

<b>Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Addendum of Focused Changes to the Braintree District Core Strategy.</b>	<b>Agenda No: 7</b>
<p><b>Corporate Priority:</b> Environment is clean and green, business is encouraged and local economy prospers, housing and transport meet local needs, healthy lifestyles.</p> <p><b>Report presented by:</b> Eleanor Dash</p> <p><b>Report prepared by:</b> Juliet Strathern</p>	
<p><b>Background Papers:</b>  <b>Core Strategy Addendum of Focused Changes Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Core Strategy</b></p> <p><b>Appendix A – Appraisal Matrices</b>  <b>Appendix B – SA/SEA Review Environmental Report</b></p>	<b>Public Report</b>
<p><b>Options:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. To approve the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Addendum of Focused Changes to the Braintree District Core Strategy Submission Draft.</b></li> <li><b>2. To not approve the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Addendum of Focused Changes to the Braintree District Core Strategy Submission Draft.</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Key Decision:</b></p> <p><b>NO</b></p>
<p><b>Executive Summary:</b>  An SA and SEA was undertaken on the Addendum of Focused Changes to the Core Strategy Submission Draft to consider the potential sustainability implications of each change in the schedule, and to appraise the focused changes that could potentially give rise to additional impacts on sustainability.  The SA/SEA was published for consultation alongside the Addendum to the Core Strategy Submission Draft. No specific comments have been received on the SA/SEA.</p> <p>The SA/SEA concluded that as a result of the focused changes detailed in the Addendum, there will mainly be positive impacts from the changes in policy. However it identifies negative impacts on economic growth, landscapes and cultural heritage due to the potential for up to 40% B8 development at the Great Notley Enterprise Park growth location.</p> <p>Indicators will be used to monitor the significant sustainability effects and to identify unforeseen adverse effects, to be able to undertake appropriate remedial action.  The Council will need to prepare a SEA Statement to demonstrate to consultation bodies how environmental and sustainability considerations are reflected in the document and how its implementation will be monitored in the future.</p>	

<b>Decision:</b>	
<p><b>It is recommended that Members approve the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Addendum of Focused Changes to the Braintree District Core Strategy Submission Draft.</b></p>	
<b>Purpose of Decision:</b>	
<p><b>To ensure compliance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, SEA Directive 2001/12/EC</b></p>	
<b>Corporate implications</b>	
<b>Financial:</b>	None
<b>Legal:</b>	Compliance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, SEA Directive 2001/12/EC
<b>Equalities/Diversity</b>	None
<b>Customer Impact:</b>	The report assesses and predicts the economic, social and environmental effects likely to arise from implementation of Core Strategy.
<b>Environment and Climate Change:</b>	The report assesses and predicts the economic, social and environmental effects likely to arise from implementation of Core Strategy.
<b>Consultation/Community Engagement:</b>	The SA/SEA was published for public consultation along with the Addendum to the Braintree District Core Strategy Submission Draft.
<b>Risks:</b>	Core Strategy could be found unsound.
<b>Officer Contact:</b>	
	Juliet Strathern
<b>Designation:</b>	Senior Planning Policy Officer
<b>Ext. No.</b>	2559
<b>E-mail:</b>	<a href="mailto:julst@braintree.gov.uk">julst@braintree.gov.uk</a>

## **1. Background**

**1.1** The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for all development plan documents and to comply with European Legislation (Directive 2001/42/E), a Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) to assess the likely effects of the development plan document on the environment.

**1.2** In 2005 Essex County Council were commissioned by Braintree District Council to undertake the SA/SEA for Braintree District Council's Core Strategy.

**1.2** A combined SA/SEA report was prepared in response to the Core Strategy Submission Draft Document to assess and predict the economic, social and environmental effects that are likely to arise from its implementation.

**1.3** This report and appendix summarise the SA/SEA that has been undertaken for the Addendum of Focused Changes to the Braintree District Core Strategy Submission Draft consultation document. The purpose of undertaking the SA/SEA at this stage of the process is to identify potential significant sustainability effects arising from the content of the consultation document and to fulfil the requirement for additional appraisal before adoption, to take account of proposals and amendments that have arisen from the consultation and previous appraisal of the Core Strategy submission draft.

## **2. Focused Changes /Minor Changes**

**2.1** The Addendum includes a schedule of focused changes that have been made to the Regulation 27 Core Strategy DPD. These are required to be subject to additional Sustainability Appraisal, considering the potential sustainability implications of each change in the schedule.

**2.2** The schedule of minor post publication changes and editing changes published in the addendum are to improve legibility and to ensure the document is up to date. Minor changes would not normally require public consultation and after review it has been deemed that neither do they require additional appraisal.

**2.3** The SA/SEA was published for public consultation, along with the Addendum to the Braintree District Core Strategy Submission Document. However, no comments were submitted regarding the SA/SEA.

## **3. Conclusions of SA/SEA**

### **3.1 Significant Effects**

As a result of the focused changes to the Core Strategy Submission Draft as detailed in the Addendum, there will be:

- Positive impacts on health due to the inclusion of healthcare provision at the Panfield Lane growth location.
- Negative impacts on economic growth, landscapes and cultural heritage due to the potential for up to 40% B8 development at the Gt. Notley Enterprise Park growth location.

