

Environmental Report



Yarpole Group Neighbourhood Area

January 2017



**Herefordshire
Council**

Yarpole Group Parish Environmental Report

Contents

Non-technical summary

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Methodology
- 3.0 The SEA Framework
- 4.0 Appraisal of Objectives
- 5.0 Appraisal of Options
- 6.0 Appraisal of Policies
- 7.0 Implementation and monitoring
- 8.0 Next steps

Appendix 1: Initial SEA Screening Report

Appendix 2: SEA Scoping Report incorporating Tasks A1, A2, A3 and A4

Appendix 3: Consultation response from Natural England

Appendix 4: SEA Stage B incorporating Tasks B1, B2, B3 and B4

Appendix 5: Consultation response to Reg14 draft Environmental Statement

Appendix 6: SEA Stage D – assessing the amendments following Reg14

Appendix 7: Environmental Report checklist

Non-technical summary

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is an important part of the evidence base which underpins Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDP), as it is a systematic decision support process, aiming to ensure that environmental assets, including those whose importance transcends local, regional and national interests, are considered effectively in plan making.

The Yarpole group Parish has undertaken to prepare an NDP and this process has been subject to environmental appraisal pursuant to the SEA Directive. Yarpole Group of Parishes comprises the two parishes of Croft with Yarpole and Lucton. They cover a large rural area within the north-west of the County of Herefordshire between the market towns of Leominster (5 miles to the south) and Ludlow (7.5 miles to the north). Hereford, the County town, lies some 18 miles to the South.

The Draft Yarpole Group NDP includes 5 objective topics and it is intended that these objectives will be delivered by 16 planning policies; with three site allocations across the villages.

The environmental appraisal of the Yarpole group NDP has been undertaken in line with the Environmental Assessment of Plan and Programmes Regulations 2004. Stage A of the SEA process involved Scoping and Stage B provided a review and analysis of the NDP. Stage C involved preparing an Environmental Report and Stage D comprises a formal consultation on both this and the Draft Plan itself.

Following the draft plan and the Environmental Report consultation, 11 policies were amended. These have been reassessed within this report.

Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening has been carried out as the Group Parish falls within the catchment for the River Wye (including River Lugg), and is within 10km of Downton Gorge both of which are European sites (Special Area of Conservation). The HRA assesses the potential effects of the NDP on the River Wye SAC and Downton Gorge.

On the whole, it is considered that the Yarpole group NDP is in general conformity with both national planning policy contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and strategic policies set within the Herefordshire Local Plan (Core Strategy). Nor does it propose any growth that would be over and above that prescribed by strategic policies.

Once made (adopted) by Herefordshire Council, the effects of the policies within the Yarpole group NDP will be monitored annually via the Council's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This report forms the draft Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Yarpole group Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).
- 1.2 The Yarpole group NDP proposes three site allocations, each of the villages of Yarpole, Bircher and Lucton identified within table 4.14 which is targeted for the main levels of proportional levels of growth in Policy RA1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan (Core Strategy). The NDP will also provide general policies for guiding future development across the parish as a whole.

Purpose of the SEA

- 1.3 SEA is a requirement of EC Directive 2001/42/EC (the SEA Directive) which requires the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment to ensure that the proposals in that plan or programme contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.
- 1.4 The Directive was transposed into domestic legislation through the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 and which applies to plans with significant environmental effects.
- 1.5. A screening opinion was carried out on the Yarpole group NDP and it concluded that due to the range of environmental designations in and around the parish, there may be significant environmental effects and consequently an SEA would be required.

Parish Neighbourhood Plan Context

- 1.6 Yarpole Group of Parishes comprises the two parishes of Croft with Yarpole and Lucton. They cover a large rural area within the north-west of the County of Herefordshire between the market towns of Leominster (5 miles to the south) and Ludlow (7.5 miles to the north). Hereford, the County town, lies some 18 miles to the South. Three settlements of any notable size lie within the Group parish and these are Bircher, Lucton and Yarpole.
- 1.7 The population of the Group Parish increased from 608 in 1991 to 703 in 2001 and to 787 in 2011. Its age structure indicates there is a high proportion of elderly present.
- 1.8 The neighbourhood area boasts many natural features, not least 2 SSSIs and 4 Special Wildlife Sites. There are numerous built heritage assets, too, including listed buildings, two Scheduled Monuments and non-designated assets.
- 1.9 The vision for Yarpole group in 2031 is as follows:
- ‘Yarpole Group Parish will be a parish where an excellent quality of life is available to all, where people are valued and there are homes, businesses and facilities to meet the needs of our vibrant rural community.’
- 1.10 The 5 topic NDP objectives are as follows:
1. *Housing* - Policies incorporated in the plan will ensure that new housing contributes to a sustainable and balanced community;
 2. *Roads and Traffic* - Within the Plan will be proposals to reduce the effects of traffic on the community;
 3. *Sustainable Environment* - The plan's policies will give a high priority to ensuring the environment contributes significantly towards sustainable development;
 4. *Opportunities for Employment* - The Plan will enable more people to work where they live or closer to their homes;

5. *Community services and facilities* - Community spirit will be fostered by maintaining and supporting existing services and facilities and encouraging new and improved provisions

Context of Neighbourhood Plans

- 1.11 NDPs are a relatively new type of planning document that form a key part of the Government's localism agenda. They enable local communities to develop plans that reflect local aspirations, in accordance with strategic policies.
- 1.12 The Yarpole group NDP must therefore conform to national planning policy set within the NPPF and strategic level local policy including the Herefordshire Local Plan (Core Strategy).
- 1.13 The Herefordshire Local Plan (Core Strategy) was adopted on the 16th October 2015.
- 1.14 Paragraph 216 of the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance set out the weight that may be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, including NDPs, and indicated that weight may be given to relevant policies in emerging NDPs according to:
- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
 - The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
 - The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).
- 1.15 This part of the NPPF is reinforced by Planning Practice Guidance published in March 2014, which is clear that an emerging NDP may be a material planning consideration once it has reached submission/local authorities publication stage (Regulation 16). This is reinforced by recent ministerial statements and case law (West Sussex), all of which have demonstrated that an emerging NDP may be a material consideration at the Regulation 16 stage.
- 1.16 Table 4.14 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy) lists Yarpole, Lucton and Bircher among the settlements which it considers to be the main focus for proportionate housing development in line with the provisions of Policy RA2.
- 1.17 Once made (adopted) by Herefordshire Council, the Yarpole group NDP will have a role in guiding future development proposals within the Parish, by setting out policies against which planning applications will be determined.

Structure of SEA

- 1.19 The structure of the document is as follows:
- Section 2 – Explains the SEA methodology and summarises the comments received in respect of the SEA Scoping Report
 - Section 3 - Introduces the Yarpole group Neighbourhood Plan objectives and the SEA framework
 - Section 4 - Appraises the objectives contained within the Neighbourhood Plan against the SEA framework
 - Section 5 - Appraises the options considered within the Neighbourhood Plan against the SEA framework
 - Section 6 – Appraises the policies contained within the Neighbourhood Plan against the SEA framework

- Section 7 – Discusses the implementation and monitoring of the Neighbourhood Plan
- Section 8 - Concludes the SEA report by outlining next steps

2.0 Methodology

- 2.1 The SEA process comprised several stages and which are summarised, in some detail, below.
- 2.2 Stage A involved 4 tasks and culminated in a Scoping Report:
- *Task A1:* Identified and reviewed relevant policies, plans and programmes and environmental protection objectives from European, National and Local sources.
 - *Task A2:* Collected baseline information to provide a picture of past, present and likely future conditions within the area. This helped to establish indicators which will be used to monitor the effects and performance of the Yarpole group NDP.
 - *Task A3:* Focused on the environmental issues identified from the baseline, highlighting key issues and problems within the neighbourhood area.
 - *Task A4:* Used the information gathered from Tasks A1-A3 to develop a set of SEA objectives, sometimes referred to as the 'sustainability framework'.
 - *Task A5:* Collated the results of Tasks A1-A4 within a Scoping Report, a document which was subject to a statutory 5 week consultation.
- 2.3 Stage B involved 4 tasks and assessed the effects of the NDP.
- *Task B1:* Tested NDP Objectives against the SEA Objectives
 - *Task B2:* Developed and refined the NDP options and policies
 - *Task B3/B4:* Predicted and evaluated the significant effects of the NDP
- 2.4 Stage C involved preparing an Environmental Report. This report presents information compiled during Stage B and Stage D of the SEA process and constitutes the Draft Environmental Appraisal of the NDP. It accompanies the Submission Plan during its formal Regulation 16 consultation with people who live, work and carry out businesses in the neighbourhood area, as well as statutory bodies listed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
- 2.5 Producing an Environmental Report was therefore a legal requirement and the submission of this report to Herefordshire Council forms Stage D of the SEA process.

Scoping Report Consultation

- 2.6 With regard to the SEA scoping assessments, documents A1 to A4 were completed by a Herefordshire Council Planning Officer and sent to the Parish Council for comment, in readiness for a 5 week consultation with statutory bodies, pursuant to the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.
- 2.7 After the document was approved by the Parish Council, the Yarpole group SEA Scoping Report was available to four¹ statutory bodies for consultation from 18 June to 23 July 2015.

¹ Statutory consultation bodies: Natural England; English Heritage; Environment Agency Natural Resources Wales

Consultation outcomes from Statutory Consultees

2.8 The consultation resulted in two detailed responses, which are attached at Appendix 3.

2.9 These responses were collated and incorporated within the scoping report where relevant.

Natural England: Recommends that additional baseline data be sourced in respect of SSSIs, and targets identified for material assets.

English Heritage: generally commendable in approach, particularly the treatment of heritage at risk. No substantive objections to the content, however notice an anomalous reference to SAMs in objective 14.

Environment Agency: Highlighted that they were unable to make specific comments at this time and will comment at Regulation 14 and Regulation 16 stages.

Natural Resources Wales: No comments received

3.0 The SEA Framework

3.1 As mentioned previously, Stage A of the SEA identifies and reviews relevant policies, plans and programmes and environmental protection objectives from European, National and Local sources (refer to Table A1 in Appendix 2 for details of those documents that were reviewed in completing Stage A of SEA on the Yarpole group NDP).

3.2 The requirement to undertake this 'context review' is contained in Annexes 1(a) and (e) of the SEA Directive which states that an Environmental Report should include:

"...an outline of the contents, main objectives of the plan or programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes" and

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

Policy context

3.3 The Yarpole group NDP will deliver the Local Plan (Core Strategy) at parish level by adding locally specific detail to strategic policies. As a consequence, the Scoping Report for the NDP was based on the context review Herefordshire Council undertook for its Local Plan (Core Strategy).

3.4 The results of this assessment (context review) provide the source of the local baseline data and have been incorporated into the SEA framework. It should be noted that:

- No list of policies, plans and programmes can ever be exhaustive and that Herefordshire Council has selected those considered to be of particular relevance to the planning system;
- New or revised plans and policies can emerge during the SEA process

3.5 The following strategies and plans have been reviewed and, where appropriate, incorporated within the SA Framework objectives:

- *The EC Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010)* - These regulations transpose the Habitats Directive in England, Wales and to a limited extent Scotland by ensuring that activities are carried out in accordance with the Habitats Directive,

which is to protect biodiversity through the conservation of natural habitats and species of wild flora and fauna.

- *The EC Water Framework Directive (2000)* - Commits all EU member states to achieve good qualitative and quantitative status of all water courses by 2015
- *The Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981)* - The major legal instrument for wildlife protection in Britain, although other significant acts have been passed since. It has numerous parts and supplementary lists and schedules many of which have been amended since publication.
- *Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services (2011)* - Forms part of the UK's Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework by setting out England's contribution towards the UK's commitments under the United Nations Convention of Biological Diversity.
- *The Countryside and Right of Way Act (2000)* - Creates a statutory right of access on foot to certain types of open land, to modernise the public rights of way system, to strengthen nature conservation legislation, and to facilitate better management of AONBs
 - *The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006)* - Designed to help achieve a rich and diverse natural environment and thriving rural communities through modernised and simplified arrangements for delivering Government policy.
 - *Revised EU Sustainable Development strategy (2009)* - Sets out a single strategy on how the EU will more effectively meet its long-standing commitment to meet the challenges of sustainable development.
 - *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)* - Consolidates the suite of PPG/PPS into one succinct planning policy document.
 - *Planning Practice Guidance (2013)* - Sets out the vision, objectives and policies for the Herefordshire Local Plan (Core Strategy), which will guide development across the county up to 2031.
 - *Herefordshire Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP) 2013-2015* - Sets out the Council's strategy for supporting economic growth, social inclusion and reducing the environmental impacts of transport, as well as the program of investment for the period April 2013 to April 2015.
 - *Understanding Herefordshire Report (2014)* - Important to understand the place such as the local economy natural and built environment in which people live, learn and work as part of understanding their quality of life. Enable development for economy and housing to the required levels and growth should be supported by sustainable transport measures.
 - *Malvern Hills AONB Management Plan 2009-2014 (2009)* - Identifies the issues and challenges facing the special features of the area and contains 24 guiding principles and 46 strategic objectives which will help address them.
 - *Wye Valley AONB management Plan 2009-2014 (2009)* - The Management Plan is the prime document which sets out the vision for the area and the priorities for its management.
 - *Herefordshire Economic Development Strategy 2011-2016* - Aims to increase the economic wealth of Herefordshire by setting out proposals and to support business growth up to 2016.

- *Herefordshire Employment Land Study (2012)* - Includes employment land assessments for the plan period 2011-2031. The study includes Quantitative and Qualitative assessments of employment land, assessment of market demand and need, as well as providing forecasts and recommendations for future employment need over the plan period.
- *Herefordshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2009)* - The SHLAA aims to justify site allocations in plans by:
 - Identifying sites which are capable of delivering housing development
 - Assessing sites for their housing potential; and
 - Predicting when a site could be developed for housing.
- *Herefordshire Local Housing Market Assessment (LHMA) (2013)* - Builds on an earlier Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) developed for Herefordshire and Shropshire. Its purpose is to inform the Local Plan's policies regarding housing need and demand (for market and affordable housing) within each of the 7 Housing Market Areas (HMAs) in Herefordshire between 2011 and 2031.
- *Herefordshire Local Housing Requirements Study (2012)* - Technical assessment of the housing market and potential future local housing requirements which supports planning policy regarding the amount of growth, housing tenure and housing type needed within Herefordshire up to 2031.
- *Herefordshire Rural Housing Background Report (2013)* - Provides the justification for the proportional housing growth targets outlined in the Core Strategy
- *Herefordshire Draft Gypsies and Travellers Assessment (2013)* - Assesses the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers across Herefordshire.
- *Herefordshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan (2007)* - Focuses conservation efforts on the areas within Herefordshire that will result in the greatest benefit for ecological networks, habitats and species.
- *Building Biodiversity into the LDF (2009)* - Provides the Council's Local Plan (Core Strategy) with evidence in respect of biodiversity and geodiversity, identifying both opportunities and constraints across Herefordshire.
- *Herefordshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (2010)* - Develops a framework of natural and culturally important features and functions so that planning for a sustainable future is at the heart of planning within Herefordshire.
- *Renewable Energy Study (2010)* - Assesses the energy demand within Herefordshire and the ability for the county to accommodate renewable and low carbon energy technologies.
- *Herefordshire Playing Pitch Assessment (2012)* - Produces a strategic framework, audit and assessment and needs analysis of outdoor sports pitches and facilities for Herefordshire. The document arises as a result of a recommendation in the Herefordshire and Worcestershire Sports Facilities Framework to develop local standards for playing fields and sports pitches throughout Herefordshire.
- *Open Spaces Study (2006)* - The 2006 space audit and assessment of need is a snap shot of the quality, quantity and distribution of open space across Herefordshire.

- *Play Facilities Study (2012)* - The Play Facilities Study 2012 updates the previous play facilities analysis under the Open Spaces Study 2006 and provides guidance and a framework for the development, delivery and continued sustainability of providing new and improved play facilities for children and young people in Herefordshire to 2031.
- *Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and Water Cycle Study (2009)* - The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) provides a summary of flood risk in Herefordshire to inform the location of future development. The Water Cycle Study examines how water resources and water supply infrastructure, wastewater treatment, water quality, sewerage and flood risk could constrain growth across Herefordshire.

3.6 Appendix 1 of the Yarpole group NDP Scoping Report provides additional detail on the Plans, Policies and Programmes mentioned above and identifies the implications for the SEA and NDP.

SEA Objectives and baseline characteristics

3.7 The SEA objectives that were used at Stages A and B of the process are listed in the following table.

| SEA Objective | |
|---------------|--|
| 1 | To maintain or enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) |
| 2 | To maintain or enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes |
| 3 | To improve the quality of surroundings |
| 4 | To conserve or where appropriate enhance the historic environment and culture heritage |
| 5 | To improve air quality |
| 6 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment |
| 7 | To reduce contributions to climate change |
| 8 | To reduce vulnerability to climate change |
| 9 | To improve water quality |
| 10 | To provide for sustainable sources of water supply |
| 11 | To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk |
| 12 | To conserve soil resources and quality |
| 13 | To minimise the production of waste |
| 14 | To improve the health of the population |
| 15 | To reduce crime and nuisance |
| 16 | To conserve natural and manmade resources |

3.8 The SEA objectives detailed above conform to the SEA Directive, and are derived from the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken for the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011-2031.

3.9 Baseline information gathered during Stage A of the SEA process provided details of the current environmental characteristics of the neighbourhood area and the status of its natural assets and features (refer to Appendix 2). This information was analysed as part of Task B2 of SEA, which looked at the extent to which the emerging NDP policies will help or obstruct these characteristics.

3.10 Following the completion of Task B2 of SEA it was apparent that the one of the largest environmental issues within the Group Parish has an impact on the County as a whole is

water quality; the River Wye (including the River Lugg), though currently meeting all its conservation objectives, will require effective management, in order to ensure that the quality of water does not deteriorate to the point that nutrient targets are missed further downstream.

