -? | - | -? | -? | +? | +? | - |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <p>living in rural areas</p> | <p>Whilst it is assumed that any proposal for development can make appropriate &amp; timely provision for supporting infrastructure in line with the Core Strategy &amp; meet requirements for affordable housing (AH) as set out in CS.18 &amp; the Position Statement (September 2019)<sup>17</sup>, there may be significant potential cumulative effects for the rural areas.</p> <p><b>Scenario A:</b> In this Do Nothing scenario, there would be no positive planning that seeks to minimise adverse effects &amp; maximise beneficial effects for reducing barriers for those living in the rural areas – particularly with regard to cumulative effects &amp; interactions. There is the potential for reserve sites to accumulate in certain areas where there could be significant loss of possibilities for the rural areas with uncertain cumulative negative effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario B:</b> The cumulative provision of all the Amber sites would provide dwellings in excess of the objectively identified needs – 5,113 dwellings compared to requirement of around 2,920 homes. The potential effects of this are uncertain at this stage as they depend on site scale &amp; location. It is uncertain how this might affect the rural areas but without positive planning, it seems likely that there would be negative effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario C:</b> Apportioning reserve sites to higher categories of settlements (Stratford-upon-Avon SUA, the Main Rural Centres) &amp; excluding sites in LSVs &amp; the LRSs would limit opportunities for these settlements in the rural areas with minor negative effects for settlements &amp; the rural area of the district as a whole. Such negative effects would include reduced support for rural services &amp; reduced scope to meet local housing needs, including affordable housing.</p> <p><b>Scenario D &amp; E:</b> Excluding Amber Sites with capacities of &lt;30 dwellings or &lt;100 dwellings indicates that the smaller sites dispersed through the rural areas would be excluded with minor negative effects associated with reduced support for rural services &amp; reduced scope to meet local housing needs – some uncertainty as depends on precise site &amp; location.</p> <p><b>Scenario F:</b> It is considered that the communities in those settlements with made NDPs have debated &amp; agreed the specific development appropriate for each settlement – and including potential impacts &amp; opportunities for those that comprise rural areas. The made NDPs are in settlements that are fairly dispersed throughout the District &amp; the scenario thus retains some Amber sites in rural areas. Therefore, overall minor positive effects with some uncertainty at this stage.</p> <p><b>Scenario G:</b> Excluding Amber Sites in LSVs that have exceeded dwelling provision in Policy CS.16 based on all commitments &amp; completions indicates that these settlements have accommodated the proportionate amount of new development – including reducing barriers for the rural areas. The quantum of development at 3,833 dwellings exceeds the required amount, indicating that there might be sufficient other Amber sites to be considered for the other rural areas – indicating possible minor positive effects but some uncertainty at this stage.</p> <p><b>Scenario H:</b> Apportioning the reserve sites mostly (approximately 81%) within the Main Town of Stratford-upon-Avon (SUA) (965), the Main Rural Centres (MRCs) (1,047) &amp; the Large Rural Sites (343) will limit the housing numbers amongst the LSVs with likely minor negative effects for reducing barriers to living in the rural areas – again, this would be associated with reduced support for rural services &amp; reduced scope to meet local housing needs.</p> |
|------------------------------|--|

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.stratford.gov.uk/doc/208689/name/CS18%20AH%20Position%20Statement%20Sept%2019%20.pdf>

Stratford-on-Avon Site Allocations Plan: Preferred Options  
Sustainability Appraisal Report: Appendix VII Scenarios X-Y & A-H

