

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

**Appendix IX: SA of Scenarios 1-5 and including Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA), where possible**

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N/A	Not Applicable	Used where SA Objectives are no longer applicable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: 13A (overall potential housing capacity) &amp; retaining thresholds of significance &gt;50 dwellings major positive &amp; &lt;50 dwellings minor positive 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>		
<p>Note 4: The SA has considered the likely significant effects identified from the SA of the strategic options for identifying reserve sites (please see SA Appendix IX) and refined the findings according to the SA findings from the Amber Sites.</p>		

## Base Scenario

<p><b>Base Scenario<sup>1</sup></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>South of Alcester Road, Stratford</b></li> <li>■ <b>Atherstone Airfield</b></li> <li>■ <b>Land east of Shipston 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> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <b>Bidford Centre, Bidford-on-Avon</b></li> <li>■ <b>Land at Napton Brickworks</b></li> <li>■ <b>University of Warwick, Wellesbourne Campus</b></li> <li>■ <b>Land at High Street, Studley</b></li> <li>■ <b>Studley Enterprise Centre</b></li> <li>■ <b>Quinton Rail Technology Centre</b></li> <li>■ <b>A46 Safeguarding sites – A422 Wildmoor &amp; A3400 Bishopston</b></li> <li>■ <b>Former Long Marston Depot (Phase 5)<sup>2</sup></b></li> <li>■ <b>Long Marston Airfield (Phase 1b)<sup>3</sup></b></li> <li>■ <b>Employment Enabling Sites Policy</b></li> </ul>
---	---	---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that each of these draft policies and proposals was subject to individual SA and reported in the SA Reports (December 2017 & February 2019); the 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>2</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>3</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:  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> 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>4</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. 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> 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. The Built-Up Area Boundaries policy contributes to maintaining settlement identities including that provided through landscape character - with at least neutral effects.	+

<sup>4</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> To protect, enhance and manage</p>	<p>9 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>+</p>
<p><b>4 Flooding</b> To reduce risk of flooding</p>	<p>All sites were found to be neutral or minor positive for flood risk; overall neutral.</p>	<p>0</p>
<p><b>5 Traffic</b> 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>5 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>+</p>

<b>6 Green Infrastructure</b>	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.	<b>+</b>	
<b>7 Minerals; Agriculture</b>	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 & 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 & 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.	<b>0</b>	<b>+/-</b>
<b>8 Air Quality; Water Quality</b>	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 & 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. 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.	<b>0/+</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>9 Waste</b>	All sites have the potential for neutral effects through development management policies in the Core Strategy and the Warwickshire Waste Local Plan.	<b>0</b>	
<b>10 Accessibility &amp; Transport</b> To increase sustainable	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	<b>+/0?</b>	

<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></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></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></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></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>+</p>
<p><b>15 Economy &amp; Employment</b></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</p>	<p>++</p>

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

SA of Scenarios 1-5 (with potential total dwelling numbers)	
<b>Scenario 1</b> (5,113 dwellings)	Cumulative: Base Scenario of all other Site Proposals - plus all Amber sites
<b>Scenario 2a</b> (4,485 dwellings)	Base Scenario of all other Site Proposals - plus all Amber sites but exclude sites in LSV Category 4. <b>Include:</b> LSV Category 1 <sup>5</sup> *: Bishop's Itchington, Harbury, Long Itchington, Quinton, Tiddington & the 2 LRSs LSV Category 2: Brailes, Fenny Compton, Lighthorne Heath, Napton-on-the-Hill, Salford Priors, Stockton, Tysoe, Welford-on-Avon, Wilmcote, Wootton Wawen LSV Category 3: Claverdon, Earlswood, Ettington, Great Alne, Ilmington, Long Compton, Newbold-on-Stour, Snitterfield, Temple Herdewycke, Tredington
<b>Scenario 2b</b> (4,737 dwellings)	Base Scenario of all other Site Proposals - plus all Amber sites but exclude sites in LSV Category 3 & 4. <b>Include:</b> LSV Category 1 *: Bishop's Itchington, Harbury, Long Itchington, Quinton, Tiddington & the 2 LRSs LSV Category 2: Brailes, Fenny Compton, Lighthorne Heath, Napton-on-the-Hill, Salford Priors, Stockton, Tysoe, Welford-on-Avon, Wilmcote, Wootton Wawen
<b>Scenario 2c</b> (3,805 dwellings)	Base Scenario of all other Site Proposals - plus all Amber sites but exclude sites in LSV Category 2, 3 & 4 <b>Include:</b> LSV Category 1 *: Bishop's Itchington, Harbury, Long Itchington, Quinton, Tiddington & the 2 LRSs
<b>Scenario 2d</b> (2,859 dwellings)	Base Scenario of all other Site Proposals - plus all Amber sites but exclude Large Rural Sites <sup>6</sup> ♦ & sites in LSV Category 1, 2, 3 & 4
<b>Scenario 3a</b> (3,659 dwellings)	Base Scenario of all other Site Proposals - plus all Amber sites but exclude sites with capacity <30 dwellings
<b>Scenario 3b</b> (2,285 dwellings)	Base Scenario of all other Site Proposals - plus all Amber sites but exclude sites with capacity <100 dwellings
<b>Scenario 4</b> (2,421 dwellings)	Base Scenario plus all Amber sites but do not include sites that are in made Neighbourhood Development Plans or those that are recommended to proceed to Referendum & that already have identified reserve sites. This means removing all Amber sites in 13 settlements. <b>Include:</b> Alderminster, Bishops Itchington, Ettington, Fenny Compton, Gaydon, Harbury, Long Itchington, Long Marston, Newbold-on-Stour, Oxhill, Salford Priors, Stockton & Welford-on-Avon
<b>Scenario 5</b> (3,396 dwellings)	Base Scenario plus all Amber sites but do not include sites in LSVs that have exceeded dwelling provision in Core Strategy Policy CS.16. <b>Include:</b> Clifford Chambers, Halford, Hampton Lucy, Ilmington, Lighthorne, Loxley, Mappleborough Green, Moreton Morrell, Napton-on-the-Hill, Priors Marston, Quinton, Tiddington, Tredington & Tysoe