- 3.11 Although, the NDP proposes that three sites are to be allocated for development and also contains criteria-based policies. The delivery of the NDP should not exacerbate existing problems regarding water quality or have an unacceptable adverse impact due to the level of growth is not exceeding that identified within the Core Strategy RA2 policy.
- 3.12 Baseline characteristics within the SEA detail the current environmental status of environmental characteristics in the neighbourhood plan area from different sources. The source of Baseline Information used in Table A2 in Appendix 2, and analysed in Table B2 can be found in Appendix 4 Baseline characteristics in relation to the Yarpole group NDP SEA objectives are listed below.

| SEA Objective | Baseline Data / Characteristic | Future Baseline trends |
|--|--|--|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data. 2010/11: 27% of Herefordshire's SSSI land was in favourable condition. 04/08/14 – status of the SSSIs are: River Lugg – unfavourable recovering, Fishpool Valley – favourable. The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data. 2010/11: 17 Habitat Action Plans and 14 Species Action Plans are currently in operation across Herefordshire. Yarpole Group has: 2 SSSI and 2 SSSIs bordering the neighbourhood area, 5 SWS. Downton Gorge SAC is 6.5 km away from the Parish. There are no NNRs and SINCs within the parish. | % of SSSI land in favourable condition (Increase) % of SSSI land in unfavourable condition but recovering (Increase) % of SSSI land in unfavourable condition and declining (Decrease) To capitalise on opportunities to enhance the areas of value to nature conservation as much as possible. |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | There are no outstanding enforcement actions or appeals concerning locally important buildings within Yarpole group at present. Yarpole, Bircher and Lucton have conservation areas. | To wherever possible improve upon or otherwise maintain current status. |
| To improve quality of surroundings | In terms of Yarpole Group itself, the study reveals that there are no play areas within the villages. In addition there are currently no hectares of playing pitch area and no hectares of secured community access playing pitch area. | No specific targets identified |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | Whilst there is no qualitative, locally specific data available at present, there is one scheduled monument in Yarpole Group, with a further SAM on the border of the Parish, according to the latest version of the register. | To wherever possible improve upon or otherwise maintain current status. |
| To improve air quality | Between 2005 and 2010 Herefordshire's total and per capita carbon emission reduced by 7% and 8% respectively; while UK's total and per capita carbon emission reduced by 8% and 12% respectively within the same period. This suggests that air quality is improving. | To reduce the overall carbon emissions. |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | % of Herefordshire residents who travel to work by: Car: 70.1%, Foot: 14.7%, Bicycle: 4.3%, Bus: 2%, Train: 0.8%, Motorbike: 0.8%, Taxi: 0.3%, Other: 7%. | To encourage the take up of lesser polluting modes of transport. |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | Herefordshire latest figure of CO2 emissions per capita-dates back to 2010: 1.61 million tonnes (mtCO ₂) | To reduce the overall carbon emissions. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | Reduce the risk of flooding-There have been no approvals contrary to EA advice since reporting began in 2004.The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data. | To have no applications permitted contrary to EA advice. |
| To improve water quality | Percentage of river length assessed as good or very good chemical quality and ecological quality as required by the Water Framework Directive. Latest figure dates back to 2005: 84%. | To ensure that rivers meet their conservation objectives and do not fall below the required standard of quality. New development within the area could lead to the water quality failing the phosphate levels and conservation objectives. |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | Staunton Group parish falls into the Herefordshire Conjunctive Use Water Resource Zones (WRZs), one of 6 zones covering Herefordshire. 39% of demand is from non-household use. | No specific targets identified |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on flood defence grounds. The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data. | To have no applications permitted contrary to EA advice. |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | Around the parish of Yarpole Group the soil classification is Grades 2 and 3, with a small area of poor (Grade 4) in the east and very poor (Grade 5) in the north west. Percentage of all new development completed on previously developed land.2010/11: 67%2011-13: 57%. | Measure the number of hectares of best and most versatile soil lost through development To increase the number of homes built on PDL in line with the provisions of national planning policy |
| To minimise the production of waste | No baseline data available | No specific targets identified. |
| To improve health of the population | No baseline data available | No specific targets identified. |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | No baseline data available | No specific targets identified. |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | There are numerous listed buildings within the parish and one SAM within the Parish. There are no outstanding enforcement actions or appeals concerning locally important buildings within Yarpole Group parish at present. 3. The Parish Area has the following landscape types: Principal settled farmlands; Estate Farmlands; with smaller areas of Wet Pasture Meadows to the south of Yarpole and Principal Wooded Hills and Unenclosed Commons to the north. | To wherever possible improve upon or otherwise maintain current status. |

3.13 There are three objectives for which there is no local baseline data available and therefore this provides a limitation on the baseline data and whether the NDP policies are able to move towards or away from this data, this also means that there are no future trends to link the SEA objective too.

4.0 Assessing the NDP Objectives

4.1 The table below tests the NDP objectives, detailed in paragraph 1.10 above, against the SEA objectives, providing a summary of the results of Task B1 of SEA. The full results are available at Appendix 4 of this report.

4.2 The majority of those NDP objectives which have a relationship with the SEA framework are positively compatible with it or some unknown effect.

4.3 It is impossible to appraise the full implications of NDP objective 4 at this stage given the lack of detail over the exact locations of schemes that may come to fruition as a result of the

implementation of these objectives (i.e. type of business and location); however, it is accepted that the planning policies that relate to these objectives would move them towards a compatible outcome given their development criteria.

- 4.4 Although Task B1 of the SEA didn't identify any specific conflicts between the NDP objectives and the SEA framework, there are unknown factors which could become potential conflicts if not mitigated within the policy development.
- 4.5 The potential conflicts could be largely attributed to the possible rise in vehicular movements in remote locations once the NDP objectives have been realised on the ground and the attendant impacts on air quality and both contributions and vulnerability to climate change.

| Key: | |
|------|------------------------------------|
| + | Compatible |
| - | Possible conflict |
| 0 | Neutral |
| X | No relationship between objectives |
| ? | Unclear, more information needed |

| NDP Objectives | SEA Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| Objective 1 | + | + | + | + | x | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | x | x | x | ? |
| Objective 2 | x | x | + | x | + | + | + | ? | x | x | x | ? | x | x | x | ? |
| Objective 3 | + | + | + | + | x | + | + | ? | ? | ? | + | ? | x | x | x | + |
| Objective 4 | ? | x | x | + | x | ? | ? | ? | x | x | ? | ? | x | x | x | ? |
| Objective 5 | x | + | + | + | x | + | x | x | x | x | ? | ? | x | x | x | + |

5.0 Assessing the NDP Options

- 5.1 All options that were considered by Yarpole Group Parish during the development of their Plan have been assessed as part of the SEA, the summary matrix of the assessment can be found in Table B2 options these tables are in Appendix 4.
- 5.2 The options covered were are followed;
- Do nothing.
 - Allocate sites for housing in Yarpole
 - Allocate Sites for housing in Bircher
 - Allocate sites for housing in Lucton
 - Manage future housing using a settlement boundary in Yarpole
 - Manage future housing using a settlement boundary in Bircher
 - Manage future housing using a settlement boundary in Lucton
 - Manage future housing through a development management policy
 - To include a policy on Local Green Space
 - To include a policy on Highway Measures
- 5.3 These options were considered at public consultation events across the Parish. The results of which will feed into the identification of the preferred options and ultimately the draft policies.
- 5.4 A 'do nothing' option was also considered by the Parish, i.e. not undertaking a Neighbourhood Development Plan, however this was disregarded at an early stage by the Parish Council as the majority of the community would support the work undertaken for a Neighbourhood Plan.

- 5.5 The second option of allocation sites for housing in each of the villages was considered. Following this sites have been identified for housing within both Bircher and Yarpole. There was no allocation of sites identified for Lucton as no sites came forward in the call for sites consultation exercise and also there is an absence of facilities with poor road infrastructure around the village.
- 5.6 Pursuing the option of allocation of sites provides greater certainty over future development within the area particularly. If required mitigation criteria can be added to site allocation policies to ensure all SEA objectives are achieved.
- 5.7 The third option of designating settlement boundaries would also have seen a positive effect on the baseline. The designation of a settlement boundary will give additional certainty and help define those areas considered as the built form and open countryside. This can aid the direction of further growth to maintain the quality of the landscape and surroundings. All of the villages within the Group Parish have a designated settlement boundary.
- 5.8 The option of producing development management criteria policies was partly chosen by the parish council as it will work with the settlement boundary at Lucton. Criteria based policy does not give the same level of certainty as the other options as it will be more reactionary than proactive in terms of growth proposals. However providing criteria is added to the policies to safeguard or mitigate against any harm, the option will have a positive effect on the baseline.
- 5.9 The remaining two options will ensure that there would be further local detail within the NDP policies than what is in existence within the Core Strategy. In addition, protecting the local area around the parish in terms of highway safety and also important green areas / land within the villages.
- 5.10 Overall all of the options had mainly a positive effect on the SEA objectives and baseline, if the policies that are developed incorporated the elements of the options that are ensuring mitigation of new development and additional details are provided for the location and design of any proposed site then the assessment of the policies should result in a positive result. As these options were generally moving towards the SEA objectives any further alternatives would probably be moving away and therefore no further options are required to be assessed.

| NDP Options | SEA Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------------|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| Option 1 | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | | | | x |
| Option 2 | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | + | + | + | + | + | + | ++ | + | | | | ++ |
| Option 3 | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | + | + | + | + | + | + | ++ | + | | | | ++ |
| Option 4 | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | + | + | + | + | + | + | ++ | + | | | | ++ |
| Option 5 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | | | + |
| Option 6 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | | | + |
| Option 7 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | | | + |
| Option 8 | + | + | ? | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | | | + |
| Option 9 | ++ | ++ | + | ++ | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | ++ | | | | ++ |
| Option 10 | ? | + | ? | ? | + | + | + | x | x | x | x | ? | | | | ? |

6.0 Appraisal of the policies

- 6.1 A key part of developing a plan such as the Yarpole Group NDP is developing a range of options and testing these, so that a preferred way forward can be selected.

6.2 The following emerging set of draft policies can be appraised for the purposes of Stage B of the SEA:

- Policy YG1: Promoting Sustainable Development
- Policy YG2: Development Strategy
- Policy YG3: Housing Development in Bircher
- Policy YG4: Proposed land for Housing Development in Bircher
- Policy YG5: Local Green Space in Bircher
- Policy YG6: Housing Development in Lucton
- Policy YG7: Local Green Space in Lucton
- Policy YG8: Housing Development in Yarpole
- Policy YG9: Land off of Croft Crescent
- Policy YG10: Brook House Farm and land to its East
- Policy YG11: Highway Measures at Yarpole
- Policy YG12: Local Green Space in Yarpole
- Policy YG13: Treatment of foul water in Yarpole
- Policy YG14: Development within Conservation Areas
- Policy YG15: Sustainable Design
- Policy YG16: Use of Community Infrastructure Levy

Stage B of SEA

6.3 In the context of Task B1 of SEA, the previous section of this report identified that many of the NDP objectives are compatible with the SEA framework, while others had either a neutral impact, no relationship with the SEA objectives or if needed; further information such as location of development. Additional policy safeguards within the NDP and Local Plan (Core Strategy) would help mitigate any possible conflicts.

6.4 With regard to Task B2 of SEA, the NDP policies were measured against both the SEA framework and the baseline characteristics identified during Stage A of the process; there was no baseline data available in respect of SEA Objectives 13, 14 and 15. Full details of this appraisal are attached at Appendix 4.

6.5 The policies largely score as positive or neutral against the SEA objectives and will not, therefore, have an adverse impact on the baseline characteristics or immediate environmental impacts. This is because they are criteria based policies which only consider schemes on their own merits, as and when planning applications are submitted to the local planning authority.

6.6 There are some unknown factors, particularly where the type, number and mix of housing development that may come forward is not yet known.

| NDP Policies | SEA Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| Policy YG1 | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | + | + | ? | x | x | x | ? | + | x | x | x | ++ |
| Policy YG2 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | + | + | x | x | 0 |
| Policy YG3 | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | x | x | 0 |
| Policy YG4 | ? | + | + | + | + | ? | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | - | x | x | x | + |
| Policy YG5 | ++ | ++ | + | ++ | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | ++ | + | + | + | ++ |

| NDP Policies | SEA Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| Policy YG6 | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | x | x | 0 |
| Policy YG7 | ++ | ++ | + | ++ | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | ++ | + | + | + | ++ |
| Policy YG8 | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | x | x | 0 |
| Policy YG9 | ? | + | + | + | + | ? | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | - | x | x | x | + |
| Policy YG10 | ? | + | + | + | + | ? | + | ? | ? | ? | + | - | x | x | x | + |
| Policy YG11 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | + | + | + | x | x | x | x | 0 | + | + | + |
| Policy YG12 | ++ | ++ | + | ++ | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | ++ | + | + | + | ++ |
| Policy YG13 | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | + | + | + | x | x | x | x | x |
| Policy YG14 | + | ++ | + | ++ | 0 | x | x | x | x | x | + | + | x | x | x | + |
| Policy YG15 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | + | x | x | x | + |
| Policy YG16 | + | + | + | + | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | ? |

- 6.7 The results of Task B3, as shown at Appendix 4, demonstrate that the cumulative impact of the NDP policies over the course of the plan period is generally positive. Although some policies may have a neutral or uncertain impact during the first 5 years of the plan period, there is no reason why they cannot have a positive effect in the medium to long-term due to policy safeguards included in the Local Plan (Core Strategy); these safeguards should avoid or mitigate against unacceptable adverse impacts.
- 6.8 Task B4 of SEA brings together the results of earlier tasks and thus identifies the cumulative impact of the entire of the NDP. This task, which is also attached at Appendix 4, reveals that the objectives and policies contained in the Yarpole Group NDP are in general conformity with the Local Plan (Core Strategy), which means that the cumulative effect of the plan will contribute to the achievement of the SEA objectives.
- 6.9 None of the NDP policies are considered to be in direct conflict with or propose greater levels of growth and development than strategic policies contained in the Local Plan (Core Strategy), which themselves have undergone a full Sustainability Appraisal.

Stage D – assessment of the amendments following the Reg 14 draft consultation

- 6.10 As mentioned previously 11 policies have been refined following the draft plan consultation which took place 6 June to 17 July 2016. These changes were necessitated by comments received during the consultation period rather than specific comments made to the Environment Report.
- 6.11 The following policies have been amended between the draft and submission version of the NDP and reassessed:
- Policy YG1: Promoting Sustainable Development
 - Policy YG3: Housing Development in Bircher
 - Policy YG4: Proposed land for Housing Development in Bircher
 - Policy YG6: Housing Development in Lucton
 - Policy YG8: Housing Development in Yarpole
 - Policy YG9: Land off of Croft Crescent
 - Policy YG10: Brook House Farm and land to its East
 - Policy YG11: Highway Measures at Yarpole
 - Policy YG12: Local Green Space in Yarpole
 - Policy YG14: Development within Conservation Areas
 - Policy YG15: Sustainable Design

- 6.12 In addition to the policies, the settlement boundaries for Bircher and Yarpole have been amended to reflect the associated changes in policies. The settlement boundaries with the plan have been defined using the criteria with the best practice guidance note produced by Herefordshire Council. Therefore this amendments ensure consistency with the given criteria.
- 6.13 The results of the further assessment can be seen in detail within Appendix 6. They reveal that the outcome of the Stage B process mentioned above are unaffected or strengthened by the refinements to these policies.

7.0 Implementation and monitoring

- 7.1 Herefordshire Council as the Local Planning Authority should make arrangements to monitor the significant effects of implementing a neighbourhood plan.
- 7.2 Regulation 17 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 requires the Local Planning Authority to monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of any NDP that was subject to SEA, in order to identify unforeseen adverse effects at an early stage and to enable appropriate remedial actions.
- 7.3 Accordingly, Herefordshire Council will monitor outcomes from the NDP policies and the results of these will be reported in the Council's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).
- 7.4 The AMR runs from 1 April to 31 March each year and the topics covered therein include the following:
- Housing delivery;
 - Previously developed land
 - Housing completions
 - Affordable housing conditions
 - Employment land delivery.

8.0 Next steps

- 8.1 This report will be subject to a formal public consultation of 6 weeks duration alongside the Submission Yarpole Group NDP.
- 8.2 Responses on the Draft NDP will be reviewed as part of the examination.
- 8.3 Any changes or modifications made to the NDP as a consequence of the examination will trigger a review of the SEA, unless they do not materially affect the outcome of the Stage B of the SEA process.

Appendix 1

**Initial Habitat Regulations Assessment and Strategic Environmental
Assessment Screening Notification**

The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulation 2012 (Reg. 32)

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (d)


| | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Neighbourhood Area: | Yarpole Group Neighbourhood Area |
| Parish Council: | Yarpole Group Parish Council |
| Neighbourhood Area Designation Date: | 21/02/2013 |

Introduction

This Initial Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening has been undertaken to assess whether any European sites exist within or in proximity to the neighbourhood area which could be affected by any future proposals or policies.

Through continual engagement the outcomes of any required assessments will help to ensure that proposed developments will not lead to Likely Significant Effects upon a European Site or cause adverse impacts upon other environmental assets, such as the built historic or local natural environment.

**HRA Initial Screening: Map showing relationship of Neighbourhood Area with European Sites
(not to scale)**



Initial HRA Screening

River Wye (including the River Lugg) SAC:

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Does the Neighbourhood Area have the River Wye (including the River Lugg) in or next to its boundary? | N | The River Wye and River Lugg SAC do not run through the Group Parish |
| Is the Neighbourhood Area in the hydrological catchment of the River Wye (including the River Lugg) SAC? | Y | The Group Parish is within the River Lugg hydrological catchment area. |
| If yes above, does the Neighbourhood Area have mains drainage to deal with foul sewage? | Y | There is mains drainage at Yarpole & Luston |

Downton Gorge SAC:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Is the Neighbourhood Area within 10km of Downton Gorge SAC? | Y | Downton Gorge is 6.5km away from the Group Parish |
|---|---|---|

River Clun SAC:

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Does the Neighbourhood Area include: Border Group Parish Council or Leintwardine Group Parish Council? | N | River Clun does not border the Group Parish |
|--|---|---|

Usk Bat Sites SAC:

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Is the Neighbourhood Area within 10km of the SAC boundary? | N | Usk Bat Sites are 52km away from the Group Parish |
|--|---|---|

Wye Valley & Forest of Dean Bat Sites SAC:

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Is the Neighbourhood Area within 10km of any of the individual sites that make up the Wye Valley & Forest of Dean Bat Sites? | N | The Group Parish is 47.75km away from Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites |
|--|---|---|

Wye Valley Woodlands SAC:

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Is the Neighbourhood Area within 10km of any of the individual sites that make up the Wye Valley Woodlands Site? | N | The Group Parish is 52km away from the Wye Valley Woodlands |
|--|---|---|

HRA Conclusion:

The assessment above highlights that the following European Sites will need to be taken into account in the future Neighbourhood Development Plan for the Yarpole Group Neighbourhood Area and a Full HRA Screening will be required.