- Positive impacts on accessibility due to the potential for significant B8 development at Great Notley Enterprise Park growth location.
- Potential positive impacts on either health or biodiversity as a result of an increased SANG provision rate per 1000 increase in population.
- Positive impacts on biodiversity through creation of new wildlife corridors.
- Positive impacts on minimising flood risk where SUDS will be used wherever possible.
- Potential for positive impacts on biodiversity where SUDS will be used wherever possible through the creation of features of a biodiversity interest within specific proposals.

### **3.2 Monitoring**

The significant sustainability effects of implementing a Local Development Document must be monitored in order to identify unforeseen adverse effects and to be able to undertake appropriate remedial action. Indicators were suggested in Annex C of the Core Strategy Submission Draft SA/SEA Environmental Report. In order to monitor each of the SA objectives, however, these may not all be collected due to limited resources and difficulty in data availability or collection. Monitoring is intended to provide important feedback on the success of the plan and progress towards its objectives. The annual monitoring report should be informed by any significant effects identified in sustainability monitoring.

## **4. Next Steps**

**4.1** In accordance with the SEA Directive Braintree District Council will be responsible for preparing a SEA Statement once the Core Strategy has been adopted to provide the public and the consultation bodies with information on how environmental and sustainability considerations and consultation responses are reflected in the plan or programme and how its implementation will be monitored in the future.

## Appendix 1

### SA/SEA Review of Schedule of Focused Changes

#### Focused Changes Proposed for Executive Summary

Section	Proposed Amendment	Reason	Would the original text have affected the original appraisal?	Does the original appraisal need to be reviewed in line with formal changes to the text?	What action we need to take...
Spatial Strategy – final bullet point	There is also a proposal for a business and innovation park at land to the west of the A131 at Great Notley which will contain 18.5ha of B1, B2, B8 and C1 uses.	To reflect current position	No	Yes	Re-appraise Policy CS4 in light of changes. (B8 and C1 uses on site)  <b><i>See further appraisal below for CS4</i></b>

**No action required for Chapter 2.**

**Focused Changes Proposed for Chapter 3**

Section	Proposed Amendment	Reason	Would the original text have affected the original appraisal?	Does the original appraisal need to be reviewed in line with formal changes to the text?	What action we need to take...
The Key Objective for Town Centres paragraphs 3.4 and 6.27	To maintain and develop vibrant and prosperous main towns of Braintree, Witham and Halstead, by encouraging new development and regeneration schemes that support their function as major service centres, with a range of good quality employment, shops and services and cultural provision	To ensure a consistent approach to the wording.	No detailed appraisal	Minor change	<i>Small possible amendment to Table 6 in Core Strategy Submission Draft SA/SEA Environmental Report ; <b>to include the Key Objective ‘Town Centres’ alongside Sustainability Objective 10 ‘Cultural Heritage’.</b></i>

**No action required for Chapter 4.**

**Focused Changes Proposed for Chapter 5**

Section	Proposed Amendment	Reason	Would the original text have affected the original appraisal?	Does the original appraisal need to be reviewed in line with formal changes to the text?	What action we need to take...
Paragraph 5.17, new wording	<p>Planning Policy Statement 3 Housing defines affordable housing as: 'Affordable housing includes social rented and intermediate housing, provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Affordable housing should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Meet the needs of eligible households including availability at a cost low enough for them to afford, determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices.</li> <li>– Include provision for the home to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or, if these restrictions</li> </ul>	Clarity	No as figures are also based on their own SHLAA, Urban Capacity Study and SHMA.	Yes in line with removed text.	<p>Statement on the removal of text on RSS, and how it affects the appraisal of Policy CS1 in the Core Strategy Submission Draft SA/SEA Environmental Report.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Appraisal</u></b></p> <p><b><i>As represented in the Environmental Report, the original SA/SEA of policy CS1 referred to the since revoked RSS in the justification of the Core Strategy's housing provision in regards to overall plan and annual targets. These targets were also backed up by other material in the existing Core Strategy evidence base (namely the SHLAA, SHMA and Urban Capacity Study)</i></b></p>

	are lifted, for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision.				<p><b>available when the SA/SEA was undertaken (January 2010). Therefore the impacts of Policy CS1 on the SA/SEA Sustainability Objectives will not change.</b></p> <p><b><i>In terms of alternatives to the preferred Core Strategy housing allocations, any deviations from those regionally allocated (and backed by the Core Strategy's independent localised evidence base in regards to housing provision) can be seen to have either negative social impacts (where lower than regional targets) or negative environmental impacts (higher than regional targets.)</i></b></p>
Paragraph 5.27 – 5.31	<p><del>5.27 There is a need for additional sites to meet the needs of gypsies and travellers in the District and in the East of England at present.</del></p> <p><del>5.28 A revision to the Regional Spatial Strategy for the East of England, entitled, 'Accommodation for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople in East of England' was published in July 2009.</del></p> <p><del>5.29 This sets out policies requiring local authorities to make provision for additional residential and transit pitches for gypsies and travellers and plots for travelling showpeople. (A pitch normally accommodates two caravans).</del></p>	To delete reference to the regional strategy.	Yes, in the appraisal of Policy CS3.	Yes	<p><i>Statement on the removal of text on RSS, and how it affects the appraisal of Policy CS3 in the Core Strategy Submission Draft SA/SEA Environmental Report.</i></p> <p><b><u>Additional Appraisal</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Where the Core Strategy Submission Draft figures for required additional Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople pitches in the District have been deleted to reflect the revocation of the RSS (as previously specified in the 'Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the East of England' document, July 2009), new</i></b></p>



