

Sustainability Appraisal of Braintree Local Plan Sections 1 and 2: Adoption Statement

Prepared by Braintree District Council

2022



Table of Contents

List of Acronyms	2
1 Introduction	3
Background	3
Adoption of the Braintree Local Plan	3
Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan, incorporating the requirements of SEA.....	3
Preparation of the Local Plan	6
Overview of the Local Plan.....	6
2 How environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan.....	7
Environmental and sustainability considerations were integrated into the Local Plan as it was developed	7
Through assessment against an SA framework	8
Other environmental considerations	8
Overview of Section 1 SA Framework	9
Overview of Section 2 SA Framework	12
3 How the SA Report Has Been Taken into Account	13
Timeline of SA Reports.....	13
Table 1: Timeline of SA preparation	13
Local Plan Stage: Issues and Scoping document 2014 (SA scoping report)	14
SA consultation Stage: SA Report on North Essex Authorities Section 1 Preferred Options Draft Local Plan (June 2017)	14
SA Consultation Stage: Preferred Options Draft Section 2 Local Plan 2016	15
Local Plan Stage: Publication Draft Local Plan 2017	15
Section 1 Examination and SA of the main modifications	16
Section 2 Examination and SA of the main modifications	16
4 How the results of consultation have been taken into account?	18
Table 2: Chronological order of SA representations referring to the SA documents.	18
SA consultation undertaken for the Local Plan	18
Consultation for the Issues and Scoping SA.....	19
Consultation for the Section 1 and 2 Draft Local Plan SA 2016	19
Consultation for the Section 1 and 2 Local Plan Publication Draft Local Plan SA 2017	20
Consultation for the Section 1 and 2 examination.....	20
5 Alternatives/options considered as part of the Local Plan preparation.....	21
Options considered in the Issues and Scoping Report	21

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

Table 3: Reasonable Alternatives to Section 1 Local Plan policies.....	21
Table 4: Reasonable Alternatives to Section 2 Local Plan policies.....	26
6 How will the environmental and sustainability effects be monitored?.....	56

List of Acronyms

ASA Additional Sustainability Appraisal

BDC Braintree District Council

DLP Draft Local Plan

LUC Land Use Consultants

HRA Habitats Regulation Assessment

NEA North Essex Authorities

PDLP Publication Draft Local Plan

S1LP Section 1 Local Plan

S2LP Section 2 Local Plan

SA Sustainability Appraisal

SEA Strategic Environmental Assessment

1 Introduction

Background

- 1.1 Braintree District Council (the Council) adopted the Local Plan on 25th July 2022. It is comprised of two documents - North Essex Authorities' Shared Strategic Section 1 Plan (S1LP) and Braintree Local Plan Section 2 (S2LP). The Braintree Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is comprised of the 2017 Section 1 SA Report, 2017 Section 2 SA Report and the 2021 SA Addendum which should be read in conjunction. The two SA Addendum Reports on the Main Modifications also provide assessments of the effects of changes to policy post examination policies.

Adoption of the Braintree Local Plan

- 1.2 Regulation 19 Publication Draft Local Plan (PDLP) was submitted to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government for independent examination on 9th October 2017. The Draft Local Plan (DLP) was split into two sections, Section 1 contains the strategic cross boundary policies and was shared with Colchester Borough Council and Tendring District Council. S2LP contains policies which will direct development of homes, employment, infrastructure and community facilities in the District between now and 2033, including meeting the requirement for homes and employment space agreed within the S1LP.
- 1.3 Following an examination process undertaken in accordance with Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the Inspector in his report concluded that Section 1 could be adopted subject to main modifications. This letter was dated 10th December 2020. Section 1 Local Plan was approved for adoption at Full Council on 22nd February. Section 2 Local Plan proceeded sequentially to be examined and was recommended by the Inspectors to be adopted subject to their final schedule of main modifications, additional modifications and modifications to Local Plan Maps on 14th June 2022. A month later, on the 25th July 2022 and the Braintree Local Plan was subsequently adopted by Full Council.

Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan, incorporating the requirements of SEA

- 1.4 Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a statutory requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which informs decision makers during the plan preparation process with the aim of maximising the contribution that a plan makes to sustainable development while minimising any potential adverse impacts. The SA process involves appraising each policy and allocation using a range of indicators (see SA objectives) to find the likely social, environmental and economic effects of the Local Plan. As recommended by planning practice guidance, the SA incorporates the requirements of the SEA so that statutory requirements of both are addressed within a single report.
- 1.5 Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is a statutory requirement of the SEA regulations for the purposes of providing high level of protection of the environment and contributing to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of Local Plans, with a view to promoting sustainable development. As the SEA process was incorporated into the SA process, this document constitutes the SA and SEA Adoption Statement for the Braintree Local

Plan.

- 1.6 Regulation 26 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations (2012) requires the Council to make the final SA Report available alongside the Adopted Local Plan. For the Braintree Local Plan, the final SA report is comprised of several documents, these are:
- [SA Report on North Essex Authorities Section 1 Publication Draft Local Plan](#) (June 2017)
 - [SA Report on Section 2 Publication Draft Local Plan](#) (June 2017)
 - [Additional SA Report on the North Essex Authorities Section 1 Local Plan](#) (July 2019)
 - [SA Addendum Report on North Essex Authorities Section 1 Main Modifications](#) (August 2020)
 - [SA Addendum Report on North Essex Authorities Section 2 Main Modifications](#) (June 2022)
- 1.7 A Post-adoption Statement completes the SA process by fulfilling the plan and programme adoption requirements of *Directive 2001/42/EC* on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (the SEA Directive) and the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.
- 1.8 The SEA Regulations sets the requirements for post adoption (Stage E) as follows:
- (a) how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme;*
 - (b) how the environmental report has been taken into account;*
 - (c) how opinions expressed in response to— (i) the invitation referred to in regulation 13(2)(d); (ii) action taken by the responsible authority in accordance with regulation 13(4), have been taken into account;*
 - (d) how the results of any consultations entered into under regulation 14(4) have been taken into account;*
 - (e) the reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with; and*
 - (f) the measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of the plan or programme.*
- 1.9 The purpose of post-adoption reporting is to allow stakeholders to see how environmental and sustainability factors have been considered, shows how consultee views have been taken into account during the preparation of the plan and outlines the measures for monitoring the significant environmental effects of implementing the plan.
- 1.10 Regulation 16 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 requires that as soon as reasonably practicable after the adoption of a plan for which an SA/SEA has been carried out, the planning authority must make a copy of the plan publicly available alongside an 'SA statement'.
- 1.11 This document is structured as follows:
- Section 2 summarises how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan by explaining who carried out the SA/SEA and what assessment framework was used.

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

- Section 3 summarises the links between the plan-making and SA/SEA processes and how the SA/SEA recommendations were taken into account.
- Section 4 summarises the consultation opinions provided on the SA/SEA at each stage and describes what changes were made to the SA/SEA process in response to these comments.
- Section 5 describes the alternatives/options considered as part of the Local Plan preparation process and why certain options were chosen.
- Section 6 describes how the significant sustainability/environmental impacts of the Local Plan will be monitored.

Preparation of the Local Plan

Overview of the Local Plan

- 1.12 The Braintree Local Plan is comprised of two documents.
- 1.13 Section 1 Local Plan is designed to set out an overarching strategy for future growth across Braintree, Colchester and Tendring – the North Essex Authorities (NEA). As well as containing strategic policies such as setting the overall housing and employment requirements for North Essex up to 2033, the plan includes proposals for a new cross-boundary Garden Community on the A120 corridor. These are strategic policies of relevance to all three authorities which also guide development management, allocation policies and other local matters in Section 2 Local Plans. Each of the three councils in the NEA also prepared their own S2LP relevant only to their respective local authority areas.
- 1.14 Section 2 of the Local Plan provides policies which directs the development of homes, employment, infrastructure and community facilities in the District between now and 2033, including meeting the requirement for homes and employment space agreed within the Section 1 Local Plan. It also sets out the Council's policies in relation to the protection of the built and natural environment and open space. The Plan includes all policies for the determination of planning applications including those relating to design, flooding, affordable housing and tree protection. The Plan also includes numerous site-specific policies relating to the proposed Strategic Growth Locations and other housing, employment and retail sites.
- 1.15 Provision for housing, employment and supporting infrastructure should accord with the Braintree Local Plan broad spatial strategy which is to concentrate development on the town of Braintree, Witham and the A12/Great Eastern Mainline corridor and Halstead.
- 1.16 Work began in 2015 initially as three separate Local Plans and three separate Scoping Reports/Issues and Options documents. In 2016, the three Councils comprising of the NEA merged strategic policies into a single Section 1 joint strategic Local Plan.

2 How environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan.

Environmental and sustainability considerations were integrated into the Local Plan as it was developed

- 6.1 The SA (incorporating the SEA) was undertaken by specialist consultants Land Use Consultants (LUC) and ECC place services (Place Services). The five documents comprising of the SA/SEA report and four preceding iterations, including the scoping and issues report, were prepared by the consultants who identified the key environmental issues and appraised the likely effects of the policies, sites and strategies (including reasonable alternatives) of the Local Plan, and put forward recommendations to avoid or mitigate negative effects and preserve or enhance positive effects.
- 6.2 The Sustainability Appraisal is an iterative processes so the SA findings were taken into account during each stage of the Local Plan's development. As the policies, sites and strategies of the Local Plan evolved, the accompanying SA Report was updated in order to inform the Council's decision making. Throughout the Local Plan preparation and examination, in particular during the drafting of policies and allocations, environmental considerations from site appraisals were shared with the Council and taken into account, thus are integral to decision making by Braintree Council. Furthermore, the latest relevant SA report and HRAs were made available to decision makers, at Local Plan Sub-Committee meetings and Full Council meetings.
- 6.3 A baseline of information and key sustainability issues was first established in the SA Scoping Report for the Issues and Scoping Local Plan, drawing on the development of an evidence base, national planning policy and consultation with stakeholders. All SA reports were produced with an up-to-date baseline and published methodologies to describe the approach taken, they identify the likely environmental and sustainability effects and put forward recommendations to avoid or minimise negative effects identified or to enhance potential positive effects.
- 6.4 Each policy and proposal, alternative site and each alternative spatial strategy was appraised in relation to its likely effects in relation to the sustainability objectives set out in the relevant SA frameworks. Comparable policies, sites and strategies were assessed against the same framework to ensure transparency and consistency. SA scores were given according to a colour coded scale to differentiate typically within 5 levels between significant positive effects and significant negative effects.
- 6.5 The scale varies at different stages of the SA report, in particular at Section 1 for Local Plan (Reg 19) SA where the judgement differs slightly, however comparable policies, sites and strategies were assessed using the same scale at each stage. Dividing lines between sustainability scores is often quite small. Following appraisal, the findings of the SA was presented in SA matrices, which will include a colour coded score for the alternatives against each of the SA objectives, along with a justification for the score.
- 6.6 To provide the context for the SA, and in compliance with the SEA Directive, a review of other relevant plans and programmes was undertaken and the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and its evolution without the Local Plan were

considered; together, they informed the identification of a series of key sustainability issues.

Through assessment against an SA framework

- 6.7 Key sustainability issues are reflected in the objectives and guide questions that comprised the frameworks used to appraise the Local Plan (the SA Framework). Broadly, the SA objectives presented the preferred sustainability outcome which usually involved minimising detrimental environmental effects and enhancing positive effects.
- 6.8 The SA scoping report, which was published in December 2014 establishes a baseline for environmental information and key sustainability issues, then introduces a proposed approach to assessment. This became the first iteration of the Section 2 SA framework. It should be noted that the SA objectives within Table 4.1 of SA scoping report document was based on a previously defined set of SA objectives used for the withdrawn pre-submission Site Allocations and Development Management Plan.
- 6.9 For the production of the DLP, the Council shared with LUC the call for sites data pertaining the characteristics of reasonable alternatives sites to housing, employment, retail and other allocations. LUC were able to share appraisal work to inform the allocations in the Local Plan. Similarly, the NEAs shared emerging evidence base documents on the garden communities and section 1 with Place Services to inform the production of the Strategic Part 1 - SA. Environmental and sustainability considerations were identified in Chapter 2 (key sustainability issues and sustainability objectives) and an SA framework for S1LP was established here.
- 6.10 The approach to SA assessment for Section 2 was first set out in Chapter 4 of the Issues and Scoping SA and was updated throughout the subsequent iterations of the SA in order to ensure that the resulting assessment framework remained robust. This was carried through to the Draft Local Plan and the Publication Draft Local Plan 2017. A final version of the assessment framework was published in Chapter 2 of the SA of the Main Modifications to the Braintree District Section 2 Local Plan.
- 6.11 The approach to Section 1 SA assessment was first set out after the Issues and Scoping SA however work was undertaken by different consultants which resulted in the use of a largely similar but nonetheless, different SA framework. This was also updated following consultation at draft Local Plan and publication draft Local Plan stages and carried through for use in the Section 1 Additional SA. A final version of this assessment framework was published at Table 2.1 of the Section 1 Additional SA.