European Site

(List only those which are relevant from above)

River Wye (including the River Lugg) SAC

Downton Gorge SAC

Strategic Environmental Assessment Initial Screening for nature conservation landscape and heritage features

The following environmental features are within or in general proximity to the Yarpole Group Neighbourhood Area and would need to be taken into account within a Strategic Environmental Assessment. In addition, the NDP will also need to consider the other SEA topics set out in Guidance Note 9a to ensure that the plan does not cause adverse impacts.

| SEA features | Total | Explanation | SEA required |
|---|--------------------------------|--|--------------|
| Air Quality Management Areas | 0 | There are no AQMA's within the Group Parish | N |
| Ancient Woodland | 7 | Tars Wood; Tars Coppice; School Wood; Tylers Vallet; Fishpool Valley; Bircher Coppice; Oaker Wood (border) | Y |
| Areas of Archaeological Interest | 0 | There are no AAI's within the Group Parish | N |
| Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty | 0 | There are no AONB's within the Group Parish | N |
| Conservation Areas | 3 | There are Conservation Areas within the villages of, Bircher, Lucton & Yarpole | Y |
| European Sites | 0 | There are no SAC's within the Group Parish | N |
| Flood Areas | | There are Flood Zones that follow the River Lugg along the south east border of the Group Parish. There is also a Flood Zone in the south west that goes through Yarpole village and ends at Cock Gate | Y |
| Listed Buildings | Numerous | There are numerous Listed Buildings scattered throughout the Group Parish | Y |
| Local Sites (SWS/SINCS/RIGS) | 5 (SWS) | Oaker Wood (border); Tylers Vallet; Tars Wood; River Lugg; Woodlands & Commons centred on Croft Ambrey | Y |
| Long distance footpaths/trails | 1 | The Mortimer Trail | Y |
| Mineral Reserves | 3 | Yarpole to Orleton (border); West of Bircher Common; Mortimers Cross to Croft | Y |
| National Nature Reserve | 0 | There are no NNR's within the Group Parish | N |
| Registered & unregistered parks and gardens | 1 Registered 1 Unregistered | Registered: Croft Castle Unregistered: Yatton Court (border) | Y |
| Scheduled Ancient Monuments | 2 | Croft Ambrey (camp) (border); Water mills and quarry at Mortimers Cross | Y |
| Sites of Special Scientific Interest | 4 | Fishpool Valley (Favourable); River Lugg Meanders (Favourable) (border); River Lugg (Unfavourable Recovering); Rockhall Quarry (Favourable) (border) | Y |

Decision Notification:

The initial screening highlights that the Neighbourhood Development Plan for the Yarpole Group Neighbourhood Area:

- a) Will require further environmental assessment for Habitat Regulations Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment.

Assessment date: 05/06/2013

Assessed by: James Latham

Appendix 1: European Sites

The table below provides the name of each European Site, which has been screened in for the purposes of neighbourhood planning in Herefordshire; includes their site features of integrity; and vulnerability data. This is based on the sites individual features of integrity and their vulnerabilities, which could include distance criteria. This has been used in identifying which parishes are likely to require a full HRA Screening of their future Neighbourhood Development Plan, to establish if their plan might have Likely Significant Effects on a European Site.

| |
|---|
| Downton Gorge |
| Site Features: <i>Tilio-Acerion</i> forests of slopes, screes and ravines |
| Vulnerability data: 10km for air quality associated with poultry units or other intensive agricultural practices. |
| River Clun |
| Site Features: Freshwater pearl mussel <i>Margaritifera margaritifera</i> |
| Vulnerability data: Water quality is important to maintain the site feature. Parishes either side of the River Clun will be affected. |
| River Wye |
| Site Features: Water courses of plain to montane levels with the <i>Ranunculion fluitantis</i> and <i>Callitricho-Batrachion</i> vegetation. Transition mires and quaking bogs. White-clawed (or Atlantic Stream) crayfish <i>Austropotamobius pallipes</i> . Sea lamprey <i>Petromyzon marinus</i> . Brook lamprey <i>Lampetra planeri</i> . River lamprey <i>Lampetra fluviatilis</i> . Twaite shad <i>Alosa fallax</i> . Atlantic salmon <i>Salmo salar</i> . Bullhead <i>Cottus gobio</i> . Otter <i>Lutra lutra</i> . Allis shad <i>Alosa alosa</i> |
| Vulnerability data: Proximity: Developments should not be within 100m of the designated bank. Some developments beyond 100m may also have impacts based on proximity and these issues should be addressed where possible when developing NDP policy and choosing site allocations. Water Quality: Within the whole catchment of the River Wye, which includes the River Lugg, mains drainage issues with regards to water quality are being resolved through the Core Strategy / Local Plan and development of a Nutrient Management Plan. Welsh Water should be consulted to ensure that the proposed growth will be within the limit of their consents. Otters: "An otter will occupy a 'home range', which on fresh waters usually includes a stretch of river as well as associated tributary streams, ditches, ponds, lakes and woodland. The size of a home range depends largely on the availability of food and shelter, and the presence of neighbouring otters. On rivers, a male's home range may be up to 40km or more of watercourse and associated areas; females have smaller ranges (roughly half the size) and favour quieter locations for breeding, such as tributary streams. Otters without an established home range are known as 'transients'. They are mostly juveniles looking for a territory of their own, or adults that have been pushed out of their territories. Transient otters may use an area for a short while, but they will move on if conditions are not suitable or if they are driven away by resident otters. Transients will have been important in extending the range of otters, but they are very difficult to identify from field signs. Within a home range an otter may use many resting sites. These include above-ground shelters, such as stands of scrub or areas of rank grass, and underground 'holts' – for example, cavities under tree roots and dry drainage pipes." (Source: EA website: http://www.environmentagency.gov.uk/static/documents/Business/Otters_the_facts.pdf accessed 09/04/2013) |

Usk Bat Site

Site Features: Annex I habitats present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection: European dry heaths, Degraded raised bogs still capable of natural regeneration, Blanket bogs, Calcareous rocky slopes with chasmophytic vegetation, Caves not open to the public, *Tilio-Acerion* forests of slopes, screes and ravines. Annex II species of primary reason for site selection: Lesser horseshoe bat *Rhinolophus hipposideros*, UK population 5%, although it is suggested this is an underestimate.

Vulnerability data: Lesser Horseshoe bats are known to migrate between 5km and 10km between their summer and winter roosts. The Lesser Horseshoe Bat is vulnerable to disturbance; light pollution; and habitat loss. Check with the planning ecologist for other issues.

Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites

Site Features: Annex II species that are a primary reason for site selection: Lesser horseshoe bat *Rhinolophus hipposideros*. Greater horseshoe bat *Rhinolophus ferrumequinum*

Vulnerability data: Lesser Horseshoe bats are known to migrate between 5km and 10km between their summer and winter roosts. The Lesser Horseshoe Bat is vulnerable to disturbance; light pollution; and habitat loss. Check with the planning ecologist for other issues.

Greater Horseshoe bats are known to migrate between 20-30km between their summer and winter roosts.

NDPs closest to the European Site will need to consider:

Woodland habitat buffer.

Lesser Horseshoe Bat: Old buildings; woodland locations; sheltered valleys, extensive deciduous woods or dense scrub, close to roost sites. In areas of fragmented habitats, linear habitats such as hedgerows are important corridors. Vulnerable to loss or disturbance of both summer and winter roosts and removal of linear habitat.


Greater Horseshoe Bat: Large buildings, pasture, edge of mixed deciduous woodland and hedgerows. Mixed land-use especially south-facing slopes, favours beetles, moths and insects they feed on. During the winter they depend on caves, abandoned mines and other underground sites for undisturbed hibernation. A system/series of sites required. Vulnerable to loss of insect food supply, due to insecticide use, changing farming practices and loss of broad-leaved tree-cover and loss / disturbance of underground roosts sites.

Wye Valley Woodlands

Site Features: Annex I habitats that are a primary reason for site selection: Beech forests *Asperulo-Fagetum*, *Tilio-Acerion* forests of slopes, screes and ravines, *Taxus baccata* woods of the British Isles. Annex II species present as a qualifying feature, but not a primary reason for site selection: Lesser horseshoe bat *Rhinolophus hipposideros*, 51-100 residents

Vulnerability data: Lesser Horseshoe bats are known to migrate between 5km and 10km between their summer and winter roosts. The Lesser Horseshoe Bat is vulnerable to disturbance; light pollution; and habitat loss. Check with the planning ecologist for other issues. NDPs closest to the European Site will need to consider: Woodland habitat buffer. Lesser Horseshoe Bat: Old buildings; woodland locations; sheltered valleys, extensive deciduous woods or dense scrub, close to roost sites. In areas of fragmented habitats, linear habitats such as hedgerows are important corridors. Vulnerable to loss or disturbance of both summer and winter roosts and removal of linear habitat.

Appendix 2: Wye Catchment Map




Yarpole Group SEA Map 1

Scale: 1:29,700



Contains, or is based upon, English Heritage's National Heritage List for England data © English Heritage.
 © Crown copyright and database rights [2013] Ordnance Survey 100024168
 © Natural England [2013], reproduced with the permission of Natural England.
 © Environment Agency copyright and/or database right 2013. All rights reserved.



Key:

- Ancient Woodlands
- Scheduled Ancient Monuments
- Unregistered Parks and Gardens
- Registered Parks and Gardens
- Mortimer Trail
- Herefordshire Trail
- Conservation Areas
- Listed Buildings
- Parish Boundaries



Yarpole Group SEA Map 2

Scale: 1:29,700



Contains, or is based upon, English Heritage's National Heritage List for England data © English Heritage.
 © Crown copyright and database rights [2013] Ordnance Survey 100024168
 © Natural England [2013], reproduced with the permission of Natural England.
 © Environment Agency copyright and/or database right 2013. All rights reserved.



Key:

- Special Wildlife Sites
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest
- Minerals Sites
- Flood Zone 2
- Flood Zone 3
- Parish Boundaries

Herefordshire Council

Appendix 2

Strategic Environmental Assessment



Yarpole Group Neighbourhood Area

Scoping Report

June 2015

Consultation on the Scoping Report

The aim of the consultation process is to involve and engage with statutory consultees and other relevant bodies on the scope of the appraisal. In particular, it seeks to:

- Ensure the SEA is both comprehensive and sufficiently robust to support the Neighbourhood Development Plan during the later stages of full public consultation;
- Seek advice on the completeness of the plan review and baseline data and gain further information where appropriate;
- Seek advice on the suitability of key sustainability issues;
- Seek advice on the suitability of the sustainability objectives.

Comments on this Scoping Report have been invited from the three consultation bodies as required by the SEA regulations, together with the Natural Resources Wales.

The three consultation bodies are as follows:

1. Natural England;
2. Historic England;
3. Environment Agency.



| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|---|----------------------------|------|---|--|---|---|
| The EC Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations | European Union Legislation | 2010 | These regulations transpose the Habitats Directive in England, Wales and to a limited extent Scotland by ensuring that activities are carried out in accordance with the Habitats Directive, which is to protect biodiversity through the conservation of natural habitats and species of wild flora and fauna. | The Regulations make it an offence (subject to exceptions) to deliberately capture, kill, disturb, or trade in the animals listed in Schedule 2, or pick, collect, cut, uproot, destroy, or trade in the plants listed in Schedule 4. However, these actions can be made lawful through the granting of licenses by the appropriate authorities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Cultural heritage and the landscape | The Neighbourhood Plan should be compliant with all the relevant legislation and regulations. |

¹ Derived from the LDF General Scoping Report (June 2007)

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|---|----------------------|------|---|---|---|---|
| The EC Water Framework Directive | European Union | 2000 | Commits all EU member states to achieve good qualitative and quantitative status of all water courses by 2015 | Aims for 'good status' for all ground and surface waters (rivers, lakes, transitional waters, and coastal waters) in the EU | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water | The Neighbourhood Plan should be compliant with all the relevant legislation and regulations. |
| The Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) | Domestic Legislation | 1981 | The major legal instrument for wildlife protection in Britain, although other significant acts have been passed since. It has numerous parts and supplementary lists and schedules many of which have been amended since publication. | The principle mechanism for the legislative protection of wildlife in Great Britain. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Soil | The Neighbourhood Plan should be compliant with all the relevant legislation and regulations. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|--|----------------------|------|---|---|---|---|
| The Countryside and Right of Way Act (2000) | Domestic Legislation | 2000 | Creates a statutory right of access on foot to certain types of open land, to modernise the public rights of way system, to strengthen nature conservation legislation, and to facilitate better management of AONBs. | <p>The Act provides for a new right of access on foot to areas of open land comprising: Mountain (land over 600 metres); Moorland; Heath; Downland; Registered common land.</p> <p>There are provisions to consider extending the right in the future to coastal land, but not woodland despite some early publicity suggesting this.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Soil | The Neighbourhood Plan should be compliant with all the relevant legislation and regulations. |
| The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) | Domestic Legislation | 2006 | Designed to help achieve a rich and diverse natural environment and thriving rural communities through modernised and simplified arrangements for delivering Government policy. | Provides that any public body or statutory undertaker in England and Wales must have regard to the purpose of conservation of biological diversity in the exercise of their functions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Soil | The Neighbourhood Plan should be compliant with all the relevant legislation and regulations. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|---|-------------------------|------|---|---|--|--|
| Revised EU Sustainable Development strategy | European Union Strategy | 2009 | Sets out a single strategy on how the EU will more effectively meet its long-standing commitment to meet the challenges of sustainable development. | Recognises the need to gradually change current unsustainable consumption and production patterns and move towards a better integrated approach to policy making. The Strategy sets overall objectives, targets and concrete actions for seven key priority challenges, predominantly environmental: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change and clean energy; • Sustainable transport • Sustainable production and consumption; • Public health threats; • Better management of natural resources; • Social inclusion, demography and migration; • Fighting global poverty. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Population and human health | The Neighbourhood Plan should take into account the objectives of the strategy. The aim of sustainable development should be implicit in its approach. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|---|---------------------------|------|---|--|---|---|
| Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services | National Strategy | 2011 | Forms part of the UK's Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework by setting out England's contribution towards the UK's commitments under the United Nations Convention of Biological Diversity. | Sets out to halt overall biodiversity loss, support healthy well-functioning ecosystems and establish coherent ecological networks, with more and better places for nature for the benefit of wildlife and people. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity | The NDP should take account of the provisions of the strategy, making the most of opportunities to enhance wildlife habitats or restore degraded ecosystems in the process. |
| National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | National planning policy. | 2012 | Consolidates the suite of PPG/PPS into one succinct planning policy document. | Aims to make the planning system less complex, more accessible and able to promote growth within the ethos of sustainable development. The presumption is in favour of sustainable development. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climatic factors • Cultural heritage • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population • Soil • Water | The guidance contained within the section on Neighbourhood Planning should be borne in mind during the preparation of the NDP. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s)¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|
| Planning Practice Guidance | Government Guidance | 2014 | Provides guidance to local planning authorities and others on the operation of the planning system. | Offers up-to-date, electronic guidance on every aspect of planning from air quality and design to land stability and rural housing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climatic factors • Cultural heritage • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population • Soil • Water | The NPD must be pro-growth and facilitate the provision and development of sustainable development. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|--|---------------------------------|------|---|--|---|--|
| Herefordshire Core Strategy, Pre-submission document 2011-2031 | Development Plan Document (DPD) | 2013 | Sets out the vision, objectives and policies for the Herefordshire Local Plan (Core Strategy), which will guide development across the county up to 2031. | <p>Outlines the emerging suite of countywide planning policies relating to housing, economic development and the environment, which the NDP will need to be in conformity with where relevant.</p> <p>The Core Strategy includes a range of objectives, five of which directly relate to rural areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To meet the housing needs of all sections of the community • To improve access to services in rural areas • To strengthen the economic viability of the villages and their rural hinterlands • To achieve sustainable communities and protect the environment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and human health • Soil • Water | <p>The NDP should take account of relevant policies set within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Where necessary, the NDP should provide services, facilities and employment opportunities that are accessible to both local and neighbouring communities.</p> <p>The following settlements are the focus for proportionate growth: Bircher, Lucton and Yarpole.</p> |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|----------------------|------------------|------|----------|--|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To conserve, promote, utilise and enjoy our natural, built, historic and cultural assets for the fullest benefit of the whole community. <p>To achieve a thriving rural Herefordshire, the Core Strategy seeks to enhance the role the villages have traditionally played in as accessible, sustainable centres for their rural catchments.</p> <p>Seeks proportional growth of 14% between Yarpole, Bircher and Lucton (Hereford HMA) over the plan period.</p> | | |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|--|------------------|------|---|--|---|---|
| Herefordshire Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP) 2013-2015 | Corporate | 2013 | Sets out the Council's strategy for supporting economic growth, social inclusion and reducing the environmental impacts of transport, as well as the program of investment for the period April 2013 to April 2015. | The document includes three key objectives, one which seeks to maintain access for rural residents and people without access to a car. Intrinsic to this is the retention of a 'core network' of bus services which focus on journeys between Hereford and the market towns, along with main transport corridors close to larger rural settlements. To this end, the strategy aims to increase the number of bus users by 1.3% (4,700 journeys) by 2015. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Climate factors • Population and human health | The LTP does not explore current transport issues in the Yarpole Group NDP area, but any new development proposed through the NDP should seek to reduce the environmental impacts of transport. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|---|--|---|----------------------------------|
| Understanding Herefordshire Report | Built and natural environment | 2014 | <p>Important to understand the place such as the local economy natural and built environment in which people live, learn and work as part of understanding their quality of life</p> <p>Enable development for economy and housing to required levels.</p> <p>Growth should be supported by sustainable transport measures.</p> | An air quality management plan is in place to tackle this. Destination Hereford project is in place to give locals more sustainable transport options. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Climate factors • Population and human health | None identified. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|---|------------------|------|---|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Herefordshire Economic Development Strategy 2011-2016 | Corporate | 2011 | Aims to increase the economic wealth of Herefordshire by setting out proposals and to support business growth up to 2016. | <p>The document outlines the path and direction to foster economic vitality within Herefordshire. Key objectives therefore include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustaining business survival and growth • Increasing wage levels, range and quality of jobs • Having a skilled population to meet future work needs • Developing the county's built infrastructure so enterprise can flourish. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Material assets • Population and human health | None of merit. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|------|---|--|--|--|
| Herefordshire Employment Land Study | Evidence | 2012 | Includes employment land assessments for the plan period 2011-2031. The study includes Quantitative and Qualitative assessments of employment land, assessment of market demand and need, as well as providing forecasts and recommendations for future employment need over the plan period. | <p>This study covers existing employment sites in Hereford, the five market towns and their rural hinterlands.</p> <p>There are no employment land allocations within Yarpole Group NDP area at present and so the study does not identify sites which are worthy of continued protection from alternative uses. Nor does it make any recommendations in respect of employment need within the neighbourhood area.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Material assets • Population and human health | None of merit; however the NDP process may have to explore whether there is any employment need locally and if so whether there is any scope for providing employment land and premises. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|--|------------------|------|--|--|--|---|
| Herefordshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) | Evidence | 2009 | <p>The SHLAA aims to justify site allocations in plans by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying sites which are capable of delivering housing development Assessing sites for their housing potential; and Predicting when a site could be developed for housing. | The SHLAA does not assess any sites within the neighbourhood area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air Biodiversity Climate factors Cultural heritage and the landscape Flora and fauna Population and human health Soil Water | Site allocations should be informed by a housing land assessment, undertaken in line with Guidance Note 21: Site assessment and allocation sites. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|--|------------------|------|---|---|--|--|
| Herefordshire Local Housing Market Assessment (LHMA) | Evidence | 2013 | Builds on an earlier Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) developed for Herefordshire and Shropshire. Its purpose is to inform the Local Plan's policies regarding housing need and demand (for market and affordable housing) within each of the 7 Housing Market Areas (HMAs) in Herefordshire between 2011 and 2031. | <p>The Yarpole Group NDP fall within the Leominster HMA. Here, the study reveals that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 55% of households are unable to afford market housing. • There is an annual requirement for 22 affordable dwellings between 2012 and 2017. <p>The study identifies that, in rural parts of the HMA, over the plan period there is a need for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 548 market houses • 183 affordable houses. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Population and human health • Soil • Water | <p>The LHMA provides an indication of housing needs and affordability within the Leominster HMA.</p> <p>It provides evidence that could be used to inform policies or market and affordable housing requirements in the NDP.</p> |

This document is copyright of Herefordshire Council. Please contact the Neighbourhood Planning team if you wish to reuse it in whole or part.