|                               |  |    |    |   |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |
|-------------------------------|--|----|----|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|
| <b>12 Settlement Identity</b> |  | -? | -? | + | 0? | 0? | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0? |
|-------------------------------|--|----|----|---|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>To protect character &amp; separate identity</p> | <p>Core Strategy Area Strategies SA.1-AS.11 provide guidance to protect the character &amp; identity of key settlements.</p> <p><b>Scenario A:</b> In this Do Nothing scenario, there would be no positive planning that seeks to minimise adverse effects &amp; maximise beneficial effects for protecting identity – particularly with regard to cumulative effects &amp; interactions. There is the potential for reserve sites to accumulate in certain areas where there could be significant loss of countryside integrity/identity but uncertainty at this stage.</p> <p><b>Scenario B:</b> A strategy that allows all the Amber Sites would provide for dwellings in excess of the objectively identified needs – 5,113 dwellings compared to requirement of around 2,920 homes. The potential effects of this are uncertain at this stage as they depend on site scale &amp; location but there is the risk of some loss of identity for some settlements with a high quantum of development.</p> <p><b>Scenario C:</b> Apportioning reserve sites to higher categories of settlements (Stratford-upon-Avon SUA, the Main Rural Centres) would mitigate potential cumulative negative effects on identity of the LSVs through avoidance (the highest category in the mitigation hierarchy) with neutral effects for the LSVs. CS Area Strategies should ensure that identity/character concerns are addressed with neutral effects for SUA, MRCs – however, there may be concern for SUA &amp; higher levels of development. Therefore, some uncertainty at this stage.</p> <p><b>Scenario D:</b> Excluding Amber Sites with capacities of &lt;30 dwellings might indicate that smaller sites would have lesser potential effects on the identity &amp; character of settlements – but this is uncertain &amp; depends on sites &amp; locations. Overall, uncertain neutral effects at this stage.</p> <p><b>Scenario E:</b> Excluding Amber Sites with capacities of &lt;100 dwellings &amp; a focus on larger sites might indicate that such larger sites could have more negative effects on settlement identity; however, this is uncertain &amp; depends on precise location – effects reduced to neutral overall with the lower quantum of proposed development.</p> <p><b>Scenario F:</b> It is considered that the communities in those settlements with made NDPs have debated &amp; agreed the specific development appropriate for each settlement – and including potential impacts on countryside integrity &amp; settlement identity. The made NDPs are in settlements that are fairly dispersed throughout the District such that significant cumulative effects are not likely. Therefore, overall neutral/insignificant effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario G:</b> Excluding Amber Sites in LSVs that have exceeded dwelling provision in Policy CS.16 based on all commitments &amp; completions indicates that these settlements have accommodated the proportionate amount of new development. A strategy that excludes these settlements will have neutral effects on the LSVs. The dwelling numbers indicated of 3,833 are in excess of the identified need so with some uncertainty with the likely neutral effects at this stage as depends upon precise scale/location of sites apportioned amongst the other categories of settlements.</p> <p><b>Scenario H:</b> Apportioning the reserve sites mostly (approximately 81%) within the Main Town of Stratford-upon-Avon (SUA) (965), the Main Rural Centres (MRCs)(1,047) &amp; the Large Rural Sites (343) will limit the housing numbers amongst the LSVs &amp; thus avoiding potential negative effects &amp; likely minor positive effects for the rural areas. CS Area Strategies should ensure that identity/character concerns are addressed with neutral effects for SUA &amp; the MRCs, but some uncertainty at this stage of assessment.</p> |
|---|---|