Other environmental considerations

- 6.12 The Council also integrated environmental considerations through:
- consultation with statutory stakeholders and the public at each stage of the Local Plan, incorporating environmental and sustainability matters;
 - adherence to national planning policy; and
 - legal compliance with the Duty to Cooperate.

Overview of Section 1 SA Framework

6.13 The appraisal questions linked to each SA objective are not intended to be exhaustive but help to guide the appraisal of plan proposals against the SA objectives, improving transparency and consistency in the appraisal process.

- SA objective 1: To create safe environments which improve quality of life and community cohesion
 - Does it seek to improve / supply community facilities for young people?
 - Does it seek to increase cultural activities or suitable development to stimulate them?
 - Does it seek to support cultural identity and social inclusion?
 - Will there be measures to increase the safety and security of new development and public realm?
- SA objective 2: To provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent, safe home which meets their needs at a price they can afford
 - Will it increase the range and affordability of housing to support the growing population and for all social groups?
 - Does it respond to the needs of an ageing population?
 - Does it seek to provide appropriate rural affordable housing?
 - Will it deliver well designed and sustainable housing?
 - Will it contribute to meeting Gypsy and Traveller pitch requirements of the GTAA?
- SA objective 3: To improve the health of the District's residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities
 - Will it ensure access to health facilities?
 - Will it ensure access to sport and recreation facilities, open space and accessible green space?
 - Will it encourage access by walking or cycling?
- SA objective 4: To ensure and improve the vitality & viability of centres
 - Does it seek to prevent loss of retail and other services in rural areas?
 - Does it promote and enhance the viability of existing centres by focusing development in such centres?
 - Does it seek to locate development in close proximity to town centres?
 - Does it seek to located development within easy public travelling distance to town centres?
 - Does it seek to improve public transport networks to town centres?
- SA objective 5: To achieve a prosperous and sustainable economy that creates new jobs, improves the vitality and viability of centres and captures the economic benefits of international gateways
 - Will it improve the delivery of a range of employment opportunities to support the growing population?
 - Will it tackle employment associated deprivation?
 - Will it enhance the area's potential for tourism?
 - Will it promote development of the ports?
 - Will it encourage the rural economy and diversification of it?
 - Will it support business innovation, diversification, entrepreneurship and changing economies?
 - Does it seek to improve existing training and learning facilities and/or create more facilities?

- Will the employment opportunities available be mixed to suit a varied employment skills base?
- SA objective 6: To conserve and enhance biological and geological diversity of the environment
 - Will development have a potential impact on a national, international or European designated site (SPA, SAC, Ramsar, SSSI)?
 - Will it maintain and enhance sites otherwise designated for their nature conservation interest?
 - Will it conserve and enhance natural/semi natural habitats?
 - Will it conserve and enhance species diversity, and in particular avoid harm to indigenous BAP priority species?
- SA objective 7: To achieve more sustainable travel behaviour, reduce the need to travel and reduce congestion
 - Will it increase and/or improve the availability and usability of sustainable transport modes?
 - Will it seek to encourage people to use alternative modes of transportation other than private vehicle?
 - Will it lead to the integration of transport modes?
 - Will it improve rural public transport?
 - Does it seek to increase the uptake or viability of walking and cycling as methods of transportation, through new infrastructure or integration?
- SA objective 8: To promote accessibility, ensure that development is located sustainably and makes efficient use of land, and ensure the necessary infrastructure to support new development
 - Will it contribute positively to reduce social exclusion by ensuring access to jobs, shopping, services and leisure facilities for all?
 - Does it seek to concentrate development and facilities where access via sustainable travel is greatest?
 - Does it seek to minimise congestion at key destinations / areas that witness a large amount of vehicle movements at peak times?
 - Would the scale of development require significant supporting transport infrastructure in an area of identified need?
 - Will it ensure adequate school places (through expansion / new facilities) and early years provision to support growth?
 - Will it ensure the required improvements to utilities infrastructure?
 - Will it ensure the required improvements in capacity to GP services?
 - Will it provide a suitable amount of sports, recreational, leisure and open space facilities?
- SA objective 9: To conserve and enhance historic and cultural heritage and assets and townscape character?
 - Will it protect and enhance designations, features and areas of historical, archaeological and cultural value in both urban and rural areas?
 - Will it have a negative impact on the significance of a designated historic environment asset or its setting?
 - Does it seek to enhance the range and quality of the public realm and open spaces?
 - Will it reduce the amount of derelict, degraded and underused land?
 - Does it encourage the use of high quality design principles to respect local character?
 - Will / can any perceived adverse impacts be reduced through adequate mitigation?

- SA objective 10: To make efficient use of energy and reduce contributions to climatic change through mitigation and adaptation.
 - Will it reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by reducing energy consumption?
 - Will it lead to an increased generation of energy from renewable sources?
 - Will it encourage greater energy efficiency?
 - Will it improve the efficient use of natural resources, minimising waste and promoting recycling?
- SA objective 11: To improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity
 - Will it lead to no deterioration on the quality of water bodies?
 - Will water resources and sewerage capacity be able to accommodate growth?
- SA objective 12: To reduce the risk of fluvial, coastal and surface water flooding
 - Does it promote the inclusion of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in new developments and will their integration be viable?
 - Does it seek to avoid development in areas at risk of flooding (fluvial, coastal, surface water)?
 - Does it seek to avoid increasing flood risk (fluvial, surface water, groundwater) in areas away from initial development?
- SA objective 13: To improve air quality
 - Will it improve, or not detrimentally affect air quality along the A12 or A120?
 - Does it direct growth away from AQMAs?
 - Does it seek to improve or avoid increasing traffic flows generally?
- SA objective 14: To conserve and enhance the quality of landscapes
 - Will landscapes sensitive to development be protected?
 - Will it lead to rural expansion or development outside development boundaries/limits that increases coalescence with neighbouring settlements?
 - Is the scale / density of development in keeping with important and valued features of the local landscape?
- SA objective 15: To safeguard and enhance the quality of soil and mineral deposits
 - Will it avoid the loss of high quality agricultural land?
 - Will it avoid the sterilisation of mineral deposits / is the site within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA)?
 - Will it support or lead to the remediation of contaminated land, avoiding environmental pollution or exposure of occupiers or neighbouring land uses to unacceptable health risk?

6.14 The SA process has considered the contribution of the Local Plan towards each of the appraisal objectives above, drawing on the baseline information to predict the likely significant effects.

6.15 The findings of Sections 1 and HRA, which has the purpose of assessing the impact of the Local Plan on internationally protected habitat sites, was used to inform the SA process, particularly pertaining assessments against SA objective 6: To conserve and enhance biological and geological diversity of the environment.

Overview of Section 2 SA Framework

6.16 The SA framework used a colour-coded symbols attributed to each policy and site allocation to indicate its likely sustainability effects and performance against each SA objective.

- SA objective 1: To create safe environments which improve quality of life, community cohesion
- SA Objective 2: Provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home
- SA Objective 3: To improve the health of the Districts' residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities
- SA Objective 4: Promote the vitality and viability of all service centres throughout the District
- SA objective 5: To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth
- SA objective 6: To conserve and enhance biological and geological diversity of the environment
- SA objective 7: To promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake
- SA objective 8: Promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development
- SA objective 9: To improve the education and skills of the population
- SA objective 10: To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings
- SA objective 11: To reduce contributions to climate change
- SA objective 12: To improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity
- SA objective 13: To mitigate flood risk
- SA objective 14: To improve air quality
- SA objective 15: To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes
- SA objective 16: To safeguard and enhance the quality of soil

3 How the SA Report Has Been Taken into Account

Timeline of SA Reports

- 3.1 As discussed in section 2 of this statement, development of the Local Plan has been an iterative process and SA reports were produced to accompany each of the plan making stages in order to inform decision making which integrates environmental and sustainability considerations. Table 1 below summarises the key stages in the development of the Local Plan and the associated SA work undertaken. A summary of how the findings of the SA were taken into account by the Council is presented later in this section.
- 3.2 The SA has influenced the Council's decision making at each stage of the Local Plan for strategy, policies and allocations. This is reflected in the stages for SA preparation.

Table 1: Timeline of SA preparation

Local Plan Consultation Stage and Documents	SA consultation stage and documents
Issues and Options Stage	
Issues and scoping (January 2015)	LUC SA Scoping Report (December 2014)
Consultation: 26 th January – 6 th March 2015	Consultation: 26 th January – 6 th March 2015
Draft Local Plan stage	
NEA Section 1 Preferred Options Local Plan (June 2016)	Place Services SA Report on North Essex Authorities Section 1 Preferred Options Local Plan (June 2016)
BDC Section 2 Draft Local Plan (June 2016)	LUC SA Report on Section 2 Draft Local Plan (June 2016)
Consultation: 9 th July – 16 th September 2016	Consultation: 9 th July – 16 th September 2016
Publication Draft stage	
NEA Section 1 Publication Draft (June 2017)	Place Services SA Report on North Essex Authorities Section 1 Publication Draft Local Plan (June 2017)
BDC Section 2 Publication Draft (June 2017)	LUC SA Report on Section 2 Publication Draft Local Plan (June 2017)
Consultation: 16 th June – 28 th July 2017	LUC Non-Technical Summary of the Section 2 Publication Draft Local Plan
	Consultation: 9 th July – 16 th September 2016
Submission to the Secretary of State	

Sections 1 and 2 Publication Draft Local Plan was submitted on 9 th October 2017. Section 1 was examined first followed by Section 2. It was necessary to prepare additional SA Reports after the Initial Hearings.	
Section 1 Examination	
Initial Hearings: 16 th – 25 th January 2018 Additional day to initial Hearings: 9 th May 2018 Additional Hearings: 14 th – 30 th January 2020	LUC Additional SA Report on the North Essex Authorities Section 1 Local Plan (July 2019)
Proposed Main Modifications to the Publication Draft Section 1 Local Plan Consultation 27 th August – 9 th October 2020	Consultation 19 th August – 30 th September 2019 LUC SA Addendum Report on the North Essex Authorities Section 1 Main Modifications (August 2020)
Examiner's Schedule of Main Modifications to the Publication Draft Section 1 Local Plan (December 2020)	Consultation 27 th August – 9 th October 2020
Section 2 Examination	
Draft schedule of recommended modifications to the Local Plan (May 2021)	LUC SA Addendum report for the main modifications to the Section 2 of the Local Plan
Hearing Sessions: 6 th July – 15 th July 2021	6 th December 2021 - 24 th January 2022
Schedule of proposed main modifications to the publication draft section 2 Local Plan (November 2021)	

Local Plan Stage: Issues and Scoping document 2014 (SA scoping report)

- 3.3 Meaningful appraisal of policies, sites and strategies was not possible at this stage of Local Plan preparation however section 5 of the scoping report does provide high level commentary for each of the topic areas in the Scoping and Options Local Plan document. It provided baseline information for social, economic and environmental issues and the SA framework for assessment. This SA influenced early decision making for the next stage of the Local Plan.

SA consultation Stage: SA Report on North Essex Authorities Section 1 Preferred Options Draft Local Plan (June 2017)

- 3.4 When the Local Plan was divided into two sections, the SA reports were also divided such that Strategic Part 1 - Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016) was produced by ECC Place Services.
- 3.5 As stated in the Background chapter to the document, Place Services were appointed as consultants. The assessment focussed on the strategic policies of the Local Plan and the three proposed Garden Communities and their alternatives, assessing higher and lower quantum of development and variations of locations within their call for sites area. At this stage of the Local Plan process, it was not

possible to make detailed recommendations for any of the Garden Community options. A set of general recommendations were made instead (Paragraph 3.4) which were taken into account for publication draft Local Plan, these were:

- Be more explicit as to the requirements of new development for historic environment and biodiversity gain in Policy SP5
- SP7 should include a new principle to achieve quality and active management of historic assets.
- Masterplanning process will have to seek to eradicate any negative impacts on agricultural land, landscape, sites of nature conservation and heritage assets.
- Policy SP9 mentions Domsey Brook and Roman River corridors but no Marks Tey brickpit SSSI.
- Policy SP10 should mention the sensitivity of Sailing Grove registered park and garden.

SA Consultation Stage: Preferred Options Draft Section 2 Local Plan 2016

- 3.6 For the Section 2 Draft Local Plan 2016 and Section 2 SA Publication Draft Local Plan 2017, LUC were retained as consultants to assess non-strategic policies, allocations and reasonable alternatives. By this stage, filtering of all call for sites options complete and these findings were shared with the Council thus influencing the selection of allocations and their reasonable alternatives. Early assessments of policies and draft site assessments were also shared with the Council to inform decision making for allocations.
- 3.7 The SA Report for the Section 2 draft Local Plan contained the first publication for the findings of the appraisal of site allocations and reasonable alternatives, preferred policies and their alternatives, objectives and spatial strategy. At this stage the spatial strategy was not assessed and instead reference made to allocating policies, including for employment and residential land, and Strategic Part 1 - Sustainability Appraisal: Preferred Options (June 2016).
- 3.8 Appraisals followed the SA methodology set out in Chapter 2 of the SA, highlighting any likely significant effects (both positive and negative, and considering the likely secondary, cumulative, synergistic, short, medium and long-term and permanent and temporary effects), making recommendations for improvements and clarifications that mitigate negative effects and maximise the benefits of the plan when drafted in full. It also described the Council's reasons for selecting or rejecting site options at this stage in the preparation of the Local Plan.
- 3.9 The SA Report for the Draft Local Plan included several recommendations at Chapter 12 and throughout the report, in particular to carry out further site assessments for the historic environment. These reflected the findings of the SA which were presented to Braintree Council through the use of committee reports.