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|--|------------------|------|---|---|---|--|
| Herefordshire Local Housing Requirements Study | Evidence | 2012 | Technical assessment of the housing market and potential future local housing requirements which supports planning policy regarding the amount of growth, housing tenure and housing type needed within Herefordshire up to 2031. | <p>The delivery of 5,300 homes in the rural areas would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support growth in the rural population by 6% • Increase the number of households by 14.5% <p>Forecasts also predict that growth in the population of the rural areas is likely to be primarily through an increase in those aged over 75.</p> <p>Moderate growth is expected in the 30-44 and 60-74 age brackets.</p> <p>The Local Housing Requirements Study therefore anticipates continuing improvements in life expectancy; significant growth is expected of those in their 80s, with the existing population in their 40s and 50s moving into retirement.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and human health • Soil • Water | <p>This study provides an indication of housing requirements in the rural areas and the Leominster HMA.</p> <p>This evidence can be used to inform the content of the Yarpole Group NDP, which could include policies to facilitate the provision of the right types of homes in the right places.</p> |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|---|------------------|------|--|---|---|--|
| Herefordshire Rural Housing Background Report | Evidence | 2013 | Provides the justification for the proportional housing growth targets outlined in the Core Strategy | The settlements within the Yarpole Group NDP are classified as RA1 settlements, which means they are considered sustainable locations for proportional growth of 14%. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and human health • Soil • Water | The Yarpole Group NDP will need to be in conformity with the provisions of Policy RA1. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|---|------------------|------|--|--|---|--|
| Herefordshire Draft Gypsies and Travellers Assessment | Evidence | 2013 | Assesses the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers across Herefordshire. | <p>Key findings from the survey of Gypsy and Traveller households in 2012 found that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31% of households surveyed have some sort of accommodation need • Of the 17 households with an accommodation need, 7 had a requirement for at least one additional pitch • 10 households had a requirement for bricks and mortar housing • There is an additional requirement for 7 pitches and 9 units of Registered Social Landlord accommodation within Herefordshire. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and human health • Soil • Water | The Yarpole Group NDP must establish whether any of the need identified in this assessment falls within the neighbourhood area and make appropriate provisions for it. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|--|------------------|------|---|--|---|---|
| Herefordshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan | Evidence | 2007 | Focuses conservation efforts on the areas within Herefordshire that will result in the greatest benefit for ecological networks, habitats and species. | Integrating biodiversity objectives with other environmental, social and economic needs can provide a sustainable living and working environment that benefits both people and nature. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodiversity | The NDP can help to achieve the LBAP priorities. |
| Building Biodiversity into the LDF | Evidence | 2009 | Provides the Council's Local Plan (Core Strategy) with evidence in respect of biodiversity and geodiversity, identifying both opportunities and constraints across Herefordshire. | This document provides useful information in respect of Hereford and the market towns only. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air Biodiversity Climate factors Cultural heritage and the landscape Flora and fauna Material assets Population and human health Soil Water | There is a lack of information about rural areas which means it will be necessary to gather and assess existing biodiversity and geodiversity data, in order to ensure that the Yarpole Group NDP can overcome any existing constraints and capitalise on opportunities to enhance habitats and their networks. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|---|------------------|------|---|---|---|---|
| Herefordshire Green Infrastructure Strategy | Evidence | 2010 | Develops a framework of natural and culturally important features and functions so that planning for a sustainable future is at the heart of planning within Herefordshire. | Establishes policies and principles for the protection and enhancement of those features and functions that contributes to the environment of Herefordshire across a range of scales. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and human health • Soil • Water | The study provides evidence that could be taken into account when preparing policies for the Yarpole Group NDP. |
| Renewable Energy Study | Evidence | 2010 | Assesses the energy demand within Herefordshire and the ability for the county to accommodate renewable and low carbon energy technologies. | <p>The total energy demand excluding transport for Herefordshire, at that point in time, was calculated as being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electrical: 731 GWh/yr • Heat: 1,810 GWh/yr • Total: 2,541 GWh/yr <p>There is scope for all types of renewable energy production.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and human health • Soil • Water | The study provides evidence that could be taken into account when preparing policies for the Yarpole Group NDP. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|--|------------------|------|--|--|--|--|
| Herefordshire Playing Pitch Assessment | Evidence | 2012 | Produces a strategic framework, audit and assessment and needs analysis of outdoor sports pitches and facilities for Herefordshire. The document arises as a result of a recommendation in the Herefordshire and Worcestershire Sports Facilities Framework to develop local standards for playing fields and sports pitches throughout Herefordshire. | <p>The study updates components of the Herefordshire and Worcestershire Sports Facilities Framework 2010 such as updating population forecasts, setting local standards for synthetic turf pitches and grass playing fields within Herefordshire. It identifies any current gaps in provision, and looks forward to 2031 to assess what facilities are likely to be required by that date.</p> <p>In terms of Yarpole Group NDP itself, the study reveals that there are no playing pitch areas.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and human health | Additional local evidence may be required to identify if there is a need for any secured playing pitch facilities within the Group Parish. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|----------------------|------------------|------|--|--|---|---|
| Open Spaces Study | Evidence | 2006 | The 2006 space audit and assessment of need is a snap shot of the quality, quantity and distribution of open space across Herefordshire. | <p>The study reveals that within the Yarpole Group NDP area there is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive under provision of parks and gardens • Extensive over provision of natural and semi-natural green space • Under provision of amenity green space • Extensive under provision for outdoor sport. And • Average provision for children and young people. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and human health | The open space audit and assessment does not give a specific indication of open space shortfalls and surpluses in Yarpole Group NDP |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|-----------------------|------------------|------|--|---|---|---|
| Play Facilities Study | Evidence | 2012 | The Play Facilities Study 2012 updates the previous play facilities analysis under the Open Spaces Study 2006 and provides guidance and a framework for the development, delivery and continued sustainability of providing new and improved play facilities for children and young people in Herefordshire to 2031. | With no play facilities available in the villages in the Yarpole Group NDP itself, there may be potential for developing an objective related to provision in neighbouring parishes, especially Leominster. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and human health | The study provides evidence that could be taken into account when preparing policies for the Yarpole Group NDP. |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|--|------------------|------|--|---|--|--|
| Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and Water Cycle Study | Evidence | 2009 | <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) provides a summary of flood risk in Herefordshire to inform the location of future development.</p> <p>The Water Cycle Study examines how water resources and water supply infrastructure, wastewater treatment, water quality, sewerage and flood risk could constrain growth across Herefordshire.</p> | <p>Yarpole Group NDP is within the Middle Lugg catchment.</p> <p>It lies within the central 'Herefordshire CU' Water Resource Zone (WRZ)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NDP area has a standard percentage run off of between 22.1 and 30.6%. With a 'Time to Peak' Response Time of between 7 and 11 hours ('average' to 'slower') | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodiversity Climate factors Material assets Population and human health Water | <p>New development proposed through the Yarpole Group NDP should be assessed against the capacity of local infrastructure.</p> <p>Up-to-date flood risk information should be gathered from the Environment Agency, in order to ensure that any flood risks are considered when preparing the Yarpole Group NDP.</p> |

Appendix A2 – Baseline information for Yarpole Group

N.B. This is based on countywide baseline information with some additions relevant to Yarpole Group (in red). Where no locally specific data is available for current status, trends and targets, only countywide data is reported. Any gaps in data may be filled following additional research.

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|---------------------|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| SEA Topic covered by objective: <i>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</i> | | | | | | | |
| 13. Value, maintain, restore and expand county biodiversity. | Natural environment | Net change in condition of SSSIs across Herefordshire. | <p>The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data. 2010/11: 27% of Herefordshire's SSSI land was in favourable condition.</p> <p><i>Within or near to Yarpole Parish there are 4 SSSIs:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Fishpool Valley (Favourable)</i> • <i>River Lugg Meanders (Favourable) (border),</i> • <i>Lugg (Unfavourable recovering)</i> | <p>2006: 22% 2007: 22% 2008: 22% 2010: 24 %</p> <p>Proportion of SSSI land that was in unfavourable condition but recovering increased between 2010 and 2012 going from 41% to 65%.</p> <p>Proportion in unfavourable and declining condition had also decreased from 4% to 1%.</p> | <p>% of SSSI land in favourable condition (Increase) % of SSSI land in unfavourable condition but recovering (Increase) % of SSSI land in unfavourable condition and declining (Decrease)</p> | <p>Herefordshire's SSSIs are in extremely poor condition relative to England as whole, where 96.1% of all SSSI land was in favourable condition in April 2014.</p> <p>The proportion of SSSI in unfavourable condition but recovering is greater than England as a whole, where the figure currently stands at 58.6%.</p> | <p>Understanding Herefordshire: An integrated needs assessment (June 2013). NE & DEFRA Website July 2014</p> |

¹ Derived from the Pre Submission Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Assessment (May 2014)

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|---------------------|---|---|--------|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rockhall Quarry (Favourable) (border) | | | | |
| 13. Value, maintain, restore and expand county biodiversity. | Natural environment | After use of mineral sites especially wildlife habitat creation | <i>There is no countywide or locally specific data available at present.</i> | - | Percentage of opportunities taken | Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations. | - |
| 13. Value, maintain, restore and expand county biodiversity. | Natural environment | Phosphate levels within the River Wye SAC and adjoining tributaries that receive increased phosphates from proportional growth. | The Yarpole Group Neighbourhood Area, falls inside the River Wye (including Lugg) SAC. This area is classed as the River Lugg sub Catchment for the purposes of the Nutrient Management Plan. The River Lugg section of the SAC is currently exceeding phosphate targets. | N/A | N/A | N/A | Nutrient Management Plan |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|---------------------|---|---|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| 13. Value, maintain, restore and expand county biodiversity. | Natural environment | Changes to protected habitats and impacts of species within the Herefordshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan. | The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data. 2010/11: 17 Habitat Action Plans and 14 Species Action Plans are currently in operation across Herefordshire. <i>There is no locally specific data available at present.</i> | There are no formal records of any unacceptable adverse impacts on habitats or protected species. Originally 156 Priority Species were identified for inclusion in Herefordshire's LBAP. Similarly Herefordshire's LBAP covered 23 habitats with Action Plans. | To protect and where possible enhance the habitats of protected species identified. No net losses. | Herefordshire Biological Records Centre (HBRC) holds limited data on some individual sites. | Herefordshire Council AMR (2010/11) |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|---------------------|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| 13. Value, maintain, restore and expand county biodiversity. | Natural environment | Changes in the areas of designated nature conservation sites as a consequence of planning permission. | <p>Yarpole Group has:</p> <p>SSSI: 4 SWS: 5</p> <p>The SWS are: Oaker Wood (border), Tylers Vallet, Tars Wood, River Lugg, Woodlands and Commons centred on Croft Ambrey.</p> <p>There are no NNRs, SINC's and LNRs within the parish.</p> | As of 2012, there had been no change in the areas of designated nature conservation sites as a consequence of the planning permissions granted. | To capitalise on opportunities to enhance the areas of value to nature conservation as much as possible. | Herefordshire Biological Records Centre (HBRC) holds limited data on some individual sites. | Herefordshire Council Initial Screening Report for the Neighbourhood Plan 2013 |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|---|---|---|--------|--|---|--|
| 13. Value, maintain, restore and expand county biodiversity. | Natural environment | Proportion of local sites where positive conservation management has or is being implemented. | The Parish Area has the following landscape types: Principal settled farmlands; Estate Farmlands; with smaller areas of Wet Pasture Meadows to the south of Yarpole and Principal Wooded Hills and Unenclosed Commons to the north. | - | No specific targets identified. | Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations. | Herefordshire Landscape Character Assessment (2004 updated 2009) |
| SEA Topic covered by objectives: <i>Material assets</i> | | | | | | | |
| 14. Use natural resources and energy more efficiently. | Resource consumption and climate change | Maintaining Herefordshire Council's County Site and Monuments Register. | Countywide data would be too large to incorporate into this template. Whilst there is no qualitative, locally specific data available at present, there are two scheduled monuments in Yarpole group according to the latest version of the register. | - | No specific targets identified, but need to ensure that the register is kept up to date. | Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations. | Herefordshire Environmental Records Register (search June 2014). |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|---|--|---|--------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| 14. Use natural resources and energy more efficiently. | Resource consumption and climate change | Monitoring changes to historic landscapes. | Historic Landscape Character assessments have only been undertaken for Hereford City. Rapid townscape Assessments (2010) were only undertaken for Hereford, Ledbury and Ross. | - | No specific targets identified. | Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations. | Historic Landscape Character Assessment for Hereford. Rapid townscape Assessments (2010) |
| SEA Topic covered by objective: <i>Population, Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna</i> | | | | | | | |
| 15. Value, protect, enhance and restore the landscape quality of Herefordshire, including its rural areas and open spaces. | Natural environment | Number of developments meeting and surpassing national design standards. | <i>There is no countywide or locally specific data available at present.</i> | - | No specific targets identified. | Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations. | - |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|---------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| 15. Value, protect, enhance and restore the landscape quality of Herefordshire, including its rural areas and open spaces. | Natural environment | The need for, frequency and outcomes of planning enforcement investigations/ planning appeals concerning aspects of local loss of heritage assets and locally important buildings particularly within a conservation area. | Countywide data would be too large to incorporate into this template. There are no outstanding enforcement actions or appeals concerning local loss of heritage assets and locally important buildings within Yarpole Group NDP area at present. | No historic records of any planning enforcement action or appeals concerning locally important buildings within the two conservation areas. | To wherever possible improve upon or otherwise maintain current status. | Current status must be verified by Dvt Mgt and Enforcement Officers, but the NDP can help to avoid enforcement action and appeals during the plan period. | Council Dvt Mgt records (searched March 2015) |
| SEA Topic covered by objective: <i>Climatic Factors</i> | | | | | | | |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 16. Reduce Herefordshire's vulnerability to the impacts of climate change as well as its contribution to the problem. | Resource consumption and climate change. | Transport patronage by mode | % of Herefordshire residents who travel to work by: Car: 70.1% Foot: 14.7% Bicycle: 4.3% Bus: 2% Train: 0.8% Motorbike: 0.8% Taxi: 0.3% Other: 7% <i>There is no locally specific data available at present</i> | The number of people cycling or travelling by bus as the main form transport to get to work declined between 2001 and 2011 – across England and Wales there was little change in either. Walking or driving a car or van on the other hand increased. | To encourage the take up of lesser polluting modes of transport. | There are a lack of transport options for many rural communities and therefore high car ownership and dependency – the last decade has seen a 15 per cent increase in household car ownership, although this is not reflected in traffic flows of recent years with volumes in Hereford City and wider county having decreased. The proportion of people working from home increased over the decade from 15 per cent in 2001 to 17 per cent in 2011. | 2011 Census |
| 16. Reduce Herefordshire's vulnerability to the impacts of climate change as well as its contribution to the problem. | Resource consumption and climate change. | Number of decentralised energy schemes granted permission. | <i>There is no countywide or locally specific data available at present.</i> | - | To contribute towards the national target. | Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations. | - |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|---|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| 16. Reduce Herefordshire's vulnerability to the impacts of climate change as well as its contribution to the problem. | Resource consumption and climate | Total CO2 emissions per capita | Latest figure dates back to 2010: 1.61 million tonnes (mtCO ₂) There is no locally specific data available at present. | Between 2005 and 2010 Herefordshire's total and per capita carbon emission reduced by 7% and 8% respectively; while UK's total and per capita carbon emission reduced by 8% and 12% respectively within the same period. This trend hides an increase in emissions between 2009 and 2010 when total emissions in the county increased by 5% the same as across the UK (+5%). | To reduce the overall carbon emissions. | CO ₂ emissions produced are decreasing. | Understanding Herefordshire: An integrated needs assessment (June 2013). |
| SEA Topic covered by objective: <i>Water</i> | | | | | | | |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|---|---------------------|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| 17. Reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to public wellbeing, the economy and the environment. | Natural environment | Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on flood defence grounds. | 2010/11: None 2011/13: Not specified 2013/14: None <i>There is no locally specific data available at present.</i> | There have been no approvals contrary to EA advice since reporting began in 2004. | To have no applications permitted contrary to EA advice. | None identified. | Herefordshire Council AMR (2010/11) |
| SEA Topic covered by objective: <i>Water, air, soil, material assets</i> | | | | | | | |
| 18. Minimise local and global pollution and protect or enhance environmental resources. | Natural environment | Agricultural land usage by quality . LA to monitor the number of hectares of the best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 3a and higher) lost to development. | The agricultural land classification around Yarpole Group is predominantly Grade 2 to 3 (Very Good and Good to Moderate), with a small area of Poor (Grade 4) in the east and Very Poor (Grade 5) in the north west. | - | Measure the number of hectares of best and most versatile soil lost through development. | Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations. | DEFRA 'Magic' website for land classification 2015 |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|---|---------------------|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| 18. Minimise local and global pollution and protect or enhance environmental resources. | Natural environment | Percentage of river length assessed as good or very good chemical quality and ecological quality as required by the Water Framework Directive | Latest figures for the county as a whole dates back to 2005 when there was considered to be 84% assessed as good or very good. This represents a decrease in the % since 2002 <i>There is no locally specific data available at present.</i> | Figure steadily improved before going into decline: Herefordshire 1999 85.9%, 2000 89.5%, 2001 92.2%, 2002 91.8% | To ensure that rivers meet their conservation objectives and do not fall below the required standard of quality. | None identified. | The State of Herefordshire (2007) Water Framework Directive (2000) |
| SEA Topic covered by objective: <i>Soil</i> | | | | | | | |
| 19. Ensure integrated, efficient and balanced land use. | Built environment | Percentage of all new development completed on previously developed land. | 2010/11: 67% 2011-13: 57% 2013-14: 65% <i>There is no locally specific data available at present.</i> | Completions on PDL had risen to 71% by 2005. | To increase the number of homes built on PDL in line with the provisions of national planning policy. | None identified | Herefordshire Council AMR (2010/11), (2011-2013) and (2013-14) |
| 19. Ensure integrated, efficient and balanced land use. | Built environment | Housing densities in urban and rural areas | <i>There is no countywide or locally specific data available at present.</i> | - | No specific targets identified. | Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations. | - |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|-------------------|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| 19. Ensure integrated, efficient and balanced land use. | Built environment | Level of development in urban areas compared to rural. | <i>There is no countywide or locally specific data available at present.</i> This indicator would not be applicable to rural NDPs. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| SEA Topic covered by objective: <i>Cultural heritage</i> | | | | | | | |
| 20. Value, protect and enhance the character and built quality of settlements and neighbourhoods and the county's heritage assets, including conservation areas, historic environment and cultural heritage. | Built environment | Number and percentage of listed buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments on Buildings at Risk Register (English Heritage). | There are numerous listed buildings within the parishes and two SAMs. None are currently recorded in the Buildings at Risk Register. | There were 79 heritage assets in Herefordshire that were considered to be at high risk and included in the Heritage at Risk Register 2014. | To wherever possible improve upon or otherwise maintain current status. | None of Yarpole Group's listed buildings or SAMs are considered to be at risk at present. | Buildings at Risk Register (English Heritage; search March 2015) |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|-------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| 20. Value, protect and enhance the character and built quality of settlements and neighbourhoods and the county's heritage assets, including conservation areas, historic environment and cultural heritage. | Built environment | The need for, frequency and outcomes of planning enforcement investigations/ planning appeals concerning aspects of local loss of heritage assets, locally important buildings within the parish and particularly within a conservation area. | Countywide data would be too large to incorporate into this template. There are no outstanding enforcement actions or appeals concerning local loss of heritage assets or locally important buildings particularly within conservation areas within Yarpole Group NDP area. | No historic records of any planning enforcement action or appeals concerning locally important buildings within the two conservation areas. | To wherever possible improve upon or otherwise maintain current status | Current status must be verified by Dvt Mgt and Enforcement Officers, but the NDP can help to avoid enforcement action and appeals during the plan period. | Council Dvt Mgt records (searched March 2015) |