	<p>5.30 Policy H3 set out a requirement for a minimum of 50 gypsy and traveller pitches for Braintree District by 2011.</p> <p>5.27 As there were already 27 authorised gypsy and traveller pitches within Braintree District in 2008. (A pitch normally accommodates two caravans). This meant that there was a requirement to provide an additional 23 authorised pitches by 2011. The Regional Spatial Strategy also required a minimum of 67 pitches for Braintree District by 2021.</p> <p>5.31 As 5.28 An assessment of need in Essex was published in 2009 (Essex Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment) which identified a very similar requirement (for 66 residential pitches) for 59 authorised pitches in Braintree District between 2008 and 2021.</p>				<p><i>figures have been adopted from the 'Essex Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment' (November 2009) forming part of the District's LDF Evidence Base. These figures did not affect the impacts predicted in the appraisal of Policy CS3 in the Core Strategy Submission Draft, where sustainability impacts are more appropriate to specific sites within the District. Where these are not required of a Core Strategy, the impacts of this policy on the Sustainability Objectives will remain as stated in the Core Strategy Submission Draft SA/SEA Environmental Report.</i></p>
<p>Policy CS3 1<sup>st</sup> line</p>	<p>Provision will be made for a minimum of 50 59 authorised residential pitches for gypsies and travellers caravans by 2011 and a minimum of 67 authorised residential pitches by 2021. This will require an additional provision of 23 32 authorised pitches by 2011 and a further 17 authorised pitches by 2021</p>	<p>To amend figures following revocation of the RSS</p>	<p>Yes, in the appraisal of Policy CS3</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><i>Statement on the removal of text on RSS and how it affects the appraisal of Policy CS1 in the Core Strategy Submission Draft SA/SEA Environmental Report.</i></p> <p><b><u>Additional Appraisal</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Where the Core Strategy Submission Draft figures for required additional Gypsy, Traveller</i></b></p>

				<p><b><i>and Travelling Showpeople pitches in the District have been deleted to reflect the revocation of the RSS (as previously specified in the 'Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the East of England' document July 2009), new figures have been adopted from the 'Essex Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment' (Nov 2009) forming part of the District's LDF Evidence Base. These figures did not affect the impacts predicted in the appraisal of Policy CS3 in the Core Strategy Submission Draft, where sustainability impacts are more appropriate to specific sites within the District. Where these are not required of a Core Strategy, the impacts of this policy on the Sustainability Objectives will remain as stated in the Core Strategy Submission Draft SA/SEA Environmental Report.</i></b></p>
--	--	--	--	---

## Focused Changes Proposed for Chapter 6

Section	Proposed Amendment	Reason	<i>Would the original text have affected the original appraisal?</i>	<i>Does the original appraisal need to be reviewed in line with formal changes to the text?</i>	<i>What action we need to take...</i>
Paragraph 6.7 and 6.8	<p><del>6.7 The East of England Plan sets out the following main economic requirements:- An indicative target of 56,000 net growth in jobs (i.e. additional jobs minus jobs lost) for the period 2001 to 2021 to be delivered in the 'Rest of Essex' which is defined as Braintree, Brentwood, Chelmsford, Epping Forest, Harlow, Maldon and Uttlesford. Local Development Documents should ensure an adequate range of sites and premises is allocated to achieve indicative job growth targets and needs of the local economy, revealed by employment land reviews. These should be at locations</del></p>	To delete reference to Regional Spatial Strategy	No	Yes	<p><i>Statement on the deletion of supporting text in light of the revocation of the RSS (and subsequent indicative targets for net job growth) and how this affects the appraisal of policy CS4 in the Core Strategy Submission Draft SA/SEA Environmental Report.</i></p> <p><b><u>Additional Appraisal</u></b></p> <p><b><i>In response to the deletion of supporting text for Policy CS4 in light of the revocation of the RSS (and subsequent indicative targets for net job growth), there will be no change to the impacts predicted for the appraisal of Policy CS4 in the Core Strategy Submission Draft</i></b></p>

	<p>which minimise commuting and promote sustainable communities, achieve a closer relationship between jobs and homes, maximise the use of public transport and provide for skills training and education. Preference should often be given to the re-use of previously developed land and intensification of existing sites over the release of Greenfield land. Local Development Documents should identify a network of town centres, district centres, neighbourhood centres and village centres.</p> <p>6.8 The local authorities in the 'Rest of Essex (Braintree, Brentwood, Chelmsford, Epping Forest, Harlow, Maldon, Uttlesford) have a net growth in jobs target