Local Plan Stage: Publication Draft Local Plan 2017

- 3.10 Appendix J to the 2018 SA Report presents the suggested mitigation identified by consultants during earlier stages of the SA process and details how and where the Council consider the Local Plan to have responded. The appraisal of the Publication Draft Local Plan subsequently identified further measures to help address potential negative effects and enhance positive effects associated with the implementation of the Local Plan. These measures were highlighted within the detailed appraisal

matrices contained at Appendices F, H and I of the 2018 SA Report, the majority of which were addressed through the Main Modifications.

- 3.11 No additional mitigation measures were identified as a result of the appraisal of the Main Modifications.

Section 1 Examination and SA of the main modifications

- 3.12 Following the inspector's initial hearing sessions, he wrote to the NEAs concerning the SA work undertaken prior to the submission of the Section 1 Local Plan with respect to three main shortcomings: the objectivity of the SA, the clarity of the reasonable alternatives and reasons for selections and the selection of the Garden Communities and combinations for assessment.
- 3.13 The Additional SA (ASA) was subsequently commissioned by the NEAs to cure the failings of the Section 1 SA. This work was undertaken by LUC who proposed a two-stage methodology. This ASA is intended to supplement earlier SA work. As explained under 'Relationship of the Additional SA Report with the original SA Report' in Section 1 of the Additional SA of North Essex Section 1 Local Plan, only Appendix 1 of the earlier SA work is replaced and further appraisal information is provided in relation to chapters 4, 5, 6 and 7.
- 3.14 The Inspector's report at paragraphs 60 to 116 provides detailed considerations of how he has taken the SA findings into account. It was summarised at paras 17 to 19 as follows:

17. *The NEAs carried out a sustainability appraisal [SA] of the Plan, prepared a report of its findings, and published the report [SD/001] along with the Plan and other submission documents, in accordance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 [the 2012 Regulations]. In IED/011 I identified a number of shortcomings in SD/001, and in response the NEAs prepared and published an additional SA report [SD/001b], which was also the subject of public consultation.*
18. *I consider that the additional SA report rectifies the shortcomings I identified in the original report. Paragraphs 60-110 inclusive of IED/022 (attached below), which form an integral part of this report, set out my reasons for taking that view, and there has been no subsequent evidence which alters that view. In particular, I consider that in EXD/094 the NEAs provide an effective response to the argument made in EXD/091 that the SA fails to take adequate account of the 2015 Paris Agreement on climate change or the Climate Change Act 2008.*
19. *SA of the Plan as modified by the proposed MMs was subsequently carried out and the report [SD/001c] was published for public consultation. In assessing the soundness of the Plan below, I have taken account of the findings of the SA reports, the responses to public consultation on them, and the comments of the NEAs' consultants on the responses to SD/001c [NEA/021a].*

Section 2 Examination and SA of the main modifications

- 3.15 The approach to assessing the SA implications of the Main Modifications firstly involved considering each modification as set out in the final Schedule of Main Modifications. A column was added to the Schedule of Main Modifications to consider and record whether the modification would be likely to change the SA findings presented in the 2017 SA Report or the 2021 SA Addendum for the relevant part of

the Local Plan that the modification relates to.

- 3.16 New site allocations as well as reasonable alternatives to these are appraised in Appendix C and their likely sustainability effects are summarised in Chapter 4 of the Section 2 SA Addendum. As explained in Chapter 4, certain other sites were also appraised, for example those whose development boundary has changed significantly relative to that allocated in the Submission Draft Local Plan.
- 3.17 The Inspectors' report at paragraphs 35 to 37 concludes their findings into the SA:
35. *We have carefully considered the effect of the removal of the Colchester/Braintree Borders and West of Braintree Garden Communities on the BLPs2's spatial strategy and housing delivery. In doing so we considered if it was necessary to undertake a full updated Sustainability Appraisal of the BLPs2 to address the loss of the Garden Communities. However, this issue was fully considered in the Sustainability Appraisal to the BLPs1 which established the spatial context for the District and was found to be sound.*
36. *A Sustainability Appraisal was also carried out of the BLPs2 at MM Stage. That did not revisit the spatial strategy in the absence of the Garden Communities. However, we are content that such an approach would not be necessary in this case. Since the submission of the Plan in 2017 a number of sites not originally allocated have granted permission, and this is reflected in the Plan. This means that the Council, as discussed below, can demonstrate the required supply of housing for the Plan period, consistent with BLPs1. Moreover, a significant proportion (around 80%) of the housing is to be delivered in and around the towns of Braintree, Witham and Halstead, the largest settlements in the District. We also note that the contribution to be made by the Garden Communities was also not envisaged to come forward until towards the end of the Plan period and that in the context of intervening additions to supply it represents a small proportion of overall supply.*
37. *Having regard to the Sustainability Appraisals to both Section 1 and Section 2 and taken as a whole, there is nothing before us to indicate that the spatial strategy as proposed is flawed, or that insufficient attention has been given to reasonable alternatives. The strategy as proposed in the BLPs2 reflects guidance in the NPPF and meets the full housing requirement for the District. Given the passage of nearly 5 years since the submission of the BLPs2, it would, in our view, be unnecessary to delay the Plan's progress any further. This would lead to increased and prolonged uncertainty in the local housing market, which would delay the delivery of much needed new homes in the District. We are therefore of the view that the approach taken with regard to the spatial strategy is an appropriate and proportionate one.*

4 How the results of consultation have been taken into account?

- 4.1 Regulation 16 of the SEA Regulations requires that the SA Adoption Statement includes a description of how the opinions expressed by the public and consultation bodies during consultation on the plan and SA Report were taken into account. The table below summarises the stages of the Braintree District Local Plan preparation and the accompanying SA Reports that have been prepared and consulted on.

Table 2: Chronological order of SA representations referring to the SA documents.

Local Plan Stage	SA documents	Consultation Period
Local Plan Issues and Scoping (January 2015)	BDC Scoping Report (December 2014)	26th January to 6th March 2015
Section 1 Local Plan Draft for Consultation (June 2016)	SA Report on North Essex Authorities Section 1 Preferred Options Local Plan (June 2016)	27 th June to 19 th August 2016
Section 2 Draft Local Plan (June 2016)	SA Report on Section 2 Draft Local Plan (2016)	27th June to 19th August 2016
Section 1 Publication Draft Local Plan (June 2017)	SA Report on North Essex Authorities Section 1 Publication Draft Local Plan (June 2017)	16 th June to 28 th July 2017
Section 2 Publication Draft Local Plan (June 2017)	SA Report on Section 2 Publication Draft Local Plan (June 2017)	16 th June to 28 th July 2017
Section 1 Examination	Additional SA Report on the North Essex Authorities Section 1 Local Plan (July 2019)	19 th August to 30 th September 2019
	SA Addendum Report on North Essex Authorities Section 1 Main Modifications (August 2020)	19 th August to 30 th September 2020
Section 2 Examination	SA Addendum Report for the proposed Main Modifications to Section 2 of the Local Plan (December 2021)	6th December 2021 to 24th January 2022

SA consultation undertaken for the Local Plan

- 4.2 The Council has undertaken three stages of consultation during the preparation of the plan as required for submission to the Secretary of State under the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012 (SI 2012 No. 767 The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.). Following each stage of consultation, all representations relating to the SA process were reviewed. Three stages of consultation were undertaken within the examination period.
- 4.3 In total there were 8 public consultations where key stakeholders, including the three named statutory bodies (the Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England) were invited to comment by letter or email. These consultations were also open to the general public and stakeholders, whom could have encountered

advertisements in local newspapers or the Council's social media. Braintree District submitted a Consultation Statement (SDBDC 006) accompanying the Publication Draft Local Plan for examination which sets out in detail how consultation responses to both the Local Plan and the SA were taken into account by summarising the main issues and how they were addressed. This covered the first three Local Plan stages up to examinations, after which the planning inspectors take responsibility, and the final 3 consultations are accounted for in their inspectors' reports.

- 4.4 Appendix 8 of the [SA Report on Section 2 Publication Draft Local Plan](#) contains a summary of representations which were received during the consultations on the:
- Scoping Report and Issues and Options SA Report; and
 - Draft Local Plan SA Report.
- 4.5 SA-related representations that were received during the consultation on the Publication Draft Section 2 Local Plan were considered by the Inspector.
- 4.6 Further representations were made during the Examination process and the Council provided a summary of representations received on the proposed Main Modifications, including the Council's response, for the Inspector to consider after the public consultation on the [Additional SA Report on the North Essex Authorities Section 1 Local Plan](#) (July 2019).

Consultation for the Issues and Scoping SA

- 4.7 A separate comments form was produced for the BDC Scoping Report SA document where 2 questions, as recommended by the SA consultants at paragraph 6.2 of the Issues and Scoping report, were put to consultees to consider. These related to querying if significant sustainability issues were missing or misrepresented and if SA objectives and SA methodology provided a reasonable framework with which to address the likely significant sustainability effects of the Local Plan.
- 4.8 The views of the three statutory consultees were specifically invited. Natural England and Historic England responded, however no comments were received from the Environment Agency. A summary of the consulted comment and the response from the SA consultants was published at Appendix 8 of the SA Report on Section 2 Draft Local Plan (June 2016). Historic England generally provided clarification on the relevant plans and policies to be used and wording of sustainability objectives. Amendments were made to the report and the methodology in response to concerns raised about using a proximity-based approach for heritage assessments, instead a qualitative approach using officer judgement was adopted. Natural England requested that the baseline information is expanded to include the River Ter SSSI and the Stour Valley AONB, and subsequent changes to accommodate these comments.

Consultation for the Section 1 and 2 Draft Local Plan SA 2016

- 4.9 The responses to the 8-week statutory consultation from all three NEAs was collated and analysed for section 1. These were broadly related to comments in site appraisal scores. ECC place services took these into account for the SA Report on North Essex Authorities Section 1 Publication Draft Local Plan (June 2017) but did not

publish their responses to comments.

- 4.10 For section 2, the summary of representations received, and the SA consultant's responses are in Appendix 8, table A8.2 of the SA Report on Section 2 Publication Draft Local Plan (June 2017). Natural England suggested that the SA monitoring measures should include the amount green infrastructure and priority habitats delivered. Historic England did not provide feedback on the Section 2 Draft Local Plan. The Environment Agency generally made notification of a number of waste facilities with existing environmental permits that are in proximity to proposed allocations and alternative sites. Adjustments to the sustainability appraisals were made to these sites where appropriate. Other comments on the sustainability appraisal were generally related to the appraisal scores given for particular sites.

Consultation for the Section 1 and 2 Local Plan Publication Draft Local Plan SA 2017

- 4.11 All responses to this stage of the Local Plan were submitted to the Planning Inspector appointed to examine the Plan. Section 2 Local Plan consultation responses at this stage were generally related to the appraisal scores given for particular sites. Section 1 Local Plan consultation responses, including ones submitted to other NEAs, Colchester and Tendring, commented on the methodology used in the appraisal and queried the criteria used for the generation of reasonable alternatives to the Garden Communities. Historic England and the Environment Agency also commented but their responses did not relate to the Sustainability Appraisals.

Consultation for the Section 1 and 2 examination

- 4.12 Section 1 examination was held first, followed by Section 2 examination. For both Local Plan examinations, there were public consultations on each of the main modifications where all comments were sent to the Inspectors for their consideration. How these comments were taken into account is reflected within the Inspector's reports and is beyond the scope of this Sustainability Statement.
- 4.13 Before the main modifications consultation for Section 1, the inspector held an additional consultation as part of his examination whereupon he invited comments on new evidence base documents. This included the [Additional SA Report on the North Essex Authorities Section 1 Local Plan](#) (2019) which was submitted in response to the Inspector's interim findings. During the creation of this additional SA, all three statutory consultees were also invited to comment on the methodology.

5 Alternatives/options considered as part of the Local Plan preparation

5.1 At each stage of the Local Plan a preferred option and a range of reasonable alternative options were considered by the Council as the decision maker for the Draft Local Plan and the Publication Draft Local Plan. Section 1 Local Plan examination was paused so that the Council could work on the Additional Sustainability Appraisal (2020) which also included the appraisal of new reasonable alternative options for the decision maker to consider. Section 2 Local Plan examination included updates to the spatial strategy and site allocations in response to the loss of 2 garden communities and any changes as result of the passing of time. All reasonable alternative options were also subject to public consultation before assessments were made available to the relevant Inspectors to aid their decision making - even though this falls out of the scope of this post adoption statement.

Options considered in the Issues and Scoping Report

5.2 The issues and scoping document presented consultees with a range of options categorised into nine themes. At least one alternative option was included for each theme however the document presents issues and gathers ideas rather than present substantive policy options. Due to the nature of the issues and scoping document, the SA scoping report discusses the types of sustainability issues and guides consultees rather than attempt to appraise the options. All consultees were invited to put forward additional options for the Council to consider in their responses.