Appendix A3 – Environmental issues identified from the Yarpole Group baseline

These environmental issues are the same as most of those identified for the Herefordshire Core Strategy¹

| SEA Topic | | Environmental issue | SA objectives |
|-----------|-------------------|--|--------------------|
| 1 | Air | High reliance upon the private car causing high levels of air pollution and in Hereford in particular | Objective 16 |
| | | Need to reduce carbon emissions by encouraging alternative modes of travel. | |
| 2 | Biodiversity | Habitats and species of national, regional and local importance are under pressure from the adaptation and diversification of farming and forestry employment. | Objectives 13 &15 |
| | | Habitats and species of national, regional and local importance are under pressure from development | |
| | | Minimise loss of biodiversity and expand opportunities for wildlife everywhere. | |
| 3 | Climatic factors | Reduce greenhouse gas emissions through planning, design and build. | Objective 16 |
| 4 | Cultural heritage | Yarpole Group has numerous Scheduled Ancient Monuments and listed buildings, all of which require ongoing protection and many in need of high levels of maintenance. | Objective 20 |
| 5 | Flora and fauna | Conserve and enhance the character and quality of historic landscapes, including all types of natural flora and fauna. | Objective 15 |
| 6 | Material assets | How the countryside can continue to be managed in an economically, socially and environmentally beneficial way in the face of continuing pressures on traditional farming. | Objectives 14 & 18 |
| 7 | Population | Minimise energy waste through good designs, which help to reduce energy consumption and maximise efficiency. | Objective 15 |
| | | Need to avoid enforcement investigations/action concerning locally important buildings and those within conservation areas in particular. | |
| 8 | Soil | Promoting development of previously developed land and buildings as opposed to greenfield sites or agricultural land of the highest quality. | Objectives 18 & 19 |

¹ Derived from the Pre-submission Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal Assessment (May 2014) and LDF General Scoping Report (June 2007)

| | | | |
|---|-------|---|--------------------|
| 9 | Water | Issues relating to availability of resources, foul drainage, pollution, and abstraction in a county which supports water dependent biodiversity of international and national importance, given the predicted climate change consequences for water availability and demanding projections for new housing. | Objectives 17 & 18 |
| | | Steady decline in the chemical quality of rivers over the last 10 years. | |

| SEA Topics | SA Objective | SEA Objective | Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions | Indicators | Targets |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Nature Conservation (Biodiversity, flora and fauna) | Value, maintain, restore or expand county biodiversity. Value, protect, enhance or restore the landscape quality of Herefordshire, including its rural areas and open spaces. | To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect or enhance habitats of international, national, regional or local importance. Protect international, national, regional or locally important terrestrial or aquatic species. Maintain wildlife corridors and minimise fragmentation of ecological areas and green spaces. Manage access to sites in a sustainable way that protects or enhances their nature conservation value. Create new appropriate habitats. | Net change in condition of SSSIs across Herefordshire. | % of SSSI land in favourable condition (Increase) % of SSSI land in unfavourable condition but recovering (Increase) % of SSSI land in unfavourable condition and declining (Decrease) |
| | | | | After use of mineral sites especially wildlife habitat creation | Percentage of opportunities taken. |
| | | | | Changes to protected habitats and impacts of species within the Herefordshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan. | To protect and where possible enhance the habitats of protected species identified. No net losses. |

| SEA Topics | SA Objective | SEA Objective | Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions | Indicators | Targets |
|------------|--------------|---------------|---|------------|---------|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Value, enhance and protect natural environmental assets including AONB's, historic landscapes, open spaces, parks and gardens and their settings. • Encourage local stewardship of local environments, for example by promoting best practices in agricultural management. • Ensure that environmental impacts caused by mineral operations and the transport of minerals are minimised. • Promote the use of rural areas and open space by all, encourage easy non-car based access, and accommodate the needs of disabled users. | | |

| SEA Topics | SA Objective | SEA Objective | Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions | Indicators | Targets |
|------------|-------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Landscape | Not covered in SA | To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect and enhance the landscape everywhere and particularly in designated areas | Changes in the areas of designated nature conservation sites as a consequence of planning permission. | To capitalise on opportunities to enhance the areas of value to nature conservation as much as possible. |
| | | To improve quality of surroundings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value and protect diversity and local distinctiveness Improve landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside | Proportion of local sites where positive conservation management has or is being implemented. | No specific targets identified. |
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space Improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods as places to live Decrease litter and graffiti in towns and countryside Result in the loss of open space | Monitoring changes to historic landscapes. | No specific targets identified. |
| | | | | Area resulting in a loss of open space as a result of planning permission | No specific targets identified |

| SEA Topics | SA Objective | SEA Objective | Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions | Indicators | Targets |
|------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Heritage | Value, protect or enhance the character and built quality of settlements and neighbourhoods and the county's heritage assets, historic environment and cultural heritage. | To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and culture heritage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve, protect and enhance heritage assets including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological sites and other culturally important features in both urban and rural settings. • Prevent development which is inappropriate in scale, form or design to its setting or to its function or local area. • Encourage development that creates and sustains well-designed, high quality built environments that incorporate green space, encourage biodiversity and promote local distinctiveness and sense of place. • Encourage cleanliness and/or improve the general appearance of the area. | The need for, frequency and outcomes of planning enforcement investigations/planning appeals concerning aspects of loss of locally important buildings within a conservation area. | To improve upon or otherwise maintain current status. |
| | | | | Number and percentage of listed buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments on Buildings at Risk Register (English Heritage). | To improve upon or otherwise maintain current status. |
| | | | | Ensure that Herefordshire Council's Sites and Monuments Register is kept up to date. | No specific targets identified, but need to ensure that the register is kept up to date. |

| SEA Topics | SA Objective | SEA Objective | Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions | Indicators | Targets |
|-----------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| Air and Climate | Minimise local and global pollution and protect or enhance environmental resources. Reduce Herefordshire's vulnerability to the impacts of climate change as well as its contribution to the problem. | To improve air quality | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimise water, air, soil, groundwater, noise and light pollution from current activities and the potential for such pollution. Protect or enhance the quality of watercourses. Provide opportunities to improve soil quality or reduce contaminated land. Reduce the county's contribution to climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from transport, domestic, commercial and industrial sources. Increase the proportion of energy generated from renewable and low carbon sources including by micro-generation, Combined Heat and Power (CHP), district heating and in transportation. | Transport patronage by mode | To increase the take up of alternative modes to the private car. |
| | | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | | Number of decentralised energy schemes granted permission. | To contribute towards the national target. |
| | | To reduce contributions to climate change To reduce vulnerability to climate change | | Total CO2 emissions per capita | To reduce the overall carbon emissions. |

| SEA Topics | SA Objective | SEA Objective | Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions | Indicators | Targets |
|------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| Water | Reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to public well-being, the economy and the environment. Minimise local and global pollution and protect or enhance environmental resources. | To improve water quality | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce flood risk both presently and taking into account climate change. Prevent inappropriate development of the floodplain, and include flood protection systems. Include sustainable urban drainage systems where appropriate. Minimise water, air, soil, groundwater, noise and light pollution from current activities and the potential for such pollution. Protect or enhance the quality of watercourses. | Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on flood defence grounds. | To have no applications permitted contrary to EA advice. |
| | | To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | | Percentage of river length assessed as good or very good chemical quality and ecological quality | To ensure that rivers meet their conservation objectives and do not fall below the required standard of quality as set out in the Water Framework Directive. |
| | | To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | | Phosphate levels within the River Wye SAC and adjoining tributaries that receive increased phosphates from proportional growth. | To meet the targets set out in the Nutrient Management Plan (2014) |
| Soil | Minimise local and global pollution and protect or enhance environmental resources. Ensure integrated, | To conserve soil resources and quality Ensure integrated, efficient and balanced land use. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimise water, air, soil, groundwater, noise and light pollution from current activities and the potential for such pollution. | Percentage of all new development completed on previously developed land. | To increase the number of homes built on PDL in line with the provisions of national planning policy. |

| SEA Topics | SA Objective | SEA Objective | Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions | Indicators | Targets |
|------------|----------------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| | efficient and balanced land use. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide opportunities to improve soil quality or reduce contaminated land. • Ensure new developments are in appropriate locations, optimising the use of previously developed land and buildings, primarily focussed on the urban areas and are accessible by walking, cycling or sustainable transport and/or will increase the share of these transport modes, thereby reducing the need to travel. | Amount of land identified as best and most versatile agricultural land lost to development. | Measure the number of hectares of best and most versatile soil lost through development. |

| SEA Topics | SA Objective | SEA Objective | Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions | Indicators | Targets |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------|
| Population and Human Health | Value, protect, enhance or restore the landscape quality of Herefordshire, including its rural areas and open spaces. | To improve health of the population To reduce crime and nuisance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value, enhance and protect natural environmental assets including AONB's, historic landscapes, open spaces, parks and gardens and their settings. Encourage local stewardship of local environments, for example by promoting best practices in agricultural management. Ensure that environmental impacts caused by mineral operations and the transport of minerals are minimised. Promote the use of rural areas and open space by all, encourage easy non-car based access, and accommodate the needs of disabled users. | Number of developments meeting and surpassing national design | No specific targets identified. |

| SEA Topics | SA Objective | SEA Objective | Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions | Indicators | Targets |
|-----------------|---|---|--|---|---|
| Material Assets | Use natural resources and energy more efficiently. Minimise local and global pollution and protect or enhance environmental resources. | To conserve natural and manmade resources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximise energy efficiency and minimise the consumption of non-renewable energy i.e. from fossil fuels. Minimise the consumption of water, land, soil, minerals, aggregates and other raw materials by all? E.g. through integrated transport, sustainable resource-efficient design, local sourcing of food, goods, materials. Encourage the re-use/enhancement (to high standards of sustainable resource-efficient design) of existing buildings and minimise the need for new build. Encourage the use of clean technologies and water minimisation techniques. | The need for, frequency and outcomes of planning enforcement investigations/ planning appeals concerning the aspects of local loss of locally important buildings within a conservation area. | Measure the number of hectares of best and most versatile soil lost through development. No specific targets identified. |
| | | | | Maintaining Herefordshire Council's County Site and Monuments Register. | No specific targets identified, but need to ensure that the register is kept up to date. |
| | | | | Monitoring changes to historic landscapes. | No specific targets identified. |
| | | | | Agricultural land usage by quality | Measure the number of hectares of best and most versatile soil lost through development. |

Appendix 3

Date: 23 July 2015
Our ref: 157220
Your ref: Neighbourhood Area SEA Scoping



Mr J. Latham
Technical Support Officer
Neighbourhood Planning, Strategic Planning & Conservation teams
Herefordshire Council
Planning Services,
Blueschool House,
Blueschool Street
Hereford,
HR1 2ZB

Customer Services
Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

T 0300 060 3900

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Mr Latham

Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping and Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening for:

Bridstow;
Clehonger;
Credenhill;
Dormington & Mordiford Group;
Holme Lacy;
Leintwardine Group;
Little Dewchurch;
Llanwarne & District Group;
Moreton on Lugg;
Tarrington;
Yarpole Group.

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated and received by Natural England on 18 June 2015.

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

We welcome the production of this SEA Scoping report. With respect to the natural environment Natural England wishes to make the following comments which are intended to further improve the SEA and its usefulness in assessing the Neighbourhood Plan.

Appendix A1 – Plans, policies and programmes

In addition to the plans, policies and programmes listed, we suggest that the following are relevant and should be added:

All

- [Natural Environment White Paper](#)

All that refer to:

Malvern Hills AONB Management Plan 2009- 2014, we advise referring to the more up to date [Malvern Hills AONB Management Plan 2014 to 2018](#).

Wye Valley AONB Management Plan 2009-2014, we advise also referring to [Draft Wye Valley Management Plan 2014 -19](#).

Appendix A2 – Baseline information

Biodiversity, flora and fauna

All

Under objective-13. proposed indicators “Net changes in condition of SSSIs across Herefordshire” and “Changes in the areas of designated nature conservation sites as a consequence of planning permission”, it needs to be clearer in these sections whether the SSSIs you refer to are within or near to the neighbourhood plan area. Furthermore, reference to any relevant European protected sites for example the River Wye SAC should be included, where applicable.

Leintwardine Group

Under objective-13, the following SSSIs and SACs have not been included and are within the boundaries of the plan area: River Clun SAC/SSSI, Downtown Gorge SAC Burrington Farm Stream Section SSSI. Additionally you state that there are 3 SSSIs within the Leintwardine Group this is incorrect.

Clehonger

Credenhill

Holme Lacy

Leintwardine Group

Moreton on Lugg

Under objective-13. proposed indicators “Phosphate levels within the River Wye SAC and adjoining tributaries that received increased phosphates from proportional growth”, this needs to be expanded to give more detail and explain the local situation. Also Trends, targets and issues and constraints columns need to be completed, refer to Bridstow SEA Scoping.

Water, air, soil and material assets

All

This section (or suitable alternative) should include information on geodiversity. The baseline and assessment should make reference to geological conservation and the need to conserve, interpret and manage geological sites and features, both in the wider environment and in relation to designated features. The Herefordshire & Worcestershire Earth Heritage Trust may be of assistance.

Material Assets

Little Dewchurch

Llanwarne and District Group

These development plan areas are partly within the Wye Valley AONB and therefore this should be included within this section and landscape should be clearly included in Appendix A3 and Appendix 4.

Appendix A4 – SEA Framework

All

Under SEA topic “material assets”, there are no targets identified against the indicator “monitoring changes to the historic landscape”. We suggest that the LPA could utilise Historic Landscape Characterisation studies and monitor the number of applications permitted despite a significant

impact on the landscape having been identified.

Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening

We would remind you of one of the basic conditions that a draft neighbourhood plan or Order must meet, as set out in the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012, which states that 'The making of the neighbourhood development plan is not likely to have a significant effect on a European site'.

Clehonger

Credenhill

Dormington & Mordiford Group

Holme Lacy

Little Dewchurch

Moreton on Lugg

Tarrington

We welcome this initial assessment and agree that a full screening exercise will be required to assess the impacts on the River Wye (including the River Lugg) Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

LLanwarne and District Group

We welcome this initial assessment and agree that a full screening exercise will be required to assess the impacts on the River Wye SAC and Wye Valleys Woodlands SAC

Bridstow

We welcome this initial assessment and agree that a full screening exercise will be required to assess the impacts on the River Wye (including the River Lugg) SAC, Wye Valley & Forest of Dean Bat Sites SAC and Wye Valleys Woodlands SAC.

Yarpole Group

We welcome this initial assessment and agree that a full screening exercise will be required to assess the impacts on the River Wye (including the River Lugg) Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Downton Gorge SAC.

Leintwardine Group

We welcome this initial assessment and agree that a full screening exercise will be required to assess the impacts on the River Clun Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Downton Gorge SAC.

We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter only please contact Gillian Driver on 0300 060 4335. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.

We really value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have attached a feedback form to this letter and welcome any comments you might have about our service.

Yours sincerely

Gillian Driver

Miss Gillian Driver
Planning Adviser
South Mercia Team



Historic England

Neighbourhood Planning Team
Herefordshire Council
Planning Services
PO Box 230
Blueschool House
Blueschool Street
Hereford
HR1 2ZB.