<sup>5</sup> \* LSV Category 1 includes the 2 LRSs because the LRS at the former Harbury works is located in Long Itchington & the former Long Marston Depot is akin to a LSV Category 1 due to its size

<sup>6</sup> ♦ Large Rural Sites (LRSs) = Former Harbury Cement works is located near Bishops Itchington & the former Long Marston Depot is akin to a LSV Category 1 due to its size & range of services

SAP Scenarios (each assumes all other SAP Site Proposals included)										
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment of Effects:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">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</p>									
	SAP Scenario Number	1	2a	2b	2c	2d	3a	3b	4	5
SA Objective		All amber Sites	All amber Sites; exclude those in Category 4 LSVs	All amber Sites; exclude those in Category 3 & 4 LSVs	All amber Sites; exclude those in Category 2, 3 & 4 LSVs	All amber Sites; exclude Category 1, 2, 3 & 4 LSVs & LRSs	Exclude amber Sites with capacity <30 dwellings	Exclude amber Sites with capacity <30 dwellings	All Amber Sites exclude those in made NDPs & to referendum	Exclude amber sites in LSVs that have exceeded CS.15 provision
<b>1 Heritage</b> To conserve designated & non-designated		-?	-?	0?	+	+	0	0?	+	0

<p>heritage assets &amp; their surroundings in a manner appropriate to their significance</p>	<p><b>Scenario 1:</b> About 45% of the Amber sites were found to have potential minor negative effects due to the proximity of the site to the setting of a Conservation Area (CA) or a Listed Building (LB) dispersed through many of the settlements. Only one site (HEN.06) was found to have possible major negative effects as a LB was located within the site; neutral effects were found for the other 55% of the sites. The precise significance &amp; possibilities for mitigating such effects are not known at this stage &amp; further heritage studies are being undertaken. However, Core Strategy Policy CS.8 Historic Environment seeks to protect and enhance heritage assets &amp; their settings. Guidance is further provided through the Area Strategies (AS.1-AS.11) and supported by design guidance. Site-specific requirements could be applied to those sites with potential negative effects to help ensure effective mitigation measures, including consideration of cumulative effects for settlements such as Brailes, Clifford Chambers, Fenny Compton, Hampton Lucy, Harbury, Ilmington, Long Itchington, Newbold, Quinton, Salford Priors, Stockton, Tysoe &amp; Wellesbourne where a higher proportion of sites (more than 50%) have been identified with potential negative effects on LBs and CAs and their settings.</p> <p><b>Scenario 2:</b> Excluding sites in LSVs category 4 reduces the approximate proportion of sites with minor negative effects to 36%; excluding LSVs 4 &amp; 3 to 29%, excluding LSVs 4, 3 &amp; 2 to 14%, and excluding all LSVs &amp; the 2 LRSs to 9%. Whilst the possibilities of mitigation measures are not known at this stage, there could still be cumulative negative effects for Scenario 2a – with uncertainty. It is considered that the reduction to some 29% minor negative sites in Scenario 2b is likely to reduce overall effects closer to insignificant/neutral – uncertainty until mitigation measures investigated. It is considered that excluding more LSVs in Scenarios 2c &amp; 2d will reduce the cumulative effects still further &amp; represent a minor positive effect for the district as a whole. The remaining Amber sites in Scenario 2d are dispersed through Main Rural Centres &amp; Stratford with Wellsbourne being the only settlement with more than one site that has minor negative effects for heritage – indicating that cumulative effects are unlikely to be an issue.</p> <p><b>Scenario 3:</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. It might be considered that the larger sites of &gt;100 dwellings are more likely to have the potential for some minor negative effects on heritage &amp; therefore, some uncertainty for Scenario 3b.</p> <p><b>Scenario 4:</b> Excluding NDPs (made or to referendum) reduces the proportion of sites with minor negative effects to some 18% - as this is dispersed through the district, it may be considered to be a minor positive effect overall – with uncertainty for cumulative effects for remaining settlements Clifford Chambers, Fenny Compton, Hampton Lucy, Long Itchington, Newbold &amp; Salford Priors. Mitigation measures could include selection of those sites that would avoid or minimise any cumulative adverse effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario 5:</b> Excluding settlements where provision in CS.16 has been exceeded reduces the proportion of sites with minor negative effects to some 23%. As this is dispersed throughout the district, it may be considered to approach insignificant or neutral effects but with some uncertainty for cumulative effects for the remaining settlements Fenny Compton, Long Itchington, Newbold, Salford Priors &amp; Stockton.</p>
---	---