Table 3: Reasonable Alternatives to Section 1 Local Plan policies

5.3 The table entries for the alternatives considered and reasons for rejection below is derived from the relevant appendix of the SA report for Pre-submission Draft Local Plan or the Additional SA. A full explanation and reasoning of the policy's likely significant effects against each objective, including short-, medium- and long-term effects, can be found within chapter 3 of the North Essex Section One Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal (August 2020).

Policy	Summary Appraisal of the proposed policy	Alternatives considered and reasons for rejection
Policy SP1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development	<p>This policy sets out that the authorities will apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development in accordance with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The effects will apply to all planning decisions equally and are not considered to be significant, minor positive effects is recorded for all SA objectives.</p>	There are not considered to be any other reasonable alternatives to this and as such, none have been assessed.

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

<p>Policy SP2 Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS)</p>	<p>This policy ensures that the Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) 2018-2038 is delivered.</p> <p>The policy relates to biodiversity matters, where negligible effects were assessed, only. Assessment against other SA objectives was not considered necessary.</p>	<p>It is not considered that a distinctly different variation to the policy exists, nor that the policy could be removed without compromising the soundness of the Local Plan and as such, no reasonable alternatives have been considered.</p>
<p>SP3 Spatial Strategy for North Essex</p>	<p>This policy sets out the spatial strategy setting the broad scale and location of new development. The adopted plan contains one garden community compared to the draft Local Plan which proposed three Garden Communities.</p> <p>There are significant positive effects for Housing, vitality of town centres and Economy.</p> <p>However, there were significant negative effects with uncertainty for Historic Environment, Air Quality and Soil.</p> <p>Minor negative effects with uncertainty were assessed for Biodiversity and geodiversity, services and infrastructure, energy efficiency and climate change, water resources and quality, flood risk and landscape.</p> <p>A minor positive effect with uncertainty for sustainable travel was assessed.</p> <p>There were uncertain effects for Health and Community Cohesion.</p>	<p>A range of assessed alternatives too numerous to be listed here can be found in the Additional Sustainability Appraisal, July 2019 and SA Report on North Essex Authorities Section 1 Publication Draft Local Plan (June 2017). See Chapters 3 and 4 for the results of Stage 1 and 2 SA of alternative spatial strategies.</p>
<p>SP4 Meeting Housing Needs</p>	<p>The adopted plan will result in an increase in housing</p>	<p>Reasonable Alternative A – Braintree housing provision</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

	<p>stock across the NEA area of around 20% over the period of the plan with the majority of development will be delivered through allocations in the Section Two Local Plans, which are subject to separate SAs (table below).</p> <p>The adopted plan sets out an OAN of 2,315 new homes per year.</p> <p>Significant positive impacts were identified for Housing and minor positive for vitality and viability of town centres and economy.</p> <p>There were significant negative uncertain effects with uncertainty for Historic environment and soil and mineral resources. Minor negative effects with uncertainty were also recorded for energy efficiency, water, air quality and biodiversity.</p> <p>There are uncertain neutral effects for all other objectives.</p>	<p>based on the 2018-based population projections</p> <p>Reasonable Alternative B – Braintree housing provision based on the NMSS 2019 projections</p> <p>Reasonable Alternative C – Braintree housing provision based on the 2014 based projections without a market uplift</p>
<p>SP5 Employment</p>	<p>The adopted plan seeks to provide land based on the Employment land needs assessments for each of the NEA authorities.</p> <p>There are significant positive effects for Economy and minor positive effects for safe environments and community cohesion and health. Housing is also expected have minor positive effects, albeit with uncertainty.</p> <p>Minor negative effects with uncertainty are expected for biodiversity, climate change, water, air quality and soil.</p>	<p>Policy SP5 is underpinned by the employment evidence base, and no reasonable alternatives have been identified.</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

	<p>Significant negative effects with uncertainty are expected for historic environment.</p> <p>There are uncertain neutral effects for all other objectives.</p>	
SP6 Infrastructure and Connectivity	<p>Policy SP6 sets out the infrastructure and connectivity requirements for the plan including the strategic transport network, the inter-urban road network, the A12, the A120, the A130, route-based strategies; rail; public transport, walking and cycling, education and healthcare and broadband.</p>	<p>The policy is derived from detailed assessment of infrastructure measures required to support the Local Plan. An alternative could include different infrastructure projects; however, these have not been progressed to a sufficient degree of certainty to form reasonable alternatives. As such, no reasonable alternatives have been considered.</p>
SP7 Place Shaping Principles	<p>Policy SP7 sets out the NEA ambitions for development to achieve high quality design and good place making.</p> <p>The main modifications SA identified significant positive effects in relation to safe environments and community cohesion, health and sustainable travel. It identified minor positive effects for housing, vitality and viability of centres, Economy, Biodiversity and Geodiversity, services and infrastructure, energy efficiency and climate change, water quality and air quality.</p> <p>There were negligible effects for historic environment and townscape and flood risk.</p> <p>The policy does not refer to soil or Landscape so the effect on these SA objectives were uncertain.</p>	<p>The policy sets out the NEAs requirements for high quality design and place making. It is considered that there are no distinctly different reasonable alternatives and as such, none are assessed.</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

<p>SP8 Tendring / Colchester Borders Garden Community</p>	<p>The provision of a Garden Community in the Tendring / Colchester Borders area was assessed as Site NEAGC3 and Strategy 'East 3' in the Additional SA.</p> <p>The main modifications SA assessed how the policy is likely to change the sustainability findings.</p>	<p>The main modifications SA states that any alternatives to this would most likely be a similarly structured policy, with different specific provisions.</p> <p>See the Additional Sustainability Appraisal, July 2019 for assessments of alternative sites on the scale of Garden Communities.</p>
---	--	--

Table 4: Reasonable Alternatives to Section 2 Local Plan policies

- 5.4 Many responses in the table below refers to ‘SA Appendices for alternative site assessments’, this is because where one or more site allocations are made, the appropriate alternative sites were individually assessed and the results published in the SA to the Publication Draft Local Plan or SA Addendum Report for the proposed Main Modifications to Section 2 of the Local Plan (December 2021).
- 5.5 Summary appraisals reflect the assessment of the adopted policy which are unchanged from the SA to the Publication Draft Local Plan, unless the policy was revised in the SA Main Modifications to Section 2 of the Local Plan.

Policy	Summary Appraisal of the proposed policy	Alternatives considered and reasons for rejection
Spatial Strategy (Part of LPP1)	<p>Adopted</p> <p>The supporting text to policy LPP1 contains the vision and objectives and the Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>The vision was first set out in the Issues and Scoping Report but first assessed, alongside 12 strategic objectives in the SA for Draft Local Plan. At this point, the broad spatial strategy for section 2 was not contained in a specific policy but in more detailed spatial policies, in the supporting text for development boundaries, and it was also acknowledged that Section 1 also sets out and implements a spatial strategy.</p> <p>An assessment of spatial strategy alternatives did not appear until the SA for Section 2 publication draft Local Plan. In this document, the vision and objectives, and the chosen strategy of concentrating development at the Main Towns, A12, GEML corridor and garden communities was assessed along with 5 other reasonable alternative options.</p>	<p>A higher-level Spatial Strategy for the NEA area of Braintree, Colchester and Tendring was submitted to examination as part of S1LP.</p> <p>A range of assessed alternatives were also submitted and can be found in the SA Report on Section 2 Publication Draft Local Plan (June 2017) at Table 5.1: Proposed spatial strategy. In summary, these were:</p> <p>Chosen strategy: Main Towns, A12/GEML corridor and Garden Communities.</p> <p>Option A: Excluding Large Sites Option B: Large Developments Only Option C: Sites with high sustainable transport Option D: Centred around Braintree Option E: Rural Distribution</p> <p>Due to the Inspector's decision to remove two of the three Garden Communities from Section 1 Local Plan, it was no longer possible for Section 2 to include a Garden Community within its Spatial Strategy. A further reasonable alternative option F was also submitted as described at Table 5.1.</p> <p>Chosen Strategy: Main towns and A12/GEML corridor.</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

		<p>Option F: Sites along the A120 corridor</p> <p>An amended and comprehensive view of Section 2 alternative spatial strategies was published within the SA of the Main Modifications to Section 2 Local Plan (June 2022), this includes the reasons for selecting the preferred approach and rejecting alternative options and is considered to be the final version of the assessment of alternative spatial strategies.</p> <p>See Table 5.3 of the SA of the Main Modifications to the Braintree District Section 2 Local Plan for detailed reasons for rejecting alternative spatial strategies.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 1 Development Boundaries</p>	<p>Adopted Development outside development boundaries will be strictly controlled to uses appropriate to the countryside while development within development boundaries will be permitted where it can take place without adverse detriment to the settlement.</p> <p>There is a minor positive effect for service centre viability, sustainable travel, accessibility and climate change mitigation, The main modifications revised biodiversity to minor positive.</p> <p>There is a significant positive effect for landscapes and townscapes.</p>	<p>Option A: To have no Development Boundaries This will have no effect in relation to any SA objective because the SA is concerned with identifying the effects of the Publication Draft Local Plan relative to a ‘do-nothing’ scenario. It did not perform better than the preferred scenario and was discounted.</p> <p>Option B: Have a restricted policy which would specify areas within development boundaries which would be suitable for development. Anything outside of identified areas would not be considered acceptable. Option B was significantly positive for landscapes and townscapes due to restricting development to specific areas but it does not perform as well as the preferred scenario for other effects and was discounted.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 2 Location of Employment Land</p>	<p>Adopted This policy is a significant allocating policy for new employment land, see SA for site assessments.</p>	<p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments</p>

<p>Policy LPP 3 Employment Policy Areas</p>	<p>Adopted The adopted policy will preserve industrial estates for B use employment, ensuring that appropriate employment space for these uses remains available for general business uses, including the distribution sector, which is important to the District's economy. This includes restricting retail and indoor recreation uses.</p> <p>There is a minor positive effect for the economy, Service centre Vitality, Sustainable travel, Accessibility, Climate change mitigation and Air quality.</p> <p>The adopted policy also allows onsite provision of services provided for the benefit of industrial estate employees, which should reduce the need to travel, with further benefits for Sustainable travel, Climate change mitigation and Air quality.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft LP text This policy is similar to the Adopted approach but did not list the designated sites. Rejected because the policy did not perform significantly better than the adopted approach.</p> <p>Option B: To be less restrictive on the potential uses on employment sites and allow retailing, ancillary uses and indoor sports and recreation facilities. This option performed significantly worse on a range of SA objectives and was rejected.</p> <p>Option C: To restrict the uses on employment areas to B1, B2, B8 and waste services only. This option increased likelihood that employees would need to travel off-site to access services, it scored similarly to the adopted approach except for the above and was rejected.</p> <p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments</p>
<p>Policy LPP 4 Kelvedon Park</p>	<p>Adopted In providing additional facilities for the emergency services, this policy may contribute to increasing community safety, and scored minor positive for the community safety and sustainable travel objectives. Significant positives were also scored for health and economy with uncertainty.</p> <p>Mixed significant positive and significant negative is scored for accessibility.</p> <p>However, significant negative effects were also identified as the site is an allocation to the open countryside rather than a service centre. In particular, it scored significantly negative for Air Quality (with uncertainty) and Soil. A minor negative was scored for biodiversity and neutral effects</p>	<p>No reasonable alternatives to the policy text of this policy was considered by the Council.</p> <p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

	<p>with uncertainty is scored for historic environment.</p> <p>Overall, the assessment produced mixed outcomes.</p>	
<p>Policy LPP 5 Allshot's Farm, Rivenhall</p>	<p>Adopted Significant positive effects for allocation of employment space at this location were identified for the economy and minor positive effects for health.</p> <p>However significant negative effects were also identified for accessibility and soil (with uncertainty) as this is an allocation in the open countryside, remote from any service centre. Further minor negative effects were scored for climate change, biodiversity and sustainable travel.</p> <p>Neutral effects with uncertainty is scored for historic environment. Mixed minor positive/negative effects were scored for landscapes and townscapes.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft LP text This policy is similar to the Adopted approach.</p> <p>Option B: No Policy The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p> <p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments</p>
<p>Policy LPP 6 Business Parks</p>	<p>Adopted The adopted approach, like Option C, would result in positive effects for landscapes and townscapes.</p> <p>However preventing ancillary uses from being co-located with E1(g) businesses would increase the need for business park employees to travel therefore have minor negative effects in for Accessibility, Climate change mitigation and Air quality.</p> <p>The adopted policy restricts general industrial and distribution uses on employment areas that the Council has assessed as being unsuitable for these uses, for example because of poor access to the strategic road network or likely adverse effects on surrounding uses. As such, the preferred policy should help to avoid traffic congestion and direct general industrial and distribution</p>	<p>Option A: B1 uses acceptable on site together with essential and ancillary other uses which make up no more than 5% of the total floorspace. This policy is similar to the adopted policy, it was rejected as the additional text made little difference to the outcome.</p> <p>Option B: To allow the same ancillary uses on B1 businesses sites as is set out in employment policy areas. This policy is similar to the adopted policy. The Policy was updated and the old version rejected.</p> <p>Option C: To be more restrictive to B1 uses only and not ancillary use This option increased likelihood that employees would need to travel off-site to access services, it scored similarly to the adopted</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