Our ref: 1441

Your ref:

Telephone

0121

6256887

09 July 2015

Dear Sir or Madam

**CONSULTATION ON SEA SCOPING REPORTS FOR NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS IN:
Bridstow; Clehonger; Credenhill; Dormington; Holme Lacy; Leintwardine; Little
Dewchurch; Llanwarne; Moreton on Lugg; Tarrington; Yarpole.**

Thank you for your e-mail and the invitation to comment on the SEA Scoping Reports for the Neighbourhood Plans listed above. As we have previously commented we note the SEA Frameworks sections of the SEA's submitted are generally commendable in their approach of including references to historic landscape and townscape quality, the maintenance of the Herefordshire SMR and conservation and wherever possible enhancement of locally significant heritage assets. We also particularly commend the treatment of "Heritage at Risk" and the commitment to put measures in place to assist in the removal of heritage assets from the register, also the commitment to encourage the retention and re-use of existing buildings.

However, having considered the above Neighbourhood Plans whilst we have no substantive objection to the contents of the documents please note that many of our comments and recommendations to you in relation to earlier tranches of SEA Scoping Reports remain relevant. We urge you to refer back to and consider these representations before finalizing the reports in relation to the above Neighbourhood Plans.

Specifically in relation to the eighth tranche of consultations we note that all of the SEA Scoping Reports appear to have anomalous references to SAM's, the Herefordshire SMR, monitoring changes to historic landscapes and historic landscape character assessments



Historic England, 8th Floor, The Axis, 10 Holliday Street, Birmingham B1 1TG

Telephone 0121 625 6870 HistoricEngland.org.uk

Please note that Historic England operates an access to information policy.

Correspondence or information which you send us may therefore become publicly available.



in relation to SA Objective 14 "Use natural resources and energy more effectively". Presumably this is unintentional? Is there some confusion as between the Herefordshire Sites and Monuments Register and the Herefordshire Environmental Records Register? Would these elements in fact be more relevant under SA Objectives 15 and 20?

It may be that we are suffering from some misapprehension as to the most appropriate structure for the documents. Nevertheless, we would strongly suggest that you hold detailed discussions in this respect and specifically address the issues raised with your own Council historic environment specialists in order that these matters can be properly clarified. To these ends you will note that I am copying the relevant officers into the e-mail that accompanies this letter.

I hope this is helpful.

Yours faithfully



Pete Boland
Historic Places Adviser
E-mail: peter.boland@HistoricEngland.org.uk

Appendix 4

| Objectives verses SEA Objectives (SMART and Compatibility Test) | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| SEA Stage B1 | Key: | SMART criteria: | |
| + =/++ | Compatible/ Very comp | S – Specific: | NDP objectives should specify what is intended to be done in detail and should not be open to a wide range of misinterpretations |
| - = | Possible conflict | M – Measurable: | It should be possible to monitor NDP objectives in a quantifiable way, by the use of indicators. Indicators should be measurable with limited resource implications. |
| 0 = | Neutral | A – Attainable/achievable: | NDP objectives should be achievable and deliverable, related to the scale of growth proposed |
| X = | No relationship between objectives | R – Realistic: | NDP objectives should relate to the overall vision of the plan. Likewise, chosen indicators should relate to objectives and their outcomes. |
| ? = | Unclear, more information needed | T – Time-Bound: | Objectives should be specific to the NDP period or another specified time-frame. Objectives should be associated with a target and indicators should specify when the target should be achieved. |

The following matrix appraises the emerging Yarpole Group NDP Objectives in terms of their SMART criteria and their compatibility with the SEA Objectives. These have been developed from Government guidance on SEA and from the local evidence base gathered for identifying the NDP issues.

- SEA Objectives**
- 1- To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna)
 - 2- To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes
 - 3- To improve quality of surroundings
 - 4- To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and culture heritage
 - 5- To improve air quality
 - 6- To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment
 - 7- To reduce contributions to climate change
 - 8- To reduce vulnerability to climate change
 - 9- To improve water quality
 - 10- To provide for sustainable sources of water supply
 - 11- To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk
 - 12- To conserve soil resources and quality
 - 13- To minimise the production of waste
 - 14- To improve health of the population
 - 15- To reduce crime and nuisance
 - 16- To conserve natural and manmade resources

| NDP objectives | SEA Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Conclusions | Recommendations | SMART Test of NDP objective | After SMART objectives |
|--|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|--|---|------------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | | | | |
| 1. Housing - policies incorporated in the plan will ensure that new housing contributes to a sustainable and balanced community | + | + | + | + | X | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | X | X | X | ? | This objective is generally compatible with the SEA objectives. Policy safeguards exist within both the Core Strategy and neighbourhood plan to mitigate any impacts upon the environment. | To ensure that sites are fully assessed to have the lowest impact on the environment. | This objective meets all of the SMART criteria. This objective is specific and measurable via the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). It will be attainable, achievable and realistic. | |
| 2. Roads and Traffic – within the plan will be proposals to reduce the effects of traffic on the community | X | X | + | X | + | + | + | ? | X | X | X | ? | X | X | X | ? | This objective is generally compatible with the SEA objectives. Policy safeguards exist within both the Core Strategy and neighbourhood plan to mitigate any impacts upon the environment. | Ensure that the location of any new roads will have no adverse impact upon the environment. Encourage more use of public transport within the policies | This objective meets all of the SMART criteria. This objective is specific and measurable via the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). It will be attainable, achievable and realistic. | |
| 3. Sustainable Environment – The plan’s policies will give a high priority to ensuring the environment contributes significantly towards sustainable development | + | + | + | + | X | + | + | ? | ? | ? | + | ? | X | X | X | + | This objective is generally compatible with the SEA objectives. Policy safeguards exist within both the Core Strategy and neighbourhood plan to mitigate any impacts upon the environment. | | This objective meets all of the SMART criteria. This objective is specific and measurable via the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). It will be attainable, achievable and realistic. | |
| 4. Opportunities for employment - the plan will enable more people to work where they live or closer to their homes | ? | X | X | + | X | ? | ? | ? | X | X | ? | ? | X | X | X | ? | Further details are required for many of the objectives with regards to the type of business and location, although the NDP objective does specifically state ‘employment suitable for a rural area’. | Many of these objectives could be positive if the business were kept local thereby reducing traffic, and had policy safeguards to ensure no adverse impact upon the environment. | This objective meets all of the SMART criteria. This objective is specific and measurable via the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). It will be attainable, achievable and realistic. | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|--|---|--|
| <p>5. Community services and facilities - maintaining and supporting existing facilities and encouraging new and improved provisions</p> | <p>X</p> | <p>+</p> | <p>+</p> | <p>+</p> | <p>X</p> | <p>+</p> | <p>X</p> | <p>X</p> | <p>X</p> | <p>X</p> | <p>?</p> | <p>?</p> | <p>X</p> | <p>X</p> | <p>X</p> | <p>+</p> | <p>This objective does not have a direct relationship with many of the SEA objectives, but the objectives that there is a relationship are compatible</p> | | <p>This objective meets the SMART criteria. This objective is specific and measurable via the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). It will be attainable, achievable and realistic.</p> | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|--|---|--|

| Objectives verses SEA Objectives (SMART and Compatibility Test) | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| SEA Stage B1 | Key: | SMART criteria: | |
| + =/++ | Compatible/very comp | S – Specific: | NDP objectives should specify what is intended to be done in detail and should not be open to a wide range of misinterpretations |
| - = | Possible conflict | M – Measurable: | It should be possible to monitor NDP objectives in a quantifiable way, by the use of indicators. Indicators should be measurable with limited resource implications. |
| 0 = | Neutral | A – Attainable/achievable: | NDP objectives should be achievable and deliverable, related to the scale of growth proposed |
| X = | No relationship between objectives | R – Realistic: | NDP objectives should relate to the overall vision of the plan. Likewise, chosen indicators should relate to objectives and their outcomes. |
| ? = | Unclear, more information needed | T – Time-Bound: | Objectives should be specific to the NDP period or another specified time-frame. Objectives should be associated with a target and indicators should specify when the target should be achieved. |

The following matrix appraises the emerging Yarpole Group NDP Objectives in terms of their SMART criteria and their compatibility with the SEA Objectives. These have been developed from Government guidance on SEA and from the local evidence base gathered for identifying the NDP issues.

| NDP Policies | SEA objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Summary in relation to baseline | Overall commentary and any initial cumulative effects/ Recommendations | Conformity with Core Strategy |
|---|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|--|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | | | |
| Baseline | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | NA | NA | NA | 13 | | | |
| Policy YG1: Promoting Sustainable development | + | + | + | + | + | + | ? | X | X | X | ? | + | X | X | X | + | Overall this policy has a positive impact upon the baseline as the policy seeks to have regard to historical and environmental constraints. | Overall this policy meets the SEA objectives and the requirements in the Core Strategy in relation to sustainable development. | This policy would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Policy YG2: Development Strategy | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | + | + | X | X | 0 | Overall this policy has a neutral or positive impact upon the baseline. This policy highlights that settlement boundary's will be defined for the three main villages and therefore provides some certainty as to where the development will be accommodated. | Overall this policy has mainly a neutral or positive impact on the SEA objectives. More detail on climate change implications and water issues in particular would probably improve this policies overall performance. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA. |
| Policy YG3: Housing Development in Bircher | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | X | X | 0 | Overall this policy has a positive impact on the baseline objectives. More detail on air quality, water and flood related issues would improve its performance. | More detail on air quality, water and flood risk would improve an otherwise largely positive policy. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA. |
| Policy YG4: proposed Land for Housing Development in Bircher | ? | + | + | + | + | ? | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | - | X | X | X | + | Overall this policy has a positive effect on the baseline, as the site allocation will provide certainty about where development will go. There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. | Overall this policy meets the SEA objectives and the requirements in the Core Strategy in relation to the settlement boundaries and housing development within policy RA2. | This policy would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Policy YG5: Local Green Space in | + | + | + | + | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | + | + | + | + | + | Overall the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the relevant baseline data, retaining the character of the area and | Overall this policy has a positive impact on the SEA objectives. | This policy meets the Core Strategy's requirements for |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| Bircher | + | + | | + | | | | | | | | + | | | | + | ensuring a valued green space is protected. | | the purposes of the SEA. |
| Policy YG6: Housing Development in Lucton | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | X | X | 0 | Overall this policy has a positive impact on the baseline objectives. More detail on air quality, water and flood related issues would improve its performance. | More detail on air quality, water and flood risk would improve an otherwise largely positive policy. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA. |
| Policy YG7: Local Green Space in Lucton | + | + | + | + | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | + | + | + | + | + | Overall this policy has a positive effect on the baseline, retaining the character of the area and ensuring a valued green space is protected. | Overall this policy has a positive impact on the SEA objectives. | This policy meets the Core Strategy's requirements for the purposes of the SEA. |
| Policy YG8: Housing Development in Yarpole | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | X | X | 0 | Overall this policy has a positive impact on the baseline objectives. More detail on air quality, water and flood related issues would improve its performance. | More detail on air quality, water and flood risk would improve an otherwise largely positive policy. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA. |
| Policy YG9: Land off Croft Crescent | ? | + | + | + | + | ? | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | - | X | X | X | + | Overall this policy has a positive effect on the baseline, as the site allocation will provide certainty about where development will go. There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. | Overall this policy meets the SEA objectives and the requirements in the Core Strategy in relation to the settlement boundaries and housing development within policy RA2. | This policy would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Policy YG10: Book House Farm and land to its East | ? | + | + | + | + | ? | + | ? | ? | ? | + | - | X | X | X | + | Overall this policy has a positive effect on the baseline, as the site allocation will provide certainty about where development will go. There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. | Overall this policy meets the SEA objectives and the requirements in the Core Strategy in relation to the settlement boundaries and housing development within policy RA2. | This policy would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Policy YG11: Highway Measures at Yarpole | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | + | + | + | X | X | X | X | 0 | + | + | + | Overall this policy has a positive or neutral impact on the baseline objectives. | Overall this policy has a positive impact on the SEA objectives. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA. |
| Policy YG12: Local Green Space in Yarpole | + | + | + | + | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | + | + | + | + | + | Overall this policy has a positive effect on the baseline, retaining the character of the area and ensuring a valued green space is protected.. | Overall this policy has a positive impact on the SEA objectives. | This policy meets the Core Strategy's requirements for the purposes of the SEA. |
| Policy YG13: Treatment of foul water in Yarpole | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | + | + | + | X | X | X | X | X | Overall the policy does not have a relationship with most of the SEA objectives however it does have a positive effect on those that it does affect. | Overall this policy has a positive impact on the SEA objectives that is affected by the policy. | This policy meets the Core Strategy's requirements for the purposes of the SEA. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Policy YG14: Development in conservation areas | + | + | + | + | 0 | x | x | x | x | x | + | + | x | x | x | + | Overall this policy has a positive impact upon the baseline as the policy seeks to have regard to the historic environment. | Overall this policy meets the SEA objectives and the requirements in the Core Strategy for preserving the historic environment. | This policy would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Policy YG15: Sustainable Design | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | + | x | x | x | + | Overall this policy has a positive impact on the baseline objectives. | Overall this policy has a very positive impact on the SEA objectives. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the SEA. |
| Policy YG16: Use of Community Infrastructure Levy | + | + | + | + | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | ? | This has a mainly positive impact upon the baseline, however a lot of the baseline does not directly relate to this policy. | Overall this policy meets the SEA objectives and the requirements in the Core Strategy. | This policy would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |

| Objectives verses SEA Objectives (SMART and Compatibility Test) | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| SEA Stage B1 | Key: | SMART criteria: | | |
| + =/++ | Compatible/very comp | S – Specific: | NDP objectives should specify what is intended to be done in detail and should not be open to a wide range of misinterpretations | The following matrix appraises the emerging Yarpole Group NDP Objectives in terms of their SMART criteria and their compatibility with the SEA Objectives. These have been developed from Government guidance on SEA and from the local evidence base gathered for identifying the NDP issues. |
| - = | Possible conflict | M – Measurable: | It should be possible to monitor NDP objectives in a quantifiable way, by the use of indicators. Indicators should be measurable with limited resource implications. | |
| 0 = | Neutral | A – Attainable/achievable: | NDP objectives should be achievable and deliverable, related to the scale of growth proposed | |
| X = | No relationship between objectives | R – Realistic: | NDP objectives should relate to the overall vision of the plan. Likewise, chosen indicators should relate to objectives and their outcomes. | |
| ? = | Unclear, more information needed | T – Time-Bound: | Objectives should be specific to the NDP period or another specified time-frame. Objectives should be associated with a target and indicators should specify when the target should be achieved. | |

| SEA Objectives | Baseline carried over from Stage A |
|--|---|
| 1- To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | 1-The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data.2010/11: 27% of Herefordshire's SSSI land was in favourable condition. 04/08/14 – status of the SSSIs are: River Lugg – unfavourable recovering, Fishpool Valley – favourable. The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data. 2010/11: 17 Habitat Action Plans and 14 Species Action Plans are currently in operation across Herefordshire. Yarpole Group has: 2 SSSI and 2 SSSIs bordering the neighbourhood area, 5 SWS. Downton Gorge SAC is 6.5 km away from the Parish. There are no NNRs and SINCs within the parish. |
| 2- To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | 2-There are no outstanding enforcement actions or appeals concerning locally important buildings within Yarpole group at present. Yarpole, Bircher and Lucton have conservation areas. |
| 3- To improve quality of surroundings | 3-In terms of Yarpole Group itself, the study reveals that there are no play areas within the villages. In addition there are currently no hectares of playing pitch area and no hectares of secured community access playing pitch area. |
| 4- To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and culture heritage | 4-Whilst there is no qualitative, locally specific data available at present, there is one scheduled monument in Yarpole Group, with a further SAM on the border of the Parish, according to the latest version of the register. |
| 5- To improve air quality | 5-Between 2005 and 2010 Herefordshire's total and per capita carbon emission reduced by 7% and 8% respectively; while UK's total and per capita carbon emission reduced by 8% and 12% respectively within the same period. This suggests that air quality is improving. |
| 6- To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | 6-% of Herefordshire residents who travel to work by: Car: 70.1%, Foot: 14.7: Bicycle: 4.3%,Bus: 2%, Train: 0.8%,Motorbike: 0.8%,Taxi: 0.3%,Other: 7%. |
| 7- To reduce contributions to climate change | 7-Herefordshire latest figure of CO2 emissions per capita-dates back to 2010: 1.61 million tonnes (mtCO ²) |
| 8- To reduce vulnerability to climate change | 8-Reduce the risk of flooding-There have been no approvals contrary to EA advice since reporting began in 2004.The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data. |
| 9- To improve water quality | 9-Percentage of river length assessed as good or very good chemical quality and ecological quality as required by the Water Framework Directive. Latest figure dates back to 2005: 84%. |
| 10- To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | 10-Staunton Group parish falls into the Herefordshire Conjunctive Use Water Resource Zones (WRZs), one of 6 zones covering Herefordshire. 39% of demand is from non-household use. |
| 11- To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | 11-Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on flood defence grounds. The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data. |
| 12- To conserve soil resources and quality | 12-Around the parish of Yarpole Group the soil classification is Grades 2 and 3, with a small area of poor (Grade 4) in the east and very poor (Grade 5) in the north west. Percentage of all new development completed on previously developed land.2010/11: 67%2011-13: 57%. |
| 13- To minimise the production of waste | 16-There are numerous listed buildings within the parish and one SAM within the Parish. There are no outstanding enforcement actions or appeals concerning locally important buildings within Yarpole Group parish at present. 3. The Parish Area has the following landscape types: Principal settled farmlands; Estate Farmlands; with smaller areas of Wet Pasture Meadows to the south of Yarpole and Principal Wooded Hills and Unenclosed Commons to the north. |
| 14- To improve health of the population | |
| 15- To reduce crime and nuisance | |
| 16- To conserve natural and manmade resources | |