<b>2 Landscape</b> To protect, enhance & manage the		--?	--?	-	-	+	-	-	0?	0	-
--	--	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---

<p>character &amp; appearance of the landscape &amp; townscape, maintaining and strengthening distinctiveness and its special qualities</p>	<p><b>Scenario 1:</b> About 48% of the Amber sites were found to have likely major negative effects due to medium/high landscape sensitivity; about 33% of the sites were found to have minor negative effects and there was uncertainty or neutral effects regarding the remaining 19% of Amber sites. Overall, including all the Amber sites in the SAP could have cumulative major negative effects for certain settlements and the District in parts and as a whole. At this stage the possibilities for mitigation are not known but it would be reasonable to assume that mitigation for major negative effects is likely to be difficult and/or expensive. As there are amber site options with only minor negative effects that might be easier to mitigate, the SAP could consider excluding those sites that were found by the SA to have likely major negative effects. Core Strategy Policy CS.5 seeks to maintain the character and quality of landscape and includes a requirement to consider the cumulative impacts of development proposals. Therefore, there should be adequate mitigation measures through policy.</p> <p>There are specific settlements where cumulative effects on landscape may be a particular issue through the high proportion of sites with potential major negative effects<sup>7</sup> – Alderminster, Bishops Itchington, Brailes, Clifford Chambers, Ettington, Fenny Compton, Gaydon, Harbury, Mappleborough Green, Moreton Morrell, Priors Marston, Quinton, Shipston, Stockton, Stratford-upon-Avon (SUA), &amp; Wellesbourne. Overall, possible minor negative effects that could be mitigated towards neutral effects. Some uncertainty until further detailed studies at project level; however, Policy CS.5 provides mitigation measures including for cumulative impacts.</p> <p><b>Scenario 2:</b> Excluding sites in LSVs category 4 reduces the approximate proportion of sites with major negative effects to 40%; excluding LSVs 4 &amp; 3 to 34%, excluding LSVs 4, 3 &amp; 2 to 31%, and excluding all LSVs &amp; the 2 LRSs to 18%. Whilst the possibilities of mitigation measures are not known at this stage, there could still be cumulative negative effects for Scenario 2a – with uncertainty. It is considered that the reduction to some 34% major negative sites in Scenario 2b &amp; 31% in scenario 2c is likely to reduce overall effects closer to minor negative effects for the district overall, although there may still be issues for major cumulative effects at settlements such as Fenny Compton, Harbury, SUA, &amp; Stockton. It is considered that excluding more LSVs in Scenarios 2d will reduce the major negative effects still further with issues for cumulative effects remaining only for SUA &amp; Wellsbourne. Therefore, excluding development from the LSVs &amp; LRSs in Scenario 2d will have both minor positive effects for all the LSVs through avoidance &amp; minor negative effects for the remaining SUA &amp; MRCs.</p> <p><b>Scenario 3:</b> Excluding Amber Sites with capacities of &lt;30 or &lt;100 dwellings is unlikely to affect the overall implications for effects on landscape &amp; townscape as these depend upon the scale &amp; location of sites for potential cumulative negative effects. Overall, likely minor negative effects for Scenario 3a as it might be assumed that the quantum of proposed development overall is still comparatively high. For Scenario 3b, the quantum of proposed development is reduced to a comparatively smaller number of 2,285 dwellings indicating possibilities for an insignificant or neutral effect with uncertainty at this stage as effectiveness of mitigation measures is not known.</p> <p>It might be considered that the larger sites of &gt;100 dwellings are more likely to have the potential for negative effects on landscape but the scale of such sites may enable greater provision of green infrastructure &amp; implementation of mitigation/enhancement measures with further positive effects that could be secured through site-specific requirements.</p> <p><b>Scenario 4:</b> Excluding NDPs (made or to referendum) reduces the proportion of sites with major negative effects to some 34% - as this is dispersed through the district, it may be considered to be a minor negative effect overall – with uncertainty</p>
---	---