	<p>uses to locations where they are accessible to the strategic road network, with minor positive effects on accessibility.</p>	<p>approach except for the above and was rejected.</p> <p>Option D: To be less restrictive and only have a policy for all employment areas. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 7 Rural Enterprise</p>	<p>Adopted The adopted approach is assessed to have a positive effect on sustainable travel.</p> <p>The policy supports the rural economy by providing greater flexibility to the employment land supply and improving access to rural employment services and facilities which is positive for Accessibility and sustainable travel.</p> <p>There is also a minor positive effect for the economy, landscapes and townscapes, community safety, biodiversity, historic environment and Air Quality.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft LP text This policy is similar to the Adopted approach.</p> <p>Option B: To have a less restrictive policy on rural enterprise which allows development to take place in more Circumstances there is no assurance that rural enterprise developments will be accessible or undamaging to the historic environment, the landscape or biodiversity. This does not score as well as the adopted approach and was rejected.</p> <p>Option C: No Policy The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 8 Tourist Development within the Countryside</p>	<p>Adopted The policy is assessed to have significant positive effects for the Economy.</p> <p>By providing a balance between supporting the rural economy and protecting the countryside a minor positive effect for accessibility and sustainable travel is expected.</p> <p>The policy also scores a minor positive effect for water, soil, historic environment and landscapes and townscapes.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft LP text This policy is similar to the Adopted approach.</p> <p>Option B: No Policy The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 9 Retailing and Regeneration</p>	<p>Adopted The policy seeks to enhance the attractiveness of local centres and increase competition across the District, which would help to encourage new businesses and</p>	<p>Option A: Draft LP text This policy is similar to the Adopted approach aside from additional text in relation to historic environment. The adopted approach scored similarly aside</p>

	<p>workforce to the District, leading to significant positive effects for the Economy.</p> <p>The policy protects and enhances the viability of existing town centres by implementing a retail hierarchy. The policy also requires the scale of development to be consistent with the settlement hierarchy, keeping large scale developments focused on town centres.</p> <p>The town centres are the primary location for main town centre uses and are the most sequentially preferable location for retail development therefore a significant positive effect is likely for Service Centre Vitality and minor positive effects for accessibility (with uncertainty), sustainable transport, townscapes and soil.</p> <p>Neutral effects with uncertainty is scored for historic environment.</p>	<p>from a positive effects for the historic environment.</p> <p>Option B: No Policy The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 10 Primary Shopping Areas</p>	<p>Adopted</p> <p>A significant positive effect was assessed for Service Centre Vitality.</p> <p>A minor positive effect was assessed for the Economy and Landscapes and Townscapes.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft LP text This policy is similar to the Adopted approach but used out-of-date retail floorspace requirements. Rejected because the policy is out-of-date.</p> <p>Option B: No Policy The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 11 District Centre</p>	<p>Adopted</p> <p>The policy would prevent the loss of retail development within the district centre and is expected to have a significant positive effect for Service centre vitality</p> <p>These measures are likely to support economic growth, regenerating existing town centres therefore scores positive for Economy and Landscapes and townscapes.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: No Policy The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

<p>Policy LPP 12 Braintree Village Designer Outlet Centre</p>	<p>Adopted This policy states that the Factory Outlet Centre shall be maintained for the purpose of a discount shopping outlet centre. There is a minor positive for Service centre vitality, Economy and Landscapes and townscapes.</p> <p>A mixed effect is expected for Accessibility and a minor negative effect is expected for Sustainable travel. Additional, spatially specific effects were identified in relation to the allocation for new retail development. See SA reports for site assessments.</p>	<p>No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.</p> <p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments</p>
<p>Policy LPP 13 Leisure and Entertainment</p>	<p>Adopted This policy will have a positive impact on the economy as leisure and entertainment facilities provide local employment opportunities and ensure the vitality of the area. A minor positive was assessed for economy, service centre vitality, accessibility and community safety and cohesion.</p>	<p>No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.</p> <p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments</p>
<p>Policy LPP 14 Retail Warehouse Development</p>	<p>Adopted This policy supports retail warehouse development within or immediately adjoining town centres. As such a minor positive effects was assessed for the economy and service centre vitality.</p>	<p>No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.</p> <p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments</p>
<p>Policy LPP 15 Retail Site Allocations</p>	<p>Adopted This policy supports retail warehouse development within or immediately adjoining town centres.</p> <p>As such a minor positive effect is expected for the economy and service centre vitality.</p> <p>See SA appendices for site assessments. Site BRE31RW was revised to no effects due to deallocation.</p>	<p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments</p>
<p>Policy LPP 16 Housing</p>	<p>Adopted</p>	<p>Four alternative levels of growth were assessed in the SA alongside the preferred scenario.</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

<p>Provision and Delivery</p>	<p>This policy allocates is a significant allocating policy for new housing land, see SA appendices for individual site assessments.</p> <p>The preferred approach adopted delivery of a minimum of 14,320 dwellings over the plan period 2016-2033. The allocations would located primarily in the Towns, Service Villages and Strategic Growth Locations.</p> <p>See SA reports and appendices for site assessments.</p>	<p>However, decision making for the appropriate level of new housing land was decided in SP4 of S1LP, see the Additional SA for assessment of the adopted policy and alternatives.</p> <p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments for allocations.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 17 Strategic Growth Location - Land East of Great Notley, south of Braintree</p>	<p>Adopted</p> <p>See SA reports and appendices for site assessments.</p>	<p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments</p>
<p>Policy LPP 18 Strategic Growth Location - Land East of Broad Road, Braintree</p>	<p>Adopted</p> <p>See SA reports and appendices for site assessments.</p>	<p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments</p>
<p>Policy LPP 19 Strategic Growth Location - Former Towerlands Park Site</p>	<p>Adopted</p> <p>See SA for site assessments, impact revised in SA Main Modifications.</p>	<p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments</p>
<p>Policy LPP 20 Strategic Growth Location - North West Braintree</p>	<p>Adopted</p> <p>See SA for site assessments, impact revised in SA Main Modifications.</p>	<p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments</p>
<p>Policy LPP 21 Strategic Growth Location - Land at Feering</p>	<p>Adopted</p> <p>See SA for site assessments, impact revised in SA Main Modifications.</p>	<p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments</p>
<p>Policy LPP 22 Strategic Growth Location - Wood End Farm, Witham</p>	<p>Adopted</p> <p>See SA reports and appendices for site assessments.</p>	<p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

Policy LPP 23 Comprehensive Redevelopment Area - Land East of Halstead High Street	Adopted See SA for site assessments, impact revised in SA Main Modifications.	See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments
Policy LPP 24 Specialist Housing - Mount Hill, Halstead	Adopted See SA reports and appendices for site assessments.	See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments
Policy LPP 25 Comprehensive Redevelopment Area - Factory Lane West/Kings Road	Adopted See SA reports and appendices for site assessments.	See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments
Policy LPP 26 Comprehensive Redevelopment Area - Kings Chase, Witham	Adopted See SA reports and appendices for site assessments.	See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments
Policy LPP 27 Comprehensive Redevelopment Area - Newlands Precinct, Witham	Adopted See SA reports and appendices for site assessments.	See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments
Policy LPP 28 – Comprehensive Redevelopment Area – Rickstones Neighbourhood Centre, Witham	Adopted See SA reports and appendices for site assessments.	See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments
Policy LPP 29 - Comprehensive Redevelopment Area – Land between A12 and GEML, Hatfield Peverel	Adopted See SA reports and appendices for site assessments.	See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments
Policy LPP 30 Residential Allocation Area - Gimsons, Witham	Adopted See SA reports and appendices for site assessments.	See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments
Policy LPP 31 - Affordable Housing	Adopted: The policy should result in newly arising affordable needs being met and may also make a	Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.

	<p>contribution to any backlog with significant positive effects in relation Housing.</p>	<p>Option B: Set a single threshold and target for affordable housing across the District. This option scored significantly positive for housing like the adopted approach except included uncertainty due to concern the policy might fail to fully meet higher levels of affordable need in rural areas or be unviable in urban areas. It was discounted for the above reasons.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 32 - Affordable Housing in the Countryside</p>	<p>Adopted To have a criteria-based policy on affordable housing development outside but adjacent to development boundaries to meet an identified local need. Market housing should be provided on these sites at no more than 30%. The policy seeks to provide affordable housing in rural areas. Criteria are set out to take account of scheme viability. The policy is based on the 15 dwelling threshold and 30% target in order to support viability of housing delivery. A significant positive effect for Housing.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: To not have a policy on rural exception sites and leave allocations of this nature to community or neighbourhood plans. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p> <p>Option C: To allow a greater or smaller percentage of open market housing on affordable housing exception sites. This option scored significantly positive for housing like the adopted approach except included uncertainty because the risks that a smaller percentage might fail to fully meet higher levels of affordable housing need in rural areas but a higher percentage could reduce viability and threaten scheme delivery. It was discounted for the above reasons.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 33 - Specialist Housing</p>	<p>Adopted To have a criteria-based policy on proposals for specialist accommodation inside and outside development boundaries. Reflecting that within the countryside only minor extensions to existing facilities will be allowed due to issues on sustainability grounds.</p> <p>Significant positive effects for local housing and minor positive effects for community safety,</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: To not have a policy on specialist housing and for it to be considered under the general policies around housing and generic design policies. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>

	<p>health, accessibility and landscape and townscapes.</p>	<p>Option C: To only allow proposals for specialist housing on specifically designated sites both inside and outside development boundaries. This policy would score uncertain effects for accessibility and landscape compared to the adopted approach. It was rejected for this reason.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 34 - Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpersons' Accommodation</p>	<p>Adopted A criteria based policy around the location of additional sites to accommodate gypsy and traveller and travelling showpeople, including being well related to existing communities, reasonable distance to services and various impacts on the road and landscape and ensuring that the plot is appropriate for the use and that plots for travelling show persons must be large enough for the safe storage and maintenance of rides and equipment.</p> <p>This policy seeks to ensure that travelling communities have a sufficient number of sites to meet their needs and scored significant positive effect for housing, minor positive effects are scored for community cohesion and accessibility.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: To not have a specific policy and rely on generic policies in relation to housing sites and landscape and highways. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p> <p>C: To allocate a specific transit site. This option did not score significantly different to the adopted approach and was discounted due to lack of suitable call for sites submissions.</p> <p>D: To allocate a specific Travelling Showpeople plot. This option did not score significantly different to the adopted approach. It was discounted due to lack of suitable call for sites submissions.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 35 Housing Mix, Density and Accessibility</p>	<p>Adopted A policy setting out that appropriate density on a site should be related to a number of factors including character, road capacity, vegetation etc. Housing mix should be based on the evidence in the SHMA 2015 (or its successor) to reflect local need and the sizes should meet with the national technical housing standards.</p> <p>Where appropriate 10% of housing should meet the higher category building regulations.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: An alternative option would be to set a minimum or maximum density standard for all development. This would ensure that land was used efficiently but it would not respect the character of the local area or be able to respond to local circumstances. A higher percentage would ensure a greater number of new homes are accessible and adaptable for the</p>

	<p>The policy seeks to ensure that all proposals for housing provide an appropriate mix of housing type and size to meet the specific needs of households in the District which should contribute significantly positively for housing.</p> <p>New housing developments can help secure a good social mix, by avoiding the creation of large areas of similar housing resulting in minor positive effects on health and community safety and cohesion.</p>	<p>District's population. However this would likely increase cost of homes making delivery less viable. A lower percentage might fail to fully meet the needs of the District's population.</p> <p>Option C: A further option would be to rely on national guidance set out in the NPPF. This does provide some detail in relation to mix of housing etc. but asks that Local Authority set out their own approach to housing density which is done in this policy. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p> <p>Option D: To set a higher or lower % of homes to meet the higher category of building regulations. To set a specific minimum and/or maximum density on all development in the District. Due to uncertain/ adverse impact on heritage and character, this option was not assessed as it was considered to be unreasonable by the Council.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 36 Residential Alterations, Extensions and Outbuildings</p>	<p>Adopted Criteria based policy setting out when development will be acceptable such as overdevelopment, and street scene.</p> <p>This policy seeks to ensure that proposals should respect the character of the locality and of the nearby dwellings and result in significant positive effects for landscape and townscape and minor positive effects for historic environment.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: To have no policy and rely on the General Permitted Development Order and NPPF. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p> <p>Option C: Criteria based policy setting out when development would be acceptable in the countryside through being in harmony with the countryside setting, compatibility with the original dwelling and impact on amenity and that outbuildings should be related to existing developments. This policy is not</p>