| NDP Options | SEA objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Summary in relation to baseline | Overall commentary and any initial cumulative effects/ Recommendations | Conformity with Core Strategy |
|---|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | | | |
| Baseline | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | NA | NA | NA | 13 | | | |
| Option 1 Do nothing / Rely on Core Strategy policies | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | X | Do nothing option is essential not to produce a neighbourhood plan and rely on the criteria policies within the Core Strategy to guide further development. Specific policies and proposals for the parishes would not exist. | All developments would need to be in conformity with the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal and policies met the SEA objectives. | n/a |
| Option 2 Allocate sites for housing in Yarpole | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | | | + | Allocation of sites for housing or other uses would give certainty to future development. Specific environmental issues could be investigated during the site search and be positively addressed within the policy wording. This option could have a positive effect on the baseline. | Pursuing this option would give greater certainty over future development within the area. If required mitigation criteria can be added to site allocations policies to ensure all SEA objectives are achieved. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Option 3 Allocate sites for housing in Bircher | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | | | + | Allocation of sites for housing or other uses would give certainty to future development. Specific environmental issues could be investigated during the site search and be positively addressed within the policy wording. This option could have a positive effect on the baseline. | Pursuing this option would give greater certainty over future development within the area. If required mitigation criteria can be added to site allocations policies to ensure all SEA objectives are achieved. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Option 4 Allocate sites for housing in Lucton | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | | | + | Allocation of sites for housing or other uses would give certainty to future development. Specific environmental issues could be investigated during the site search and be positively addressed within the policy wording. This option could have a positive effect on the baseline. | Pursuing this option would give greater certainty over future development within the area. If required mitigation criteria can be added to site allocations policies to ensure all SEA objectives are achieved. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Option 5 Manage future housing using a settlement boundary in Yarpole | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | | | + | The designation of a settlement boundary will give additional certainty and help define those areas considered as the built form and open countryside. This can aid the direction of further growth to maintain the quality of the landscape and surroundings. There is less certainty over the positive effects on the baseline as any growth with be adjudged by criteria based policy. | Any settlement boundary would need to be designated to ensure that sufficient capacity was included to permit the proportional growth requirements within Policy RA2 of the Core Strategy. Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against effects on any SEA objectives. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Option 6 Manage future housing using a settlement boundary in | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | | | + | The designation of a settlement boundary will give additional certainty and help define those areas considered as the built form and open countryside. This can aid the direction of further growth to maintain the quality of the landscape and surroundings. There is less certainty over the positive effects on the baseline as any growth with be adjudged by criteria based policy. | Any settlement boundary would need to be designated to ensure that sufficient capacity was included to permit the proportional growth requirements within Policy RA2 of the Core Strategy. Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against effects on any SEA objectives. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |

| Bircher | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| Option 7 Manage future housing using a settlement boundary in Lucton | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | | | + | The designation of a settlement boundary will give additional certainty and help define those areas considered as the built form and open countryside. This can aid the direction of further growth to maintain the quality of the landscape and surroundings. There is less certainty over the positive effects on the baseline as any growth will be adjudged by criteria based policy. | Any settlement boundary would need to be designated to ensure that sufficient capacity was included to permit the proportional growth requirements within Policy RA2 of the Core Strategy. Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against effects on any SEA objectives. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Option 8 Manage future housing through a development management policy | + | + | ? | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | | | | + | Criteria based policy does not give the same level of certainty as the other options as it will be more reactionary than proactive in terms of growth proposals. However, provided criteria are added to the policy to safeguard or mitigate against any harm, the option will have a positive effect on the baseline. | Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against effects on any SEA objectives. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Option 9 Include a policy on Local Green Space | + | + | + | + | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | + | | | | + | This policy identifies key areas that the community have identified as areas worthy of special protection. | This option will offer more certainty to the parish for the protection of Local Green Spaces within the parish, and allows the parish to identify the areas that are important | |
| Option 10 Include a policy on highway measures | ? | + | ? | ? | + | + | + | X | X | X | X | ? | | | | ? | There are a number of transportation policies within the Core Strategy however they are not specifically talking about Yarpole Group Parish therefore many factors remain unknown. | This option can detail criteria for new roads and sustainable transport methods so will have a mitigating effect against new development. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

Key:

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------------------|
| ++ Move significantly | + Move towards Marginally | - - Move away significantly | - Move away marginally | 0 Neutral | ? Uncertain | N/A No relationship |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------------------|

towards

Policy YG1: Promoting Sustainable Development

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | +++ | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | +++ | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|--|--|
| | | | | period. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | ++ | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | ++ | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| To reduce contributions to climate change | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | Other policies within the plan will help to mitigate against contributions to climate change over the long term. |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | Other policies will provide mitigation for the long term. |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|--|----|----|--|--|
| To minimise the production of waste | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | ++ | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. Policy safeguards exist to ensure long term effects are positive. | | | | |

Policy YG2: Development Strategy

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---------------|---|--------|-----------|---------------------|--|
| | Short term (1 – | Medium | Long term | | |
| | | | | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | 5 years) | term (6 – 10 years) | (11 years +) | | |
|--|----------|----------------------------------|--------------|--|--|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | 0 | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Biodiversity will increase as gardens and landscaped areas become established. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the land- and townscapes will improve as the developed areas mature. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the surroundings will improve as the developed areas mature. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | 0 | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The hub of the village will become more prominent as more of the plans aspirations are realised over time | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|-----------|---|--|
| To improve air quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Unknown what the cumulative effect will be | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | ? | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Likely that societal improvements may have more of an impact on this trend than the Plan will. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Unclear how this will be effected. | |
| To improve water quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Unknown how this will be effected. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Unknown how this will be effected. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|----------|--|--|
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | - | 0 | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the disturbed soils may improve as the developments mature. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Households will be committed to the Local Authority's waste reduction measures. | |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Unclear as to how this will be improved | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. | | | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

Policy YG3: Housing Development in Bircher

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Biodiversity will increase as gardens and landscaped areas become established helped by the retention of existing trees hedgerows and green space. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the landscape and built environment will improve as the developed areas mature. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the surroundings will improve as the developed areas | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|-----------|---|--|
| | | | | mature. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The requirement for developments to complement the village character and be in scale with existing properties will contribute to this performance. | |
| To improve air quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would necessarily improve air quality. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Extra houses, and in smaller villages would generate more traffic. | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would reduce climate change contribution. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would reduce climate change | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|----|--|--|
| | | | | vulnerability. | |
| To improve water quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would improve water quality. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would provide a sustainable water source. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would avoid, reduce or manage flood risk. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the disturbed soils will improve as the developments mature. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Households will be committed to the Local Authority's waste reduction measures. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|----------|--|--|
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. | | | | |

PolicyYG4: Proposed land for Housing development in Bircher

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---------------|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| | | | | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To improve water quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | impacts. |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. | | | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

Policy YG5:Local Green Space in Bircher

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | ++ | ++ | ++ | This policy should make a positive contribution to the protection or enhancement of the natural environment. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | ++ | ++ | ++ | The protection or enhancement of local greenspaces should help maintain the quality of the 'townscape' and character of the area. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | The protection or enhancement of local greenspaces should help maintain the quality of the surroundings of the area. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|--|
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | ++ | ++ | ++ | The protection or enhancement of local greenspaces should help maintain the quality the character of the area. | |
| To improve air quality | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | ++ | ++ | ++ | This policy will provide added protection to the finest agricultural land. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|------------|------------|---|--|
| To minimise the production of waste | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| To improve health of the population | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | ++ | ++ | ++ | To protect or enhance local greenspaces should negate the need to develop additional land and use additional resources for recreations or community uses. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This policy will seek to continue to protect and enhance the character of the Parish and special areas within it. | | | | |

Policy YG6: Housing Development in Lucton

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|----------------------|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| | | | | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | years) | | | |
|--|---|--------|----|---|--|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Biodiversity will increase as gardens and landscaped areas become established helped by the retention of existing trees hedgerows and green space. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the landscape and built environment will improve as the developed areas mature. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the surroundings will improve as the developed areas mature. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The requirement for developments to complement the village character and be in scale with existing properties will contribute to this performance. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| To improve air quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would necessarily improve air quality. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Extra houses, and in smaller villages would generate more traffic. | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would reduce climate change contribution. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would reduce climate change vulnerability. | |
| To improve water quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would improve water quality. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would provide a sustainable water | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|-----------|--|--|
| | | | | source. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would avoid, reduce or manage flood risk. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the disturbed soils will improve as the developments mature. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Households will be committed to the Local Authority's waste reduction measures. | |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | |
|--|--|
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. |
|--|--|

Policy YG7: Local Green Space in Lucton

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | ++ | ++ | ++ | This policy should make a positive contribution to the protection or enhancement of the natural environment. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | ++ | ++ | ++ | The protection or enhancement of local greenspaces should help maintain the quality of the 'townscape' and character of the area. | |
| To improve quality of | + | + | + | The protection or enhancement of local greenspaces should help | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|--|--|
| surroundings | | | | maintain the quality of the surroundings of the area. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | ++ | ++ | ++ | The protection or enhancement of local greenspaces should help maintain the quality the character of the area. | |
| To improve air quality | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | X | X | X | No relationship. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|-----|-----|---|--|
| To conserve soil resources and quality | ++ | ++ | ++ | This policy will provide added protection to the finest agricultural land. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| To improve health of the population | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | ++ | ++ | ++ | To protect or enhance local greenspaces should negate the need to develop additional land and use additional resources for recreations or community uses. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This policy will seek to continue to protect and enhance the character of the Parish and special areas within it. | | | | |

YG8: Housing Development in Yarpole

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---------------|---|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| | Short term (1 – | Medium term | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| | | | | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | 5 years) | (6 – 10 years) | | | |
|--|----------|----------------|----|---|--|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Biodiversity will increase as gardens and landscaped areas become established helped by the retention of existing trees hedgerows and green space. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the landscape and built environment will improve as the developed areas mature. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the surroundings will improve as the developed areas mature. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The requirement for developments to complement the village character and be in scale with existing properties will contribute to this performance. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| To improve air quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would necessarily improve air quality. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Extra houses, and in smaller villages would generate more traffic. | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would reduce climate change contribution. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would reduce climate change vulnerability. | |
| To improve water quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would improve water quality. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would provide a sustainable water | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|-----------|--|--|
| | | | | source. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would avoid, reduce or manage flood risk. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the disturbed soils will improve as the developments mature. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Households will be committed to the Local Authority's waste reduction measures. | |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | |
|--|--|
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. |
|--|--|

Policy YG9: Land off Croft Crescent

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| townscapes | | | | | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To improve water quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|----------|---|--|
| To conserve soil resources and quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. | | | | |

Policy YG10: Brook House Farm and land to its East

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---------------|---|--------|-----------|---------------------|--|
| | Short term (1 – | Medium | Long term | | |
| | | | | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | 5 years) | term (6 – 10 years) | (11 years +) | | |
|--|----------|----------------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To improve water quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | n/a | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. | | | | |

Policy YG11: Highway Measures at Yarpole

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Reducing traffic will have a positive but limited impact upon wildlife. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|-----------|---|--|
| townscapes | | | | | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Reducing and managing vehicle speeds, reducing traffic effects, and encouraging alternative forms of transport will all improve the quality of the surroundings over time. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | 0 | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Reducing traffic effects, and encouraging alternative forms of transport will all improve the quality of the surroundings over time. | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Measures in this policy will contribute towards better air quality. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. This policy is designed to limit the effects of traffic upon the environment | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|-----------|---|--|
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Encouraging alternative forms of transport will reduce the contribution to climate change | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | + | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Encouraging alternative forms of transport will reduce the vulnerability to climate change | |
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | This Policy has no, or very little, relationship to water quality. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | This Policy has no, or very little, relationship to water supplies. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | X | X | X | This Policy has no, or very little, relationship to flood risk. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | X | X | X | This Policy has no, or very little, relationship to soil resources. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. It will have a neutral, or at best a marginally positive role in reducing waste, via reduced or avoided consumption from | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|----|--|--|
| | | | | unnecessary journeys. | |
| To improve health of the population | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Encouraging walking and cycling will improve peoples health | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Reducing speed and managing traffic will reduce the nuisance impact of traffic in the parish. | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Encouraging public transport and alternative forms of transport will conserve resources. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. | | | | |

Policy YG12: Local Green Space in Yarpole

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation |
|----------------------|---|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
|----------------------|---|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | | opportunities |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | ++ | ++ | ++ | This policy should make a positive contribution to the protection or enhancement of the natural environment. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | ++ | ++ | ++ | The protection or enhancement of local greenspaces should help maintain the quality of the 'townscape' and character of the area. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | The protection or enhancement of local greenspaces should help maintain the quality of the surroundings of the area. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | ++ | ++ | ++ | The protection or enhancement of local greenspaces should help maintain the quality the character of the area. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| To improve air quality | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | X | X | X | No relationship. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | ++ | ++ | ++ | This policy will provide added protection to the finest agricultural land. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| To improve health of the population | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| To reduce crime and | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|----|----|---|--|
| nuisance | | | | | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | ++ | ++ | ++ | To protect or enhance local greenspaces should negate the need to develop additional land and use additional resources for recreations or community uses. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This policy will seek to continue to protect and enhance the character of the Parish and special areas within it. | | | | |

Policy YG13: Treatment of Foul Water in Yarpole

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | X | X | X | n/a | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|--|--|
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To improve air quality | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To improve water quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|----------|--|--|
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To minimise the production of waste | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | X | X | X | n/a | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Although this policy does not have a relationship with the majority of the SEA objectives, those that it does relate to does not go over and beyond the Core Strategy. | | | | |

Policy YG14: Development in conservation areas

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | +++ | +++ | +++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|---|--|
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | ++ | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | |
| To improve air quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | n/a | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | | | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

Policy YG15: Sustainable Design

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|---|--|
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To improve water quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | of housing development on the environment. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | | | | |

Policy YG16: Use of Community Infrastructure Levy

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|----------------------|--|----------------------------|---|
|----------------------|--|----------------------------|---|

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy | |
| To improve air quality | X | X | X | n/a | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|-----|--|
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To minimise the production of waste | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | n/a | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the policies and sites within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|----------|---|--|
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The policy will look to help achieve mitigating influences on the SEA objectives. | | | | |

Key:

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------|
| ++ Move significantly towards | + Move marginally towards | -- Move away Significantly | - Move away marginally | 0 Neutral | ? Uncertain | X No relationship |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------|

| SEA Objective / Policy | 1. To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | 2. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | 3. To improve quality of surroundings | 4. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and culture heritage | 5. To improve air quality | 6. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | 7. To reduce contributions to climate change | 8. To reduce vulnerability to climate change | 9. To improve water quality | 10. To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | 11. To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | 12. To conserve soil resources and quality | 13. To minimise the production | 14. To improve health of the population | 15. To reduce crime and nuisance | 16. To conserve natural and manmade resources |
|------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|
| Objective 1 | + | + | + | + | X | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | X | X | X | ? |
| Objective 2 | X | X | + | X | + | + | + | ? | X | X | X | ? | X | X | X | ? |
| Objective 3 | + | + | + | + | X | + | + | ? | ? | ? | + | ? | X | X | X | + |
| Objective 4 | ? | X | X | + | X | ? | ? | ? | X | X | ? | ? | X | X | X | ? |
| Objective 5 | X | + | + | + | X | + | X | X | X | X | ? | ? | X | X | X | + |
| Policy YG1 | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | + | + | ? | X | X | X | ? | + | X | X | X | ++ |
| Policy YG2 | 0 | + | + | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | + | + | X | X | 0 |
| Policy YG3 | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | X | X | 0 |
| Policy YG4 | ? | + | + | + | + | ? | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | - | X | X | X | + |
| Policy YG5 | ++ | ++ | + | ++ | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | ++ | + | + | + | ++ |
| Policy YG6 | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | X | X | 0 |
| Policy YG7 | ++ | ++ | + | ++ | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | ++ | + | + | + | ++ |
| Policy YG8 | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | X | X | 0 |
| Policy YG9 | ? | + | + | + | + | ? | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | - | X | X | X | + |
| Policy YG10 | ? | + | + | + | + | ? | + | ? | ? | ? | + | - | X | X | X | + |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|----|---|
| Policy YG11 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | + | + | + | X | X | X | X | 0 | + | + | + | |
| Policy YG12 | ++ | ++ | + | ++ | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | |
| Policy YG13 | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | + | + | + | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Policy YG14 | + | ++ | + | ++ | 0 | X | X | X | X | X | + | + | X | X | X | + | |
| Policy YG15 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | + | X | X | X | + | |
| Policy YG16 | + | + | + | + | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | ? | |
| Summary of effects of whole plan on each SEA Objective | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | X | X | X | + | |
| | On balance the plan aiming to conserve and enhance the natural environment. | On balance the plan aims to protect and enhance the environment around Yarpole Group parish and the setting and character of the village | The plan aims improve the quality of the surroundings and encourage additional facilities | The plan aims to protect and enhance the environment around each of the villages in the parish and the setting and character of the villages | The Plan's objectives and policies do not specifically detail reducing the need to travel and therefore this could be strengthened to improve air quality, however it does encourage the use of public transport and states to provide pedestrian links from new developments to public transport. | The Plan's objectives and policies do not specifically detail reducing the need to travel and therefore this could be strengthened to improve air quality. | Policies within the Core Strategy and the NDP include provisions to reduce the contributions to climate change such as design. | Criteria are included to reduce the risks of flooding. | Policies are in conformity with the requirements of the Core Strategy in terms of SEA. | Policies are in conformity with the requirements of the Core Strategy in terms of SEA. | Criteria are included to reduce the risks of flooding. | Policies aim to conform to the locational policies within the Core Strategy in terms of SEA. | | | | | Policies exist to conserve or reuse existing resources. |
| Cumulative effects of whole plan (1 + 2 + 3...) | <i>Overall the Yarpole Group Neighbourhood Plan will contribute to meeting the SEA objectives and having a positive impact on the baseline. Policies have been drafted in general conformity with the Core Strategy objectives and contain many policy safeguards to ensure that the effects on environmental assets can be avoided or mitigated against. None of the policies are over and above those already assessed for the Core Strategy.</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commentary for significant cumulative effects | <i>The Yarpole Group neighbourhood plan is unlikely to have any significant cumulative effects on the SEA objectives.</i> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Appendix 5

Consultation date: 6 June to the 17 July 2016

Consultation title: Yarpole Group Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14

*N.B. This consultation feedback is **only** for comments received on the SEA of the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (April 2016)*

| Consultee | Summary of Comments | Response to Comments |
|-------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Natural England | Comments received to the NDP and the HRA but none received to the Environmental Report | n/a |
| Heritage England | No comment received regarding the Environmental Report | n/a |
| Environment Agency | Comments receive to the NDP but none received to Environmental Report | n/a |
| Natural Resources Wales | No comments received | n/a |