	<p>for cumulative effects for remaining settlements of Alderminster, Bishops Itchington, Clifford Chambers, Fenny Compton, Gaydon, Mappleborough Green, Morton Morrell, Priors Marston, Quinton, Stockton, &amp; Tysoe. Mitigation measures could include selection of those sites that would avoid or minimise any cumulative adverse effects &amp; minimising selection of sites in these settlements. Minor positive effects for the NDPs through avoidance. Overall quantum of proposed development is comparatively less at 2,421 dwellings indicating possibilities for an insignificant or neutral effect with uncertainty at this stage as effectiveness of mitigation measures is not known.</p> <p><b>Scenario 5:</b> Excluding settlements where provision in CS.16 has been exceeded reduces the proportion of sites with major negative effects to some 23%. As this is dispersed throughout the district, it may be considered to approach minor negative effects overall but with some uncertainty for cumulative effects for the remaining settlements Clifford Chambers, Halford, Hampton Lucy, Ilmington, Long Compton, Loxley, Pillerton Priors, Priors Marston, Mappleborough Green, Napton, Tredington &amp; Tysoe.</p>									
<p><b>3 Biodiversity &amp; Geodiversity</b> To protect, enhance &amp; manage</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="853 587 987 753">+?</td> <td data-bbox="987 587 1122 753">+</td> <td data-bbox="1122 587 1256 753">+</td> <td data-bbox="1256 587 1391 753">+</td> <td data-bbox="1391 587 1525 753">+</td> <td data-bbox="1525 587 1659 753">+?</td> <td data-bbox="1659 587 1794 753">+++</td> <td data-bbox="1794 587 1928 753">+</td> <td data-bbox="1928 587 2058 753">+?</td> </tr> </table>	+?	+	+	+	+	+?	+++	+	+?
+?	+	+	+	+	+?	+++	+	+?		

<sup>7</sup> Estimated as those with more than about 50% of sites identified as with potential for major negative effects

<p>biodiversity &amp; geodiversity</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>8</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 – assumed to be minor positive at this stage. 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. No Amber sites are affected by SSSIs or any other national designation.</p> <p>There are only 13 sites with indicative minor negative effects for biodiversity due to the proximity of the site option to a Local Wildlife Site – with uncertainty as to the effectiveness of mitigation possibilities. This relates to around 10% of the sites &amp; is considered to be insignificant for the district as a whole. Only 2 settlements included more than 50% potential minor negative effects – Studley &amp; Loxley (each for 2 out of a total of 2 sites) – and care may be needed to avoid any cumulative effects in these areas.</p> <p><b>Scenario 1:</b> Due to the higher quantum of proposed development at 5,113 dwellings, the extent of the effectiveness of mitigation measures and the precise significance of minor positive effects is uncertain.</p> <p><b>Scenario 2:</b> Minor positive effects indicated for each sub-scenario but some uncertainty for Scenario 2a with higher quantum of development at 4,485 dwellings.</p> <p><b>Scenario 3:</b> A focus that excludes the smaller sites &lt;30 dwellings in Scenario 3a equates to housing numbers of 3,659 dwellings that 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 settlements. A focus on the larger sites &gt;100 dwellings in Scenario 3b could increase the possibilities for biodiversity enhancement as larger sites may be more able to provide enhancements including those that link into wider networks with wider multi-functional benefits. Potential for comparative major positive effects but with uncertainty at this stage.</p> <p><b>Scenario 4:</b> Minor positive effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario 5:</b> The dwelling numbers indicated of 3,396 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>
--	--

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

<p><b>4 Flooding</b>                  To reduce the risk of flooding</p>		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<p><b>5 Traffic</b>                  To minimise the district's</p>		-?	0	0	0	+	-	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. All scenarios are likely to have neutral effects due to strong policy requirements.

Only 10 sites were identified as having potential minor negative effects for flooding due to part of the site being in a flood risk zone. This represents only 8% of the site options overall & is considered to be insignificant. Mitigation measures include avoiding that part of the site for developable land & provision of sustainable drainage designs.