		<p>significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option D: No policy and rely on the General Permitted Development Order and NPPF. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the ‘do nothing’ approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 37 Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside</p>	<p>Adopted Criteria based policy setting out when development will be acceptable such as overdevelopment, and street scene.</p> <p>This is a criterion based policy which states that proposals would be acceptable provided that the replacement dwelling and any outbuildings, would not have a more harmful impact, or be more intrusive in the landscape, or countryside setting, than the original dwelling and results in significant positive effects for landscape and townscape and minor positive effects for historic environment.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: To have no policy and rely on the General Permitted Development Order and NPPF. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the ‘do nothing’ approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 38 Rural Workers Dwellings in the Countryside</p>	<p>Adopted Criteria based policy which sets out when a home for a rural worker may be acceptable in the countryside. This includes establishing a functional need which cannot be met in existing buildings, that the house should be of a size commensurate to the building and that the business is in profit. There are also additional criteria relating to temporary dwellings which may be granted for a three-year period.</p> <p>This policy accommodates rural workers where the nature of work in agriculture, forestry or other rural industries makes it essential for some rural workers to live at, or very close to the site. Significant positive effects for economy, housing and landscapes and townscapes were assessed.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: Rely on the NPPF and not have a policy on rural workers dwellings and for each application to be considered on its merits. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the ‘do nothing’ approach.</p>

<p>Policy LPP 39 Infill Developments in Hamlets</p>	<p>Adopted: A significant positive effect is expected. The policy will help increase the range of housing in the District while also preventing sporadic development which could adversely affect the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>Significant positive effects for housing and landscapes and townscapes were assessed.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: To not allow any infill development within the countryside and focus all development to development boundaries. This option scored less positively for SA objective 2: Housing as there would be fewer housing in rural areas. It was rejected for this reason.</p> <p>Option C: To identify all the hamlets in the District where infill development of a hamlet (a collection of 10 plus dwellings which does not have a development boundary) may be suitable for infill by a single development. This was rejected because the adopted approach has a similar outcome but without the additional work and complexity this option would require.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 40 Residential Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside</p>	<p>Adopted: A significant positive effect is expected for SA Housing as this policy encourages conversion of permanent rural buildings to new homes, thereby offering a greater range of homes resulting in a significant positive score for housing.</p> <p>The criteria of the policy require that there is no unacceptable impact on protected species, the historic environment or the character of the site or the surrounding countryside and its landscape value. Therefore a minor positive effect is scored for Biodiversity and geodiversity, Historic environment and Landscapes and townscapes.</p> <p>However minor negative effect is scored for community safety, economy and accessibility.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: To be more restrictive and not allow the conversion of rural buildings outside that which is permitted development due to their position outside of development boundaries This was assessed to have similar effects to a 'do nothing' scenario. The overall sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>

<p>Policy LPP 41 Garden Extensions</p>	<p>Adopted Uncontrolled garden extensions, can have a serious impact on the landscape due to the domestic garden paraphernalia such as garden furniture, sheds and children's play equipment extending out into undeveloped areas, as well as changes to the way in which the land is used and looked after with mown grass, flower beds etc.</p> <p>A significant positive effect is scored for biodiversity and landscapes and a minor positive for historic environment.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is similar to the Adopted policy without additional references to heritage assets. Rejected as it does not perform as well as adopted policy</p> <p>Option B: No Policy The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 42 Sustainable Transport</p>	<p>Adopted This policy ensures that all new developments make appropriate provision for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport, community transport and low emission vehicles leading to significant positive effects for sustainable travel, accessibility, climate change and air quality.</p> <p>This is likely to promote a modal shift to sustainable transport modes, including walking and cycling, which could help encourage communities and visitors to lead a more active lifestyle. In addition, the policy encourages modal shift away from private car, which could reduce congestion and improve air quality therefore having a positive effect on people's health.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: have an alternative that defines the scale and type of 'development proposals' to which the policy applies. This policy was considered to be inflexible, stifle innovation and at risk of becoming outdated and was rejected for these reasons.</p> <p>Option C: No Policy The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 43 Parking Provision</p>	<p>Adopted This policy will safeguard parking at a number of rail stations (Braintree, Bures, Hatfield Peverel, Kelvedon and Witham), which may encourage train travel as an alternative to car travel for longer journeys and thereby promote use of sustainable transport.</p> <p>Freeport West currently consists of unallocated greenfield land, which would be lost if developed for parking, leading to a minor</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: No Policy The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p> <p>Option C: To have a criteria based policy on the provision and retention of a car parking provision which is judged on a case by case basis.</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

	<p>negative effect on Biodiversity and Soil, both with uncertainty.</p> <p>A significant positive effect is expected for Accessibility and minor mixed effects for Sustainable transport, Health, Climate change and Air Quality.</p>	<p>This option encouraged more parking and higher car ownership and there is no reference to providing parking for bicycles or other sustainable modes of transport. It scored poorly on health, sustainable travel and climate change and was rejected.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 44 Transport Related Policy Areas</p>	<p>Adopted The policy requires control of development to limit the type and extent of development.</p> <p>There is a significant positive effect is expected for Landscapes and townscapes.</p> <p>Minor positive for Accessibility, Service centre vitality and Economy.</p>	<p>See SA Appendices for alternative site assessments</p>
<p>Policy LPP 45 New Road Infrastructure</p>	<p>Adopted This policy supports a number of road infrastructure improvements to improve access to services and facilities by car and ease congestion.</p> <p>A minor positive effect is expected for Accessibility and Economy.</p> <p>A mixed effect is expected for Sustainable travel, Health, Climate change and Air Quality.</p> <p>The policy has the potential to result in negative effects on the landscape, historic environment and biodiversity, all with uncertainty.</p>	<p>No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 46 Broadband</p>	<p>Adopted This policy should help to ensure broadband where provision is not currently practical or economically viable, developer contributions are collected to enable greater access in the future.</p> <p>The policy is expected to have minor positive effects in relation to the Economy, Accessibility and Climate change.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: No Policy The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p> <p>Option C: Require all properties to be served to the door by super high speed broadband. Significant positive effects were identified in relation to accessibility and climate change however the</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

		policy would stifle development of employment and housing in remote locations. The Council rejected this option as it would not be compliant with national policy.
Policy LPP 47 Built and Historic Environment	<p>Adopted This policy seeks to secure the highest possible standards of design and layout in all new development, and to the protection and enhancement of the historic environment. Local groups are encouraged to formulate Local Lists which is likely to further strengthen conservation and enhancement of the historic environment and have positive effects for Community safety & cohesion</p> <p>There are significant positive effects for SA Historic environment, Landscapes and townscapes and minor positive effects for Community safety & cohesion, Accessibility and the Economy.</p>	No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.
Policy LPP 48 An Inclusive Environment	<p>Adopted This policy is likely to improve the quality of life for a number of people, regardless of disability, age, gender, ethnicity or economic circumstances by responding to their different needs through inclusive design. This helps reduce inequality, encouraging greater community cohesion.</p> <p>A significant positive effect is therefore likely for Community safety & cohesion.</p> <p>Minor positive effects for Housing, Health and Accessibility.</p>	No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.
Policy LPP 49 Health and Wellbeing Impact Assessment	<p>Adopted This policy requires health impact assessments to assess the capacity of existing health services and facilities.</p> <p>A significant positive effect is expected for Health and a minor positive effect for Community safety & cohesion and Accessibility.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: No Policy The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

<p>Policy LPP 50 Provision for Open Space, Sport and Recreation</p>	<p>Adopted The policy focuses on requiring developers to replace types of recreational facility in surplus with those in deficit.</p> <p>The assessment of minor positive effects for Accessibility with uncertainty, rather than the positive effect at Draft Local Plan stage.</p> <p>There are also minor positive effects with uncertainty on Biodiversity and geodiversity.</p> <p>Minor positive effects are identified for Health and Accessibility, Community safety & cohesion, Climate Change, economy and landscapes and townscapes.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan The requirements for open space will be set out in an SPD to follow. This policy is otherwise not significantly different from the adopted policy</p> <p>Option B: No Policy The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the ‘do nothing’ approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 51 Equestrian Facilities</p>	<p>Adopted This policy states that new equestrian facilities will only be permitted where there is no significant effect on important heritage assets, landscape or nature conservation interests, therefore minor positive effects are expected for Historic Environment, Biodiversity and Landscape.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: No Policy The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the ‘do nothing’ approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 52 Layout and Design of Development</p>	<p>Adopted This policy guides the layout and design of new development according to a long list of criteria.</p> <p>There is likely to be minor positive effects for Landscapes and townscapes, Community safety & cohesion, Historic environment, health, sustainable travel, water, flood risk, air quality, Landscapes and townscapes, Biodiversity and geodiversity,</p> <p>A mixed effect is likely in relation to Housing.</p>	<p>No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 53 Conservation Areas</p>	<p>Adopted This policy requires proposals within or adjacent to a conservation area to not detract from the character, appearance and essential features of the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy but had been split into two policies.</p> <p>Option B: No Policy</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

	<p>It is expected to have a significant positive effect in relation to Historic environment and Landscapes and townscapes.</p>	<p>The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p> <p>Option C: Use policies LPP 58 and LPP 59. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 54 Demolition in Conservation Areas</p>	<p>Adopted This policy is also expected to have minor positive implications for Historic environment and townscapes as demolition will only be permitted in exceptional cases, where the historic environment and landscape are not harmed and may be enhanced.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: No Policy The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p> <p>Option C: Use policies LPP 58 and LPP 59. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 55 Shop Fronts, Fascias and Signs in Conservation Areas</p>	<p>Adopted A policy which helps to encourage good design, appropriate materials, and minimises the proliferation of advertisements in order to protect and enhance the character of conservation areas.</p> <p>This policy is assessed as significant positive for landscapes and townscapes and the historic environment.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: Reliance on national guidance, reliance on general design policy. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 56 Illuminated Signs in Conservation Areas</p>	<p>Adopted A policy which ensures that illuminated signs do not impact on the overall character and appearance of conservation areas.</p> <p>This policy is likely to make a significantly positive contribution to conserving and enhancing townscapes and the historic environment.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: Reliance on national guidance, reliance on general design policy. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>

<p>Policy LPP 57 Heritage Assets and their settings</p>	<p>Adopted A policy which seeks to protect and enhance heritage assets and their settings by allow works only if they do not harm the heritage asset significance, through appropriate design, materials, and finishes.</p> <p>The preservation and enhancement of the historic environment will contribute to the tourism industry so scores a minor positive effect for the economy and the strong criteria-based policy will score a significant positive effect for historic environment.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: Reliance on national guidance. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 58 Demolition of Listed Buildings or Structures</p>	<p>Adopted A policy which ensure that demolition of listed buildings or structures only take places when absolutely necessary, and when it does occur a record of the structure is taken.</p> <p>The strong criteria-based policy will score a significant positive effect for historic environment. The preservation and enhancement of the historic environment will contribute to the tourism industry so scores a minor positive effect for the economy and townscapes.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: Reliance on national guidance. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 59 Archaeological Evaluation, Excavation and Recording</p>	<p>Adopted A policy which ensures that where development takes place, its site is checked for archaeological potential, and if any found it is properly mitigated and recorded.</p> <p>This policy benefits preservation of all remains of archaeological significance and score significantly positive for Historic Environment and minor positive for townscape and landscape.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: Reliance on national guidance. The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 60 Educational Establishments</p>	<p>Adopted A criteria based policy for the release of educational sites which are no longer in use and support from appropriately located and designed new educational developments.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan The adopted approach included two site allocations for educational facilities which allowed for greater certainty. The Council considers that the benefits of the adopted approach outweighs the inevitable</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

	<p>The adopted approach is similar to the draft local plan but identifies two specific sites for development of new educational facilities.</p> <p>Significant positives were scored for community safety and cohesion, accessibility, education and skills and a minor positive for the economy and sustainable travel.</p> <p>However the specific sites resulted in the adopted policy also scoring minor negative for water, landscapes and biodiversity reflecting the environmental impact of the use of land.</p>	<p>negatives identified for the use of greenfield land so the previous option was discounted.</p> <p>Option B: To provide a list of all the sites considered redundant and suitable for reuse and the locations where new educational facilities will be provided. This consideration is not judged to alter the sustainability performance of the policy options relative to the draft policy. This option was discounted as it would be insufficiently flexible.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 61 Local Community Services and Facilities</p>	<p>Adopted Criteria based policy for the retention of existing community facilities and services within the District and the support for enhancement and extension of existing and new community facilities wherever possible.</p> <p>The adopted approach is similar to the draft local plan but identifies two community assets and three sites for community facilities. Significant positives were scored for community safety and cohesion, health and accessibility and minor positives for the economy, service centre vitality and sustainable travel (all with uncertainty).</p> <p>However the identification of specific sites resulted in the adopted policy also scoring significantly negative for soil, flooding and townscapes and minor negative for water, historic environment and biodiversity, reflecting the environmental impact of the use of land. All scores are uncertain often pending detailed assessment.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy. The adopted approach has site allocations for community facilities which allowed for greater certainty. The Council considers that the benefits of the adopted approach outweighs the inevitable negatives identified for the use of greenfield land so the previous option was discounted.</p> <p>Option B: To provide specific allocations for new community facilities. New and enhanced facilities would still be supported; however it is not clear where the new facilities would be located. This option was discounted due to lack of certainty.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 62 Cemeteries and Churchyards</p>	<p>Adopted Retain all existing cemeteries and churchyards, unless all other reasonable options for retaining the facility have been considered or a</p>	<p>No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.</p>

	<p>replacement facility of at least equivalent quality is provided. Allocate an extension to Bocking Cemetery and the churchyard at St Mary The Virgin, Great Bardfield.</p> <p>The assessment featured the environmental impacts of allocating two sites for burial facilities which were minor positive for accessibility and sustainable travel but significantly negative for Soils. Water and landscapes and townscapes effects were uncertain.</p>	
<p>Policy LPP 63 Natural Environment and Green Infrastructure</p>	<p>Adopted Similar to option A but with greater emphasis on green infrastructure and removal of references to the excessive use of water and other resources and prioritisation of poorer quality agricultural land.</p> <p>The policy requires development proposals to take all available measures to ensure the protection, and where possible, the enhancement of the natural environment, habitats, biodiversity and geodiversity of the District and scored significant positive effects for landscapes, biodiversity and climate change.</p> <p>Minor positive effects were gained from the inclusion of green infrastructure in the policy for sustainable travel, water environment, flood risk, air quality and soil.</p>	<p>Option A: Development proposals must take all available measures to ensure the protection, and where possible, the enhancement of the natural environment, habitats, biodiversity and geodiversity of the District. This will include, where appropriate, protection from all types of pollution and the excessive use of water and other resources. Development proposals should take account of the potential impacts of climate change in their design, and propose measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions where necessary. Where required, the Council will prioritise the development of poorer quality agricultural land. References to reducing the use of water and prioritisation of poorer quality agricultural land were removed and thus the benefits were downgraded. However, a requirement for green infrastructure in the adopted approach scored minor positives for health and economy. The adopted approach was preferred for these reasons.</p> <p>Option B: Include a separate policy for considering climate change. This approach was undertaken and was not discounted.</p>

<p>Policy LPP 64 Protected Species, Priority Spaces and Priority Habitat</p>	<p>Adopted Ecological assessment required where proposals may affect a protected species, focusing more on ensuring no net loss of protected species, priority species or habitats and a precautionary approach where uncertainty remains. Impacts on species/habitats will be assessed and mitigation conditions applied where appropriate. Where harmful impacts are evident without satisfactory mitigation, permission will be refused.</p> <p>This policy scored significant positives for biodiversity and geodiversity.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: Include policy seeking to create a network of wildlife corridors and avoid fragmented and isolated pockets of habitat. This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option C: Inclusion of a more specific policy requiring specialist design features in new development to provide habitat and thereby improve biodiversity. This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option D: Inclusion in policy of measures to identify and protect species rich and local habitats of importance. This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 65 Tree Protection</p>	<p>Adopted The Publication approach states that prominent trees contributing to local character will be protected by tree preservation orders. Any works to trees or development on sites with existing trees or planned tree planting should be carried out in line with the relevant British Standards.</p> <p>Significant positives identified for biodiversity, landscapes and townscapes in addition to minor positives for health.</p>	<p>No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 66 Protection, Enhancement, Management and Monitoring of Biodiversity</p>	<p>Adopted Proposals should protect biodiversity and mitigate adverse impacts of development with additional requirements relating to compliance with the Anglian River Basin Management Plan and the value of brownfield sites. Biodiversity enhancements should be included in all developments. Retention/improvement of the natural environment is to be</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy did not score as well as the adopted approach for water and was discounted.</p> <p>Option B: Include policy/wording seeking to create a network of wildlife corridors and avoid fragmented and isolated pockets of habitat. This policy could provide the developer</p>

	<p>encouraged by maximising green infrastructure and creating green infrastructure networks to link urban areas to countryside and enhancing biodiversity.</p> <p>Significant positive benefits for biodiversity and water.</p>	<p>with more certainty on the type of enhancement desired however it would take more time and resources to implement. It also did not score as well as the adopted approach for water and was discounted.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 67 Landscape Character and Features</p>	<p>Adopted Landscape character/roles will be taken into account in decision making assisted by the Landscape Character Assessments. Proposals must include an assessment of their landscape impact and should not be detrimental. Development should retain and not harm existing landscape features. Protects landscape character and roles through requiring sympathetic development.</p> <p>This scored significantly positive for biodiversity and landscapes and townscapes.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy did not score as well as the adopted approach for water and was discounted.</p> <p>Option B: Design policies specifically for areas in the Upper Stour Valley which accord with the Stour Valley Management Plan and promote its future inclusion within the inclusion of the Dedham Vale AONB. There were positive effects of this approach on the Upper Stour Valley however this was balanced by negative effects for all other areas of the District. It was discounted for these mixed effects.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 68 Green Buffers</p>	<p>Adopted Development proposals which require a countryside location, within Green Buffers as defined on the proposals map, will only be allowed under very special circumstances. Where development is necessary it will have regard to the local landscape character, and be of a design, density, and layout which minimises the coalescence between built areas. An assessment of the local landscape will be required demonstrating that the development is to be located on an area which has the least detrimental impact to the character of the countryside.</p> <p>The policy supports the use of green buffers to be used to prevent the main towns in the District coalescing with neighbouring villages and scored significantly positive for landscape and townscape and also minor positive for biodiversity.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy did not score as well as the adopted approach for water and was discounted.</p> <p>Option B: To Have No Policy</p>

<p>Policy LPP 69 Protected Lanes</p>	<p>Adopted Proposals that would adversely affect the physical appearance of these protected lanes, or generate an inappropriate type of amount of traffic would not be permitted.</p> <p>This policy would have a significant positive effect for Biodiversity and Landscapes.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: No Policy The sustainability benefits of having a policy is considered to be better than the 'do nothing' approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 70 Protecting and Enhancing Natural Resources, Minimising Pollution and Safeguarding from Hazards</p>	<p>Adopted Proposals should minimise polluting emissions without harming amenity or rural tranquillity land stability, land quality/condition with additional emphasis on avoiding unacceptable impacts on land and soil quality. Proposals on or near possible land contamination or involving hazardous substances must submit an appropriate assessment of risks, remediation, implementation etc. with or before the planning application. These and monitoring may be secured by planning condition.</p> <p>Minor positive effects are expected for health and soil.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan The additional emphasis on avoiding unacceptable impacts on land and soil resulted in the adopted policy scoring better and was preferred over the draft approach.</p> <p>Option B: This policy might consider also the need to protect soil quality during development to protect good quality land, protect the ability of soil to allow water penetration by avoiding compaction. This also scored better than the adopted approach for soil but otherwise performed similarly to the adopted approach. This option was discounted as the approach is less flexible compared to the adopted approach.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 71 Climate Change</p>	<p>Adopted Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and require developments to demonstrate that the principles of climate change mitigation and adaptation have been embedded into design. Encourage and support the provision of renewable and low carbon technologies, subject to their impacts on landscape, amenity, pollution, heritage, biodiversity, soils and highways.</p> <p>This is broad policy that scored minor positive for health, economy, biodiversity, sustainable travel, historic environment, flood risk, air quality, landscapes and soil, and significantly positive for Climate Change.</p>	<p>No reasonable alternatives to this policy were considered by the Council.</p>

<p>Policy LPP 72 Resource Efficiency, Energy Generation and Energy Efficiency</p>	<p>Adopted This policy was merged with PDLP LPP77</p> <p>The primary purpose of this policy is to encourage greater energy efficiency.</p> <p>This policy scores significantly positives effects for water (with uncertainty) and climate change and mixed effects for housing (with uncertainty).</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: Energy efficiency is mainly considered through the building regulations and the measures contained in this policy might be included in the development design policies. This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>C: Exception sites outside the settlement boundaries for energy efficient development to a recognised high technical standard. The number of exception sites might be limited. This would have a minor positive effect for a small number of houses across a number of objectives however there would also be significant negative effects on Housing. It was discounted due to negative effects on rural housing.</p> <p>Former policy LPP77 options Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: Exclusion of the percentage figures as a target. This option had significant positive effects like the adopted policy but with uncertainty therefore the adopted policy performed better.</p> <p>Option C: One or a number of exception sites outside of a settlement boundary for development meeting strictly the criteria of a specified and nationally recognised energy efficient standard. This option did not perform as well as the adopted approach and was discounted.</p> <p>Option D: The Council has not identified areas as suitable for wind energy development in the Local Plan however areas could</p>
---	--	---

		be identified in Neighbourhood Plans made during the plan period. This option was assessed to have no effect rather than significant positive effects and was discounted.
Policy LPP 73 Renewable Energy Schemes	<p>Adopted Renewable energy proposals will be encouraged where they do not result in harmful environmental, highways, defence and heritage impacts. The Council will consider the energy generating potential of the scheme. Solar farm proposals should include a sequential assessment which considers using brownfield and lower quality agricultural land and should show how it allows for agricultural use and bio diversity. A planning condition requiring remediation may be applied. Proposals for wind turbines are only acceptable if included in a Neighbourhood plan and if accompanied by a consultation exercise showing that planning impacts have been addressed and therefore has community backing.</p> <p>This scored significantly positive for biodiversity, climate change and landscapes.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: This policy might be split into several policies covering specific technologies e.g. solar power, wind turbines, ground and water source heat pumps etc. Geographical areas could be designated as being more suitable for specific forms of renewable energy generation and where permissions might be more likely to be successful.</p> <p>Geographical areas that would be more suitable for renewable developments could also be designated. This policy provides more certainty regarding the development of renewable energy schemes and performed similarly to the adopted approach. A single policy was preferred and this option was discounted.</p>
Policy LPP 74 Flooding Risk and Surface Water Drainage	<p>Adopted Development should take place in areas at lowest risk of flooding and any development elsewhere must detailed criteria for developments in Flood Zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>As well as preventing development at risk of adverse effects of flooding, this policy aims to ensure the safety of people in development in areas at risk of flooding there is potential for new flood management measures, such as attenuation ponds, to contribute to local biodiversity. This scored significantly positive for flood risk and minor positives for biodiversity, with uncertainty, and health.</p>	<p>Option A: More high level general wording which refers to national policy could be adopted to slim down the policies. Policies for run off rates, EA licences and fluvial flood risk would be as in the NPPF/NPPG and other material considerations.</p> <p>This approach did not score as well as the adopted approach for health and biodiversity and was discounted.</p> <p>Option B: Developments on previously developed land of more than one dwelling or commercial building or development of a site greater than 0.1 hectare are required to reduce post development run off rates for events up to and</p>

		<p>including the 1 in 100 year return period event, with an allowance for climate change, to that of a greenfield condition. A minimum requirement is for a 50% betterment. Calculations to demonstrate that such requirements can be met should be submitted to the Local Planning Authority as part of a planning application. This approach did not score as well as the adopted approach for health and biodiversity and was discounted.</p> <p>Option C: Strengthen the policy by adding specific policy requirements for all sites within CDAs (Critical Drainage Areas). The adopted approach strengthened requirements for all areas rather than just CDAs and was preferred.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 75 Surface Water Management Plan</p>	<p>Adopted Development will comply with the aims and objectives of the Surface Water Management Plan.</p> <p>The SWMP will help ensure that new development within Braintree District does not increase the number of people or properties at risk of flooding and does not result in increased flood risk elsewhere. It is also likely to result in improved water efficiency and sustainable water resource management on the whole across the District. It is also likely to reduce water pollution from flooding events. Significant positive effects identified for water and flood risk, and also minor positive for housing and biodiversity.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: Omission of the policy pending publication of the SWMP and its adoption as a material consideration. (The Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) is being prepared by the LLFA. Although not completed, it is expected to be completed by this plan's Examination in Public.) This option was assessed to have no affect on SA objectives. The Council discounted this approach as including the policy in the Local Plan provided clarity to developers.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 76 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems</p>	<p>Adopted Require SUDS in developments of 10 dwellings or more and major commercial development; planning applications to provide details on proposed SUDS and their on-going and maintenance; cross reference to relevant standards with additional wording supporting</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan The additional wording on SUDS resulted in the adopted policy scoring better for health and was preferred over the draft approach.</p> <p>B: The level of detail the Local Planning Authority requires before the application is</p>

	<p>dual use of land for SUDS and open space.</p> <p>SUDS required in all major residential and commercial development unless the developer provides compelling evidence that is not suitable or viable. This should attenuate surface run-off during extreme rainfall events and help to ensure that a natural run-off profile is achieved, avoiding increased flood risk on-site and downstream of the development. This scored significant positive effects for Flood Risk and minor positive effects for housing, health, biodiversity and water (both with uncertainty).</p>	<p>determined could be set out in a more detailed and prescriptive manner.</p> <p>This option was discounted because the Council considered the approach to be too inflexible.</p> <p>C: The maintenance and funding of SUDs could be set out in a more prescriptive manner.</p> <p>This option was discounted because the Council considered the approach to be too inflexible.</p> <p>D: SUDs measures might be explicitly excluded from counting as “Open Space” for the purposes of calculating spaces requirements if they are not fit for that purpose e.g. swales and ponds might be dangerous for small children.</p> <p>This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 77 External Lighting</p>	<p>Adopted Proposals for external lighting will be permitted subject to design criteria to minimise its impact on its neighbours and on the environment. If approved, hours of operation may be limited.</p> <p>The policy will help limit pollution and help conserve or enhance dark skies by incorporating strict design criteria. There are significant positive effects for Townscape and community safety and minor positive effects for biodiversity.</p>	<p>Option A: Draft Local Plan</p> <p>This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p> <p>Option B: Lighting is now classed as a form of pollution and its use has consequences for energy use and impacts on wildlife, amenity and character. The impacts of lighting could be considered with design and pollution policies.</p> <p>This policy is not significantly different from the adopted policy.</p>
<p>Policy LPP 78 Infrastructure Delivery and Impact Mitigation</p>	<p>Adopted Permission will only be granted if it can be demonstrated that there is sufficient appropriate infrastructure capacity to support the development or that such capacity will be delivered by the proposal and that this is sustainable over time. The cumulative impacts of development must be considered and mitigated.</p> <p>This policy ensures that there will be sufficient infrastructure availability and capacity to serve</p>	<p>No alternatives were considered by the Council.</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

	<p>new development and that this is sustainable over time. This is expected to ensure that key infrastructure and services are available and accessible to residents and workers and there are expected to be minor positive effects across all SA objectives.</p>	
--	--	--

6 How will the environmental and sustainability effects be monitored?

- 6.1 The SEA Regulations require that: *“The responsible authority shall monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of each plan or programme with the purpose of identifying unforeseen adverse effects at an early stage and being able to undertake appropriate remedial action.”* and that the SA Adoption Statement should set out *“...the measures that are to be taken to monitor the significant environmental effects of the implementation of the plan or programme.”*
- 6.2 This Sustainability Statement outlines the monitoring indicators most appropriate for future monitoring of the Plan in line with Regulation 16 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.
- 6.3 The monitoring table below was presented in Chapter 5 of the North Essex Section One Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal which is the final set of monitoring indicators for section 1 Local Plan.