Appendix 6

| Objectives verses SEA Objectives (SMART and Compatibility Test) | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| SEA Stage B1 | Key: | SMART criteria: | | The following matrix appraises the emerging Yarpole Group NDP Objectives in terms of their SMART criteria and their compatibility with the SEA Objectives. These have been developed from Government guidance on SEA and from the local evidence base gathered for identifying the NDP issues. |
| + =/++ | Compatible/very comp | S – Specific: | NDP objectives should specify what is intended to be done in detail and should not be open to a wide range of misinterpretations | |
| - = | Possible conflict | M – Measurable: | It should be possible to monitor NDP objectives in a quantifiable way, by the use of indicators. Indicators should be measurable with limited resource implications. | |
| 0 = | Neutral | A – Attainable/achievable: | NDP objectives should be achievable and deliverable, related to the scale of growth proposed | |
| X = | No relationship between objectives | R – Realistic: | NDP objectives should relate to the overall vision of the plan. Likewise, chosen indicators should relate to objectives and their outcomes. | |
| ? = | Unclear, more information needed | T – Time-Bound: | Objectives should be specific to the NDP period or another specified time-frame. Objectives should be associated with a target and indicators should specify when the target should be achieved. | |

| NDP Policies | SEA objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Summary in relation to baseline | Overall commentary and any initial cumulative effects/ Recommendations | Conformity with Core Strategy |
|---|----------------|----|----|----|---|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|--|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | | | |
| Baseline | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | NA | NA | NA | 13 | | | |
| Policy YG1: Promoting Sustainable development Amendment: inclusion of active travel in (b) and change of 'must' to 'should' | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | + | ++ | ? | x | x | x | ? | + | x | x | x | ++ | Overall this policy has a positive impact upon the baseline as the policy seeks to have regard to historical and environmental constraints. The amendment could have a positive effect on traffic as it is promoting the use of active travel modes | Overall this policy meets the SEA objectives and the requirements in the Core Strategy in relation to sustainable development. | This policy would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Policy YG3: Housing Development in Bircher Amendment: additional criteria regarding residential amenity and junction improvements | + | + | + | + | ? | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | x | x | 0 | Overall this policy has a positive impact on the baseline objectives. More detail on air quality, water and flood related issues would improve its performance. The amendment is seeking junction improvements to reduce the impacts of traffic and an additional criteria regarding residential amenity. | More detail on air quality, water and flood risk would improve an otherwise largely positive policy. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA. |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Policy YG4: proposed Land for Housing Development in Bircher</p> <p>Amendments: additional criteria regarding junction improvements</p> | ? | + | + | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | x | x | x | + | <p>Overall this policy has a positive effect on the baseline, as the site allocation will provide certainty about where development will go. There are some unknown factors but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts.</p> <p>An amendment is seeking to provide junction improvements to reduce the effects of traffic.</p> | <p>Overall this policy meets the SEA objectives and the requirements in the Core Strategy in relation to the settlement boundaries and housing development within policy RA2.</p> | <p>This policy would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA.</p> |
| <p>Policy YG6: Housing Development in Lucton</p> <p>Amendment: additional criteria regarding residential amenity</p> | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | x | x | 0 | <p>Overall this policy has a positive impact on the baseline objectives. More detail on air quality, water and flood related issues would improve its performance.</p> <p>Additional criteria regarding residential amenity has been added.</p> | <p>More detail on air quality, water and flood risk would improve an otherwise largely positive policy.</p> | <p>This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA.</p> |
| <p>Policy YG8: Housing Development in Yarpole</p> <p>Amendment: additional criteria regarding residential amenity</p> | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | x | x | 0 | <p>Overall this policy has a positive impact on the baseline objectives. More detail on air quality, water and flood related issues would improve its performance.</p> <p>Additional criteria regarding residential amenity has been added.</p> | <p>More detail on air quality, water and flood risk would improve an otherwise largely positive policy.</p> | <p>This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA.</p> |
| <p>Policy YG9: Land off Croft Crescent</p> <p>Amendment: policy text to reflect site now has outline permission</p> | ? | + | + | + | + | ? | + | ? | + | + | + | + | x | x | x | + | <p>Overall this policy has a positive effect on the baseline, as the site allocation will provide certainty about where development will go. The site now has the benefit of outline planning permission and the policy wording has been amended accordingly.</p> | <p>Overall this policy meets the SEA objectives and the requirements in the Core Strategy in relation to the settlement boundaries and housing development within policy RA2.</p> | <p>This policy would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA.</p> |
| <p>Policy YG10: Book House Farm and land to its East</p> | ? | + | + | + | + | ? | + | ? | ? | ? | + | + | x | x | x | + | <p>Overall this policy has a positive effect on the baseline, as the site allocation will provide certainty about where development will go. There are some unknown factors but there are additional policies that will help to</p> | <p>Overall this policy meets the SEA objectives and the requirements in the Core Strategy in relation to the settlement boundaries and housing development within policy RA2.</p> | <p>This policy would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA.</p> |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|----|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|----|--|---|---|
| Amendment: criteria regarding conservation area and retained features and housing sizes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | mitigate against the impacts. Amendments have included additional policy criteria to safeguard the conservation area and feature of the village. | | |
| Policy YG11: Highway Measures at Yarpole Amendment: wording amended to refer to traffic calming | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | + | + | + | + | x | x | x | x | 0 | + | + | + | Overall this policy has a positive or neutral impact on the baseline objectives. Amendments are now referring to traffic calming measures rather than designation of green lanes | Overall this policy has a positive impact on the SEA objectives. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA. |
| Policy YG12: Local Green Space in Yarpole Amendment: deletion of LGS and associated text | ++ | ++ | + | ++ | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | ++ | + | + | + | ++ | Overall this policy has a positive effect on the baseline, retaining the character of the area and ensuring a valued green space is protected. Amendment resulted in one of the three proposed local green spaces being deleted | Overall this policy has a positive impact on the SEA objectives. | This policy meets the Core Strategy's requirements for the purposes of the SEA. |
| Policy YG14: Development in conservation areas Amendment; change to 'conserve' to 'preserve' | + | ++ | + | ++ | 0 | x | x | x | x | x | + | + | x | x | x | + | Overall this policy has a positive impact upon the baseline as the policy seeks to have regard to the historic environment. | Overall this policy meets the SEA objectives and the requirements in the Core Strategy for preserving the historic environment. | This policy would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Policy YG15: Sustainable Design Amendment: additional criteria regarding contamination | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | x | x | x | + | Overall this policy has a positive impact on the baseline objectives. Amendment now includes reference to contaminated land. | Overall this policy has a very positive impact on the SEA objectives. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the SEA. |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

Key:

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------------------|
| ++ Move significantly | + Move towards Marginally | - - Move away significantly | - Move away marginally | 0 Neutral | ? Uncertain | N/A No relationship |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------------------|

towards

Policy YG1: Promoting Sustainable Development

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | ++ | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | ++ | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|--|--|
| | | | | period. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | ++ | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | ++ | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| To reduce contributions to climate change | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | Other policies within the plan will help to mitigate against contributions to climate change over the long term. |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To improve water quality | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | Other policies will provide mitigation for the long term. |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|--|----|----|--|--|
| To minimise the production of waste | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To improve health of the population | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | ++ | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and will promote sustainable development through the plan period. Policy safeguards exist to ensure long term effects are positive. The amendments has now included reference to active travel. | | | | |

Policy YG3: Housing Development in Bircher

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---------------|---|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| | | | | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | years) | | | |
|--|---|--------|----|---|--|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Biodiversity will increase as gardens and landscaped areas become established helped by the retention of existing trees hedgerows and green space. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the landscape and built environment will improve as the developed areas mature. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the surroundings will improve as the developed areas mature. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The requirement for developments to complement the village character and be in scale with existing properties will contribute to this performance. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| To improve air quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would necessarily improve air quality. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Extra houses, and in smaller villages would generate more traffic. | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would reduce climate change contribution. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would reduce climate change vulnerability. | |
| To improve water quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would improve water quality. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would provide a sustainable water | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|----|--|--|
| | | | | source. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would avoid, reduce or manage flood risk. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the disturbed soils will improve as the developments mature. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Households will be committed to the Local Authority's waste reduction measures. | |
| To improve health of the population | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. | |
| Overall commentary | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The amendment is seeking to safeguard | | | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| and any cumulative effects | residential amenity and junction improvements. |
|-----------------------------------|--|

PolicyYG4: Proposed land for Housing development in Bircher

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To improve water quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | against the impacts. |
|--|---|---|---|---|----------------------|
| To conserve soil resources and quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To improve health of the population | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. | | | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

Policy YG6: Housing Development in Lucton

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Biodiversity will increase as gardens and landscaped areas become established helped by the retention of existing trees hedgerows and green space. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the landscape and built environment will improve as the developed areas mature. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the surroundings will improve as the developed areas | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|----|---|--|
| | | | | mature. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The requirement for developments to complement the village character and be in scale with existing properties will contribute to this performance. | |
| To improve air quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would necessarily improve air quality. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Extra houses, and in smaller villages would generate more traffic. | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would reduce climate change contribution. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would reduce climate change | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|----|--|--|
| | | | | vulnerability. | |
| To improve water quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would improve water quality. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would provide a sustainable water source. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would avoid, reduce or manage flood risk. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the disturbed soils will improve as the developments mature. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Households will be committed to the Local Authority's waste reduction measures. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| To improve health of the population | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Additional criteria to safeguard residential amenity has been included. | | | | |

YG8: Housing Development in Yarpole

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---------------|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| | | | | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|----|---|--|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Biodiversity will increase as gardens and landscaped areas become established helped by the retention of existing trees hedgerows and green space. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the landscape and built environment will improve as the developed areas mature. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the surroundings will improve as the developed areas mature. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The requirement for developments to complement the village character and be in scale with existing properties will contribute to this performance. | |
| To improve air quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | necessarily improve air quality. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Extra houses, and in smaller villages would generate more traffic. | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would reduce climate change contribution. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would reduce climate change vulnerability. | |
| To improve water quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would improve water quality. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would provide a sustainable water source. | |
| To avoid, reduce and | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|----|--|--|
| manage flood risk | | | | above the Core Strategy. No mention of anything that would avoid, reduce or manage flood risk. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The quality of the disturbed soils will improve as the developments mature. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Households will be committed to the Local Authority's waste reduction measures. | |
| To improve health of the population | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Additional criteria has been added to safeguard residential amenity. | | | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

Policy YG9: Land off Croft Crescent

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---|---|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | against the impacts. |
| To improve water quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To conserve soil | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| resources and quality | | | | terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To improve health of the population | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. The site now has outline planning permission. | | | | |

Policy YG10: Brook House Farm and land to its East

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---------------|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| | | | | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the | ? | ? | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| environment | | | | terms of SEA objectives. | housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To improve water quality | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To provide for sustainable sources of | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| water supply | | | | terms of SEA objectives. | housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | ? | ? | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To improve health of the population | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | |
|--|---|
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. There are some unknown factors as the full details of the housing are unknown but there are additional policies that will help to mitigate against the impacts. Amendment has been included to recognise the conservation area and the retention of features. |
|--|---|

Policy YG11: Highway Measures at Yarpole

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Reducing traffic will have a positive but limited impact upon wildlife. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|----|----|---|--|
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Reducing and managing vehicle speeds, reducing traffic effects, and encouraging alternative forms of transport will all improve the quality of the surroundings over time. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | 0 | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Reducing traffic effects, and encouraging alternative forms of transport will all improve the quality of the surroundings over time. | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Measures in this policy will contribute towards better air quality. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. This policy is designed to limit the effects of traffic upon the environment | |
| To reduce contributions | + | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|-----------|---|--|
| to climate change | | | | Encouraging alternative forms of transport will reduce the contribution to climate change | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | + | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Encouraging alternative forms of transport will reduce the vulnerability to climate change | |
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | This Policy has no, or very little, relationship to water quality. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | This Policy has no, or very little, relationship to water supplies. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | X | X | X | This Policy has no, or very little, relationship to flood risk. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | X | X | X | This Policy has no, or very little, relationship to soil resources. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. It will have a neutral, or at best a marginally positive role in reducing waste, via reduced or avoided consumption from unnecessary journeys. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|----|--|--|
| To improve health of the population | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Encouraging walking and cycling will improve peoples health | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Reducing speed and managing traffic will reduce the nuisance impact of traffic in the parish. | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Encouraging public transport and alternative forms of transport will conserve resources. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. | | | | |

Policy YG12: Local Green Space in Yarpole

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|----------------------|--|----------------------------|---|
| | | | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | ++ | ++ | ++ | This policy should make a positive contribution to the protection or enhancement of the natural environment. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | ++ | ++ | ++ | The protection or enhancement of local greenspaces should help maintain the quality of the 'townscape' and character of the area. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | The protection or enhancement of local greenspaces should help maintain the quality of the surroundings of the area. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | ++ | ++ | ++ | The protection or enhancement of local greenspaces should help maintain the quality the character of the area. | |
| To improve air quality | x | x | x | No relationship. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the | x | x | x | No relationship. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|---|--|
| environment | | | | | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | x | x | x | No relationship. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | x | x | x | No relationship. | |
| To improve water quality | x | x | x | No relationship. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | x | x | x | No relationship. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | x | x | x | No relationship. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | ++ | ++ | ++ | This policy will provide added protection to the finest agricultural land. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| To improve health of the population | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | N/A | N/A | N/A | | |
| To conserve natural and manmade | ++ | ++ | ++ | To protect or enhance local greenspaces should negate the need to develop additional land | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| resources | | | | and use additional resources for recreations or community uses. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This policy will seek to continue to protect and enhance the character of the Parish and special areas within it. | | | | |

Policy YG14: Development in conservation areas

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of | ++ | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|---|--|
| landscapes and townscapes | | | | terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | ++ | ++ | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | |
| To improve air quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | x | x | x | n/a | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| To improve water quality | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To improve health of the population | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| | | | | historic environment. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to have regards to the historic environment. | | | | |

Policy YG15: Sustainable Design

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| townscapes | | | | effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To improve water quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and | |

B3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To improve health of the population | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | x | x | x | n/a | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and seeks to mitigate against the effects of housing development on the environment. Amendment has been included to make reference to contamination issues. | | | | |

Appendix 7

| Objectives and context | Where referenced in NDP/SEA |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Neighbourhood Development Plan's purpose and objectives are made clear. • The Neighbourhood Area's environmental issues and constraints, including acknowledgement of those in the Local Plan (Core Strategy) SA, where relevant, and local environmental protection objectives, are considered in developing objectives and targets. • SEA objectives are clearly set out and linked to indicators and targets where appropriate. • Links with other locally related plans, programmes and policies are identified, explained and acknowledgement for those set out in the SA of the Local Plan (Core Strategy) is given, where relevant. • Conflicts that exist between SEA and Neighbourhood Development Plan objectives; and between SEA objectives and other local plan objectives are identified and described. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1 (paras 1.9 – 1.10). • Sections 2 and 3; and Tables A2 and A3 • Section 3 (para 3.7). • Section 3 (para 3.5). • Section 3 (paras 3.8 – 3.12) |
| Scoping | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory Consultees are consulted in appropriate ways and at appropriate times on the content and scope of the Environmental Report. • The assessment focuses on significant issues. • Technical, procedural and other difficulties encountered are discussed; assumptions and uncertainties are made explicit. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2 (paras 2.6 – 2.7) and Appendix 3 • Sections 2 and 4 • Sections 2 and 4 |

| Alternatives | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realistic alternatives are considered for key issues, and the reasons for choosing them are documented. Alternatives include 'do minimum' and/or 'business as usual' scenarios wherever relevant. The environmental effects (both adverse and beneficial) of each alternative are identified and compared. Inconsistencies between the alternatives and other relevant local plans, programmes or policies are identified and explained. Reasons are given for selection or elimination of alternatives. | Section 5 (5.1 to 5.10) |
| Baseline information | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant aspects of the current state of the local, neighbourhood area environment and their likely evolution without the Neighbourhood Development Plan are described. Acknowledgement to the information in the SA of the Local Plan (Core Strategy) is given, where relevant. Environmental characteristics of the local, neighbourhood area, likely to be significantly affected are described, including areas wider than the physical boundary of the designated neighbourhood area, where it is likely to be affected by the Neighbourhood Development Plan. Difficulties such as deficiencies in information or methods are explained. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 1 and 4. Initial screening report and Section 1. Section 2. |

| Prediction and evaluation of likely significant environmental effects | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects identified include the types listed in the Directive (biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climate factors, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape), as relevant; and other local likely environmental effects are also covered, as appropriate. • Both positive and negative effects are considered, and the duration of effects (short, medium or long-term) is addressed. • Likely secondary, cumulative (growing in quantity and strength) and synergistic (acting together) effects are identified, where practicable. • Inter-relationships between effects are considered, where practicable. • The prediction and evaluation of effects makes use of relevant accepted standards, regulations, and thresholds (i.e. data gathered for the evidence base). • Methods used to evaluate the effects are described. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tables A2, A3 and A4 (Appendix 2) • Tables B2 and B3 (Appendix 4), Table D2 and D3 (Appendix 6) • Table B4 (Appendix 4) • Section 4 • Section 4 • Section 2 |
| Mitigation measures | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and offset any significant adverse effects of implementing the Neighbourhood Development Plan are indicated. • Issues to be taken into account when determining planning applications or other projects, for example funding bids, are identified. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6 (paras 6.3 to 6.9) • Section 4 |

| The Environmental Report | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is clear and concise in its layout and presentation. • Uses simple, clear language and avoids or explains technical terms. • Uses maps and other illustrations, where appropriate. • Explains the methodology used. • Explains who was consulted and what methods of consultation were used. • Identifies sources of information, including expert judgement and matters of opinion. • Contains a non-technical summary covering the overall approach to the SEA, the objectives of the Neighbourhood Development Plan, the main options considered, and any changes to the Neighbourhood Development Plan resulting from the SEA. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A • N/A • N/A • Section 2 • Section 2 • Section 2 • Included at page 1 |
| Consultation | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SEA is consulted on as an integral part of the plan-making process of the Neighbourhood Development Plan. • Consultation Bodies and the public likely to be affected by, or having an interest in, the Neighbourhood Development Plan are consulted in ways and at times, which give them an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinions on the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan and Environmental Report. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2 (paras 2.6 – 2.7) • Section 6 |

| Decision-making and information on the decision | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environmental report and the opinions of those consulted are taken into account in finalising and adopting the Neighbourhood Development Plan. An explanation is given of how they have been taken into account. Reasons are given for choosing the Neighbourhood Development Plan as adopted, in the light of other reasonable alternatives considered. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sections 2 and 6 Following draft consultation Following draft consultation |
| Monitoring measures | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures proposed for monitoring the Neighbourhood Development Plan are clear, practicable and linked to the indicators and objectives used in the SEA. Monitoring is used, where appropriate, during implementation of the Neighbourhood Development Plan to make good deficiencies in baseline information in the SEA. Acknowledgement that monitoring enables unforeseen adverse effects to be identified at an early stage. (These effects may include predictions which prove to be incorrect.) Proposals are made for action in response to significant adverse effects arising from the monitoring of the Neighbourhood Development Plan. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5 Section 5 Section 5 Section 5 |