<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 two 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>The SA of Amber sites identified some potential minor negative effects for some sites in some settlements – associated with concerns about access to the highway – and possibilities for mitigation measures are uncertain at this stage. Most sites were found to have likely neutral effects. Some 19% of sites overall were found to have minor negative effects – these are dispersed through the district and include the two LRSs. Only 5 settlements included more than 50% of Amber sites with potential access issues – Henley, Mappleborough Green, Oxhill – and SUA.</p> <p><b>Scenario 1:</b> Due to the higher quantum of proposed development at 5,113 dwellings with all the Amber sites included, there is the potential for increased traffic &amp; emissions with minor negative effects overall - although the 19% proportion of sites with minor negative effects approaches less significance &amp; perhaps nearing more neutral effects. Some uncertainty at this stage as the mitigation possibilities are unknown.</p> <p><b>Scenario 2:</b> Neutral effects indicated for each sub-scenario as most settlements with minor negative effects are excluded. Minor positive effects indicated for Scenario 2d that will result in reduced emissions overall – particularly for the rural areas - through 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 networks.</p> <p><b>Scenario 3:</b> Likely minor negative effects for the more dispersed option that excludes dwellings &lt;30 &amp; proposed development accrues to 3,659 dwellings. Likely insignificant/neutral effects for &lt;100 dwellings &amp; proposed development that accrues to lower numbers of 2,285 dwellings with less emissions overall.</p> <p><b>Scenario 4:</b> The made NDPs are in settlements that are fairly dispersed throughout the District such that significant cumulative effects are not likely. Therefore, 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 5:</b> The dwelling numbers indicated of 3,396 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 minor negative effects overall as sites are dispersed &amp; with greater reliance on vehicular transport with increased emissions.</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> To plan for the anticipated levels of 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><b>Scenarios 1-5:</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. 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>9</sup>, including opportunities for positive synergistic and cumulative effects, for example, providing links between green spaces &amp; sustainable transport routes.</p> <p><b>Scenario 1:</b> Due to the higher quantum of proposed development at 5,113 dwellings, the extent of the effectiveness of mitigation measures and the precise significance of minor positive effects is uncertain.</p> <p><b>Scenario 2:</b> Minor positive effects indicated for each sub-scenario but some uncertainty for Scenario 2a with higher quantum of development at 4,485 dwellings.</p> <p><b>Scenario 3:</b> A focus on the smaller sites 30-100 &amp; &gt;100 equates to housing numbers of 3,155 dwellings 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 settlements. A focus on the larger sites &gt;100 dwellings in Scenario 3b could increase the possibilities for GI provision &amp; enhancement as larger sites may be more able to provide enhancements including those that link into wider networks (such as for sustainable transport) with wider multi-functional benefits. Potential for comparative major positive effects but with uncertainty at this stage.</p> <p><b>Scenario 4:</b> Minor positive effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario 5:</b> The dwelling numbers indicated of 3,396 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>										

<sup>9</sup> <https://apps.warwickshire.gov.uk/api/documents/WCCC-863-513>

<b>7<sup>10</sup> Minerals;                  Agriculture</b>		-?	-?	-?	-	-?	-?	-?	+	-	+	-?	0?	0	+	0	+	-	+?
--	--	----	----	----	---	----	----	----	---	---	---	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	----

<sup>10</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>11</sup>. Some 59% of the Amber sites were found to have major negative effects due to the entire site being located within an area safeguarded for minerals; a further 6% of the sites were found to be partially in a minerals safeguarding area (MSA) with minor negative effects. It is not known whether there would be any significant effects at this stage, so some uncertainty. None of the sites is affected by an allocation for mineral extraction in Warwickshire County Council's Minerals Plan. It is assumed that development would be restricted on any sites shown to be viable for mineral extraction, so mitigation measures in place – minor negative effects with uncertainty.</p> <p><b>Scenario 1:</b> With all the Amber sites &amp; some 59% located in MSAs, negative effects are indicated with the proposed quantum of development at 5,113 dwellings. None of the sites is affected by an allocation for mineral extraction in Warwickshire County Council's Minerals Plan. It is assumed that development would be restricted on any sites shown to be viable for mineral extraction, so mitigation measures in place – minor negative effects with uncertainty.</p> <p><b>Scenario 2:</b> Similarly, with Scenario 2a &amp; proposed development of 4,485 dwellings, negative effects are potentially indicated overall. The quantum of development in Scenario 2b is reduced to 4,339 dwellings such that the proportion of those sites with potential major negative effects may be reduced but uncertainty at this stage. Further reductions in numbers of sites with Scenario 2c indicate that the overall effects might be reduced to minor negative but uncertainty; for Scenario 2d, numbers are reduced to 2,859 dwellings indicating likely neutral effects as sits in the rural areas would be avoided.</p> <p><b>Scenario 3:</b> Exclusion of the small sites with &lt;30 dwelling capacity in Scenario 3a may reduce the number of sites with major negative effects for location in MSAs – to minor negative effects but with some uncertainty at this stage. Removal of all sites &lt;100 capacity will exclude many of the sites located within MSAs thus indicating neutral effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario 4:</b> Avoids all made NDPs &amp; those at referendum – and this includes about one third of the settlements that have major negative effects through location in MSAs, thus reducing the negative effects to approach insignificance &amp; overall, taking into account the lower quantum of development, likely neutral effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario 5:</b> Excluding sites that have exceeded dwelling provision in CS.16 removes some of the sites located in MSAs &amp; reduces the significance of negative effects to minor overall.</p> <p>The new draft Minerals Plan<sup>12</sup> (November 2019) that was submitted for independent examination includes Policy MCS5 that defines the Mineral Safeguarding Areas to ensure that Warwickshire's sand and gravel, crushed rock, brick-making clay resources, cement raw materials and building stone will be safeguarded against needless sterilisation by non-minerals development, unless "prior extraction". Policy DM10 advises that non-mineral development must demonstrate that it will not sterilise mineral resources or prejudice the use of existing or future mineral sites or infrastructure. Therefore, overall &amp; for each scenario, effects will be neutral since policy mitigation measures would have be applied in order to comply with the CS &amp; the Minerals Local Plan.</p>
--	--

---

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/environment/planning/policy/mineralslocalplan/mineralsLocalPlan.aspx>

<sup>12</sup> [https://warwickshire-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/warwickshire\\_minerals\\_plan\\_submission](https://warwickshire-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/warwickshire_minerals_plan_submission)

	<p><b>Agricultural Land:</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>13</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 best &amp; most versatile land (BMVL – Grades 1, 2 &amp; 3a) 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>The SAs of the Amber sites identified that some 16% of the sites would have minor negative effects due to a proportion of the site being BMVL; a further 12% of sites spread amongst 7 settlements would have major negative effects as each whole site is BMVL. There may be mitigation measures possible, such as avoiding those parts of the site that are BMVL &amp; using them for GI. However, overall, this represents some 28% of the sites that would have negative effects that are cumulative &amp; permanent. Avoidance of the sites with major negative effects would reduce the overall negative effects &amp; approach insignificance – Alcester, Bidford-on-Avon, SUA, Salford Priors, Tiddington, Welford-on-Avon &amp; Wellesbourne (it may be noted that these settlements have made NDPs or at referendum).</p> <p>However, some 64% of the Amber sites are on previously developed land or do not contain any BMVL – indicating minor positive effects by avoiding use of the BMVL. This is significant and indicates that overall, negative effects are minimised as far as possible.</p> <p>It may be noted that NE guidance<sup>14</sup> advises that development that would involve the loss of 20 hectares or more of best and most versatile land should be particularly avoided. Many of the Amber sites are relatively small.</p> <p><b>Scenario 1:</b> Due to the higher quantum of proposed development at 5,113 dwellings with all the Amber sites included, there will be some loss of BMVL – about 28% of the sites indicating some minor negative effects but uncertain as there may be effective mitigation measures.</p> <p><b>Scenario 2:</b> The number of sites is reduced to 4,485 dwellings in Scenario 2a &amp; to 4,339 dwellings in Scenario 2b but this is in excess of the requirements for around 2,920 dwellings &amp; therefore, minor negative effects indicated for loss of some BMVL. Scenarios 2c &amp; 2d involve removal of many of the sites that include BMVL in part &amp; therefore, minor positive effects indicated – uncertainty for 2c due to the quantum of development; certainty for 2d due the smaller numbers.</p> <p><b>Scenario 3:</b> Exclusion of the small sites with &lt;30 dwelling capacity in Scenario 3a may reduce the number of sites with BMVL – perhaps approaching neutral overall; exclusion of all sites &lt;100 capacity will remove most of the sites with BMVL thus confirming at least minor positive effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario 4:</b> Avoids all made NDPs &amp; those at referendum – and this includes the settlements that have major negative effects through loss of BMVL, thus reducing the negative effects to approach insignificance &amp; overall, taking into account the lower quantum of development, minor positive effects.</p> <p><b>Scenario 5:</b> Excluding sites that have exceeded dwelling provision in CS.16 removes some 60% of the sites with major negative effects, thus overall reducing negative effects to minor positive with some uncertainty due to the quantum of development.</p>
--	---

	Mitigation measures could include avoiding those sites that include all or part BMVL – and thus confirming minor positive effects, including cumulative, overall, for the district.																				
<b>8 Air Quality (AQ); Water Quality (WQ)</b>		-?	0	-?	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	-?	0	0	0	0	-?	0

<sup>13</sup> Best and most versatile land (BMVL grades 1-3a)

<sup>14</sup><https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/agricultural-land-assess-proposals-for-development/guide-to-assessing-development-proposals-on-agricultural-land>

<p>To reduce air, soil and water pollution</p>	<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 effects tend to align with effects predicted for traffic (see previously SA No 5) - but depends on precise scale &amp; location. The SA of the Amber sites found that most sites had neutral effects on air quality; only the sites in Stratford-upon-Avon (SUA) were identified to have negative effects &amp; these to be major as SUA has an AQMA. Therefore, 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. Overall, cumulative effects likely to align with those identified for traffic – with mostly neutral effects - minor negative effects but uncertain at this stage for Scenarios 1, 3a &amp; 5; minor positive effects indicated for Scenario 2d as the proposed development focused on certain settlements avoids dispersal through the rural areas &amp; more dependence on vehicular movement.</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. The SA of the Amber sites identified sites in settlements that are within a water safeguarding zone – Bishops Itchington, Fenny Compton, Harbury, Long Itchington, Priors Marston, Southam, Stockton, &amp; Tiddington – representing about 27% of all the sites. It is considered that mitigation measures will be able to be implemented through design &amp; pollution control measures resulting in likely neutral effects for all scenarios.</p>																				
<p><b>9 Waste</b> To reduce waste generation and disposal</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td style="background-color: #1a3d54; color: white; text-align: center;">0</td> </tr> </table>										0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0											
<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>																					

<b>10 Accessibility &amp; Transport</b> To Improve the efficiency of		+?	+?	+?	+	+	+	+	+	+
---	--	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---

<p>transport networks by increasing the proportion of travel by sustainable modes and by promoting policies which reduce the 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. Policies CS.7 GI, CS.9 Design, &amp; CS.26 Transport provide mitigation measures that seek to avoid unacceptable transport impacts &amp; promote sustainable transport modes. 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>Some 66% of the Amber sites were found to have minor positive effects for access to sustainable transport modes (within 400m of bus stop) &amp; proximity to key facilities &amp; services (within 800m). 27% of the sites dispersed amongst 19 settlements were identified to have minor negative effects with a further 4% in 4 settlements found to have major negative effects since access to sustainable transport is not within 400m of a bus stop &amp; is beyond 800m for existing facilities/services.</p> <p><b>Scenario 1:</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. With some 66% of the sites found to be minor positive for accessibility, overall – the positive effects are reduced for this scenario including all the sites with some uncertainty for the precise significance. Only 6 settlements have more than 50% less accessible sites – Bidford-on-Avon, Halford, Mappleborough Green, Moreton Morrell, Priors Marston, Napton &amp; Oxhill.</p> <p><b>Scenario 2:</b> The number of sites is reduced to 4,485 dwellings in Scenario 2a &amp; to 4,339 dwellings in Scenario 2b – and with corresponding likely reductions in positive &amp; negative effects indicating minor positive effects overall but with some uncertainty for the precise significance at this stage. For Scenario 2c, most of the settlements with minor negative effects are excluded, thus confirming the overall minor positive effects; for Scenario 2d – all settlements are excluded &amp; minor positive effects confirmed.</p> <p><b>Scenario 3:</b> Excluding sites &lt;30 dwelling capacity removes many of the sites with negative effects indicating minor positive effects overall &amp; for most settlements. Excluding sites &lt;100 dwellings capacity removes most of the sites (one exception is SOU.04) with negative effects confirming minor positive effects overall &amp; for each settlement.</p> <p><b>Scenario 4:</b> Excluding sites in made NDPs or those at referendum, reduces the proportion of sites with minor negative effects to some 22%; the quantum of development is reduced to 2,421 indicating that likely minor positive effects overall &amp; for each settlement.</p> <p><b>Scenario 5:</b> Excluding sites in LSVs that have exceeded dwelling provision in Core Strategy CS.16 removes many of the sites with minor negative effects, confirming minor positive effects overall &amp; for most settlements.</p> <p>Mitigation measures could include focusing new development on those settlements with good public transport &amp; opportunities for GI/sustainable transport networks &amp; linkages – and excluding those sites in the 6 settlements where poorer accessibility is more than 50% of the sites. It is possible that larger developments can support/promote more sustainable transport.</p>
---	---

<p><b>11 Rural Communities</b> To reduce barriers for those 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>15</sup>, there may be significant potential cumulative effects for the rural areas.</p> <p><b>Scenario 1:</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 2:</b> Apportioning reserve sites to higher categories of settlements (Stratford-upon-Avon SUA, the Main Rural Centres &amp; the 2 new settlements) &amp; excluding sites in LSVs &amp; the LRSs would limit opportunities for these settlements in the rural areas with major negative effects for settlements &amp; the rural area of the district as a whole. Excluding all LSVs 1-4 &amp; the Large Rural Sites would have a major negative effect on the overall rural area of the district for Scenario 2d. Only 5 LSVs would be included in Scenario 2c, so likely similar major negative effects with some uncertainty. Minor negative effects indicated for Scenarios 2b &amp; 2a with some uncertainty of significance for 2a that excludes all the LSVs category 4 – reflecting the smaller settlements with particularly rural areas.</p> <p><b>Scenario 3:</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 negative effects that might be minor for &lt;30 and for &lt;100 dwellings – some uncertainty as depends on precise site &amp; location.</p> <p><b>Scenario 4:</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 5:</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 3,396 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>										

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.stratford.gov.uk/doc/208689/name/CS18%20AH%20Position%20Statement%20Sept%2019%20.pdf>

<b>12 Settlement Identity</b> To protect character & separate identity - Protect the integrity of the district's countryside		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Core Strategy Area Strategies SA.1-AS.11 provide guidance to protect the character & identity of key settlements. Most of the Amber sites were found to have minor positive effects for settlement identity – development would enhance the character of the settlements & have a minor or no contribution to defining & maintaining the separate identity of the settlement. Only 6 sites in 5 settlements were found to have minor negative effects – representing 5% of the Amber sites; a further 4 sites in 2 settlements were identified to have major negative effects. Of all these sites, only Mappleborough Green had a significant proportion with all 3 Amber sites having major negative effects since they do not follow the extant settlement boundary & may adversely affect identity with neighbouring settlements. <b>Scenarios 1-5:</b> For all scenarios, with over 90% of sites having minor positive effects – such effects are indicated overall and for all settlements with the exception of Mappleborough Green.									
<b>13 Housing</b> To provide affordable, environmentally sound & good quality for all	<b>13A Total Housing (TH) capacity</b>	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++	++
	<b>13B Affordable Housing (AH) capacity<sup>16</sup></b>	++	++	++	++	+	++	+	+	++?

<sup>16</sup> Calculated to be around 18 dwellings which approximates to 35 % of total in accordance with the Policy CS.18

	<p>All scenarios have the potential for 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>All sites were found through SA to have at least minor positive effects for total housing capacity; some 17% of sites were identified as having major positive effects for housing since they provide &gt;50 dwellings per site. These 17% of sites dispersed within 9 settlements &amp; the 2 LRSs also provide major positive effects with regard to affordable housing. In consideration of the particular issue of AH &amp; deliverability through the SAP, this proportion is considered to be significant. Some 10% of the sites were unable to meet the threshold of 18 AH dwellings and as such were considered to have minor negative effects – again, due to the issue of AH throughout the district, this proportion is considered to be significant.</p> <p><b>Scenario 1:</b> Major positive effects indicated for the whole of the district as including all Amber sites would provide for dwellings in excess of the objectively identified needs – 5,113 dwellings compared to requirement of around 2,920 homes.</p> <p><b>Scenario 2:</b> Scenarios 2a &amp; 2b with quanta of proposed development at 4,485 &amp; 4,339 dwellings – major positive effects for total housing likely as the amount of housing exceeds the required need; proportionately, it is assumed that sites with minor negative effects for AH could be avoided &amp; sites with major positive effects could be encouraged such that major positive effects for AH would be achieved through the quanta of development.</p> <p>Scenario 2c excludes sites in LSV category 2 which reduces the numbers of sites with minor negative effects for AH to some 6% (in Fenny Compton, Lighthorne &amp; Napton), although also removing the site in Fenny Compton that has major positive for AH. However, overall – major positive effects retained for both categories of housing.</p> <p>Scenario 2d excludes sites in LSV1 which would remove one site in Quinton &amp; the two LRSs – this reduces the amount of AH &amp; with only 2,859 dwellings provided overall could reduce the positive effects to only minor significance.</p> <p><b>Scenario 3:</b> Excluding sites &lt;30 dwellings in Scenario 3a removes those sites with minor negative effects due to no provision of any AH &amp; thus confirming major positive effects overall &amp; for each settlement. Excluding sites &lt;100 dwellings in Scenario 3b removes the sites with minor negative effects for AH but also removes those sites with 50-100 dwellings that will have major positive effects for housing – 6 sites in the Main Rural Centres, 1 in LSV2, 1 LRS, and 1 in SUA - reducing the major positive effects to around 10%. 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. Therefore, overall positive effects for AH reduced to minor significance.</p> <p><b>Scenario 4:</b> Excluding sites in made NDPs or those at referendum, reduces the quantum of development to 2,421 dwellings indicating &amp; this would not meet the required need for 2,920 dwellings. Therefore, overall positive effects for AH reduced to minor significance. Settlements excluded would be Alcester, Bidford-on-Avon, SUA &amp; Wellesbourne – all with sites providing major positive effects for AH; also, Ilmington &amp; Loxley with 3 sites that are too small to provide any AH &amp; minor negative effects.</p>
--	--

	<p><b>Scenario 5:</b> Excluding sites in LSVs that have exceeded dwelling provision in Core Strategy CS.16 removes 9 sites in 7 settlements with minor negative effects due to their small size &amp; no provision of AH. However, excluding these settlements removes 19 sites in 7 settlements that were found to have major positive effects for AH – Alcester, Bidford-on-Avon, Quinton, Shipston, Southam, SUA &amp; Wellesbourne. Whilst the overall quantum for this scenario of 3,396 dwellings exceeds the required need of some 2,920 dwellings, the exclusion of these sites that can provide major positive effects for AH introduces some uncertainty to the AH provision for these settlements &amp; the district as a whole.</p> <p>Mitigation measures could comprise selection of those sites that can deliver major positive benefits for AH &amp; excluding those smaller sites that do not provide for any AH.</p>																				
<p><b>14 Community &amp; Health</b> To safeguard &amp; improve health, safety &amp; well-being</p>	<table border="1" style="width:100%; text-align:center;"> <tr> <td style="background-color:#92d050;">+</td> </tr> </table>										+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+											
<p><b>15 Economy &amp; Employment</b> To develop a dynamic, diverse</p>	<table border="1" style="width:100%; text-align:center;"> <tr> <td style="background-color:#92d050;">+</td> </tr> </table>										+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+											

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.

13 sites spread over 11 settlements were found to have potential minor negative effects due to the proximity of the site to conflicting uses & possible effects on health & wellbeing. Overall, the number of sites with minor negative effects is around 10% & dispersed throughout the district. Therefore, Scenarios 1-5 are all likely to have minor positive effects for all settlements & the district overall; the one exception is Stockton a LSV category 2. Exclusion of these sites in Scenario 2c & 2d would reduce the proportion of negative sites to 8% and dispersed. Mitigation measures may be available.

<p>and knowledge-based economy that excels in innovation with higher value, lower impact activities</p>	<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>All the Amber sites were found to be neutral for SA No 15 as they are indicated for housing development. Nonetheless, it is accepted that provision of good quality housing will support local economies &amp; local employment. The base scenario includes significant employment land with major positive effects; also, some mixed-use proposals – and this is included in each of the Scenarios 1-5. Therefore, overall, minor positive effects indicated for the district as a whole &amp; each scenario.</p>
---	--