SA objectives	Additional monitoring indicators
1. To create safe environments which improve quality of life, community cohesion	All crime – number of crimes per 1000 residents per annum Number of new community facilities granted planning permission Number of new cultural facilities granted planning permission, including places of worship
2. To ensure that everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent, safe home which meets their needs at a price they can afford	The number of net additional dwellings Affordable housing completions Number of zero-carbon homes completed Number of additional Gypsy and Traveller pitches Number of starter homes completed Number of homes for older people completed
3. To improve health/reduce health inequalities	Percentage of new residential development within 30mins of public transport time of a GP or hospital Percentage of new residential development that adheres to Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards Percentage of new residential development within walking and cycling distance to schools Percentage of new residential development within walking and cycling distance to sport and recreation facilities / open space

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

SA objectives	Additional monitoring indicators
4. To ensure and improve the vitality & viability of centres	<p>Amount of completed retail, office and leisure development delivered (and in centres)</p> <p>Amount of completed retail, office and leisure development across the NEA area</p>
5. To achieve a prosperous and sustainable economy that creates new jobs, improves the vitality and viability of centres and captures the economic benefits of international gateways	<p>Amount of floor space developed for employment, sqm</p> <p>Successful employment use applications in rural areas</p> <p>Number of jobs created in the ports</p> <p>Number of developments approved associated with the tourism sector</p> <p>Level 2 qualifications by working age residents</p> <p>Level 4 qualifications and above by working age residents</p> <p>Employment status of residents</p> <p>Average gross weekly earnings</p> <p>Standard Occupational Classification.</p>
6. To value, conserve and enhance the natural environment, natural resources, biodiversity and geological diversity	<p>Impacts (direct and indirect) on designated sites</p> <p>Amount of development in designated areas</p> <p>Area of land offset for biodiversity</p>
7. To achieve more sustainable travel behaviour, reduce the need to travel and reduce congestion	<p>Percentage of journeys to work by walking and cycling and percentage of journeys to work by public transport</p>
8. To promote accessibility, ensure that development is located sustainably and makes efficient use of land, and ensure the necessary infrastructure to support new development	<p>Number / amount of new homes / employment development completed at ward level within Growth / Regeneration Areas</p> <p>Percentage of new development within 30 minutes of community facilities (as defined by each authority)</p> <p>Percentage of new residential development within 30 minutes of public transport time of a GP, hospital, primary and secondary school, employment and a major retail centre</p> <p>Additional capacity of local schools / incidents of new school applications</p>
9. To conserve and enhance historic and cultural heritage and assets and townscape character	<p>Percentage of new and converted dwellings on previously developed land</p> <p>Number of listed buildings demolished, repaired or brought back to use, including locally</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

SA objectives	Additional monitoring indicators
	<p>listed buildings</p> <p>New Conservation Area Appraisals adopted</p> <p>Number of Listed Buildings, Scheduled Monuments, Conservation Areas, Registered Parks and Gardens (and percentage at risk)</p> <p>Area of highly sensitive historic landscape characterisation type(s) which have been altered</p> <p>and their character eroded</p> <p>Number of major development projects that enhance or detract from the significance of heritage assets or historic landscape character</p> <p>Percentage of planning applications where archaeological investigations were required prior to approval or mitigation strategies developed or implemented</p>
<p>10. To make efficient use of energy and reduce contributions to climatic change through mitigation and adaptation</p>	<p>Total CO2 emissions</p> <p>Renewable Energy Installed by Type</p> <p>Number of zero carbon homes delivered</p>
<p>11. To improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity</p>	<p>Quality of Rivers (number achieving ecological good status)</p> <p>Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency</p>
<p>12. To reduce the risk of fluvial, coastal and surface water flooding</p>	<p>Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on flood defence grounds</p> <p>Number of SuDS schemes approved</p>
<p>13. To improve air quality</p>	<p>Number of Air Quality Management Areas</p>
<p>14. To conserve and enhance the quality of landscapes</p>	<p>Percentage of new and converted dwellings on previously developed land</p> <p>Number of proposals permitted within areas noted for their high landscape value</p> <p>Number of proposals permitted contrary to a desire to restrict coalescence</p>
<p>15. To safeguard and enhance the quality of soil and mineral deposits</p>	<p>Percentage of new development on best and most versatile agricultural land (ALC)</p> <p>Number of developments proposed within MSAs</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

SA objectives	Additional monitoring indicators
	Contaminated land brought back into beneficial use, hectares

Chapter 12 of the 2017 SA Report and 7 of the 2022 Main Modifications SA Report combine to set out the suggested indicators for monitoring the potential significant sustainability effects.

SA objectives	Additional monitoring indicators
SA1 To create safe environments which improve quality of life, community cohesion	Recorded key offences KSI casualties for adults and children Public perceptions on leisure / community facilities. Street level crime statistics.
SA2 Housing To provide everyone with the opportunity to live in a decent home	House Prices. Indices of Multiple Deprivation Score – particularly Housing and Services Domain and the Living Environment Deprivation Domain. Number of affordable dwelling completions. Annual dwelling completions. Population projections and forecasts. Number of zero-carbon homes completed Number of additional Gypsy and Traveller pitches Number of starter homes completed Number of homes for older people completed
SA3 Health To improve the health of the Districts' residents and mitigate/reduce potential health inequalities	Life Expectancy. Indices of Multiple Deprivation – Health and Disability sub-domain scores. Residents' opinion on availability of open space/leisure facilities. Location and extent of accessible open space to development site. Natural England Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards (ANGSt). Location and extent of recreational facilities to development site.

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

SA objectives	Additional monitoring indicators
	<p>Location and extent of accessible greenspace to development site.</p> <p>Proximity of site to healthcare facilities</p> <p>Percentage of population obese.</p> <p>Number of GPs and dentists accepting new patients.</p> <p>Number or % of open spaces receiving Green Flag Award.</p>
<p>SA4 Service Centre Vitality</p> <p>To promote the vitality and viability of all service centres throughout the District</p>	<p>Amount of retail, leisure and office floorspace in town centres.</p> <p>Implemented and outstanding planning permissions for retail, office and commercial use.</p> <p>Number and type of services from Rural Services Study.</p> <p>Number of post offices closed down.</p> <p>Number of village shops closed down.</p> <p>Pedestrian footfall count.</p>
<p>SA5 Economy</p> <p>To achieve sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth</p>	<p>Employment land availability.</p> <p>Typical amount of job creation (jobs per ha) within different use classes.</p> <p>Percentage change and comparison in the total number of VAT registered businesses in the area.</p> <p>Businesses by industry type.</p> <p>Amount of vacant industrial floorspace.</p> <p>Amount of high quality agricultural land.</p> <p>Travel to work flows.</p> <p>Employment status by residents and job type.</p> <p>Job densities.</p> <p>Economic activity of residents.</p> <p>Average gross weekly pay.</p> <p>Proportion of business in rural locations.</p> <p>Implemented and outstanding planning permissions for retail, office and commercial use.</p> <p>Number of minerals sites safeguarded for extraction.</p> <p>Current and planned broadband coverage.</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

SA objectives	Additional monitoring indicators
<p>SA6 Biodiversity and geodiversity</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the biological and geological diversity of the environment</p>	<p>Spatial extent of designated sites within the District.</p> <p>Achievement of Biodiversity Action Plan targets.</p> <p>Ecological potential assessments.</p> <p>Distance from site to nearest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSSIs. • NNR. • LWS. • Ancient Woodland. • Protected lanes. • Other sensitive designated or non-designated receptors. • Other special landscape features. <p>Condition of the nearest sensitive receptors (where viable).</p> <p>Site visit surveys on typical abundance and frequency of habitats (DAFOR scale).</p> <p>Number of % of permitted developments providing biodiversity value e.g. green/brown roof, living wall, native planting.</p>
<p>SA7 Sustainable Travel</p> <p>To promote more sustainable transport choices and uptake</p>	<p>Access to services and business' by public transport.</p> <p>Indices of Multiple Deprivation.</p> <p>Travel to work methods and flows.</p> <p>Car ownership.</p> <p>Network performance on roads.</p> <p>Public transport punctuality and efficiency.</p> <p>Length of Public Rights of Way created/enhanced; number of Rights of Way Improvement Plans implemented.</p>
<p>SA8: Accessibility</p> <p>To promote accessibility and ensure the necessary transport infrastructure to support new development</p>	<p>Residents' opinions on availability of open space/leisure facilities.</p> <p>Access to services by public transport.</p> <p>Indices of Multiple Deprivation – sub-domain scores.</p> <p>Recorded traffic flows.</p> <p>KSI casualties for adults and children.</p> <p>Car ownership.</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

SA objectives	Additional monitoring indicators
	<p>Location of site with regards to areas of high deprivation.</p> <p>Transport Assessments.</p> <p>Number / amount of new homes / employment development completed at Strategic Growth Locations and Comprehensive Redevelopment Areas</p>
<p>SA9 Education</p> <p>To improve the education and skills of the population</p>	<p>Additional capacity of local schools.</p> <p>GCSE or equivalent performance.</p> <p>Level 2 qualifications by working age residents.</p> <p>Level 4 qualifications and above by working age residents.</p> <p>Employment status of residents.</p> <p>Average gross weekly earnings.</p> <p>Standard Occupational Classification.</p>
<p>SA 10 Historic Environment</p> <p>To conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their settings</p>	<p>Number and % of Listed Buildings (all grades), Scheduled Monuments, Registered Parks and Gardens, Registered Battlefields, Places of Worship, conservation areas, locally listed heritage assets at Risk.</p> <p>% of Conservation Areas with an up-to-date character appraisal.</p> <p>% of Conservation Areas with published management proposals.</p> <p>Number of historic buildings repaired and brought back into use.</p> <p>% of local authority area covered by historic characterisation studies.</p> <p>Area of highly sensitive historic landscape characterisation type(s) which have been altered and their character eroded.</p> <p>Number of major development projects that enhance the significance of heritage assets or historic landscape character.</p> <p>Number of major development projects that detract from the significance of heritage assets or historic landscape character.</p> <p>Improvements in the management of historic and archaeological sites and features.</p> <p>% change in visits to historic sites.</p> <p>% of planning applications where archaeological investigations were required prior to approval.</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement

SA objectives	Additional monitoring indicators
	<p>% of planning applications where archaeological mitigation strategies (were developed and implemented).</p> <p>Number and extent of street / public realm audits.</p> <p>Number of actions taken in response to breach of listed building control.</p>
<p>SA11: Climate change mitigation</p> <p>To reduce contributions to climate change.</p>	<p>Carbon Dioxide emissions.</p> <p>Energy consumption GWh/households.</p> <p>Percentage of energy supplied from renewable sources.</p> <p>Renewable energy installed by type</p> <p>Number of zero carbon homes delivered</p>
<p>SA12: Water environment</p> <p>To improve water quality and address water scarcity and sewerage capacity.</p>	<p>Percentage of water bodies at good ecological status or potential.</p> <p>Percentage of water bodies assessed at good or high biological status.</p> <p>Percentage of water bodies assessed at good chemical status.</p> <p>Water cycle study capacity in sewerage and resources.</p> <p>Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency</p>
<p>SA13 Flood Risk</p> <p>To reduce the risk of flooding</p>	<p>Spatial extent of flood zones 2 and 3</p> <p>Residential properties flooded from main rivers</p> <p>Planning permission in identified flood zones granted permission contrary to advice from the Environment Agency</p> <p>Incidences of flooding and location</p> <p>Distance of site to floodplains</p> <p>SFRA results</p>

Braintree Local Plan SA Adoption Statement