|  |                                       |    |    |    |    |    |      |         |   |    |   |    |    |
|--|---------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|------|---------|---|----|---|----|----|
| <b>13 Housing</b><br>To provide affordable, environmentally sound & good quality for all | <b>13A Housing – overall capacity</b> | +? | ++ | ++ | 0  | ++ | +++? | ++<br>? | 0 | ++ | 0 | ++ | +  |
|  | <b>13B Housing – affordable</b>       | +? | ++ | ++ | -? | +? | +++? | ++<br>? | 0 | ++ | 0 | ++ | +? |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>All scenarios have the potential for major positive effects through delivery of environmentally sound &amp; good quality housing in accordance with the Core Strategy Policies CS.15 &amp; CS.16. Core Strategy Policy CS.18 Affordable Housing sets out how all new residential development is required to contribute to the provision of affordable housing (AH) in accordance with specified thresholds &amp; taking into account the distributional strategy set out in Policy CS.15 that addresses the likelihood of smaller sites coming forward &amp; depletion of stock of AH especially in the rural locations.</p> <p><b>Scenario A:</b> In this Do Nothing scenario, there would be no positive planning that seeks to minimise adverse effects &amp; maximise beneficial effects for provision of appropriate housing for all groups &amp; including sufficient housing. There is uncertainty about how much additional housing would be delivered without positive guidance indicating uncertainty of minor positive effects. It may be assumed that any provision of additional housing would include affordable housing in line with CS.18 but not optimised through positive planning &amp; therefore uncertainty of positive effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario B:</b> A strategy that allows all the Amber Sites would provide for dwellings in excess of the objectively identified needs – 5,113 dwellings compared to requirement of around 2,920 homes. This indicates major positive effects for housing objectives, including for affordable housing.</p> <p><b>Scenario C:</b> Apportioning reserve sites to higher categories of settlements (Stratford-upon-Avon SUA, the Main Rural Centres) would have likely major positive effects for these categories of settlements &amp; including for affordable housing. It would limit further housing development for the LSVs &amp; LRSs with no positive effects for these categories of settlements – neutral effects for overall capacity but the exclusion of sites in the LSVs would exclude affordable housing in the rural areas, where it is perhaps most needed and therefore, minor negative effects indicated. Such a strategy provides 2,859 dwellings &amp; this is close to the requirement of around 2,920 homes.</p> <p><b>Scenario D:</b> Excluding Amber Sites with capacities of &lt;30 dwellings would limit the provision of AH on smaller sites &amp; these are more likely in the rural locations where the AH stock is depleted. Therefore, overall, still positive effects but reduced to uncertain minor positive effects through the effects on the smaller locations, particularly in the rural areas. However, this scenario would provide for 3,658 dwellings &amp; this covers more than the required need of around 2,920 and indicating that positive effects might be increased to major positive.</p> <p><b>Scenario E:</b> Excluding Amber Sites with capacities of &lt;100 dwellings would limit the provision of housing to only 2,285 dwellings &amp; this would not meet the required need for 2,920 dwellings. However, the focus would be on the larger sites &gt;100 dwellings &amp; these are considered to be more likely to be deliverable with affordable housing. Therefore, overall major positive effects likely but with some uncertainty as this scenario alone would not meet the required housing needs.</p> <p><b>Scenario F:</b> It is considered that the communities in those settlements with made NDPs have debated &amp; agreed the specific development appropriate for each settlement - including AH provision &amp; with particular consideration for meeting local housing needs. Therefore, overall major positive effects for the district as a whole but with some uncertainty as the quantum of proposed development is less than needed, and with neutral effects for the NDPs as further development is avoided for these settlements.</p> <p><b>Scenario G:</b> Excluding Amber Sites in LSVs that have exceeded dwelling provision in Policy CS.16 based on all commitments &amp; completions indicates that these settlements have accommodated the proportionate amount of new</p> |
|--|--|

|  |  |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | <p>development – including provision of AH. A strategy that excludes these settlements will have neutral effects on the LSVs, but overall, still major positive effects for housing indicated.</p> <p><b>Scenario H:</b> Apportioning the reserve sites mostly (approximately 81%) within the Main Town of Stratford-upon-Avon (SUA) (965), the Main Rural Centres (MRCs)(1,047) &amp; the Large Rural Sites (343) will limit the housing numbers amongst the LSVs &amp; reducing numbers for both overall capacity and affordable housing in the rural areas to less significance – minor positive effects. The reduced numbers of housing in the rural areas will reduce the numbers of affordable housing introducing some uncertainty of the positive effects.</p> |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>14 Community &amp; Health</b><br>To improve health, safety & well-being |  | +  | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
|  |  | <p>It was determined at the revised SA scoping for the SAP that any proposal for new development can make appropriate &amp; timely provision for necessary supporting infrastructure, or contributions towards it - Core Strategy Policy CS.16 Housing &amp; CS.27 Developer Contributions. All sites have the potential for long term positive effects on health through provision of good quality housing and this will be cumulative.</p>   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| <b>15 Economy &amp; Employment</b>   |  | +?   | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
|  |  | <p>The scenarios investigated are for a strategy for reserve housing and therefore neutral effects are indicated, although it is acknowledged that provision of good quality housing will have positive effects towards sustaining the local economy &amp; employment.</p> <p>The base scenario includes significant employment land with major positive effects; also, some mixed-use proposals. Therefore, overall, minor positive effects indicated - with some uncertainty for the Do Nothing Scenario &amp; a loss of positive planning to help optimise benefits for economy/employment.</p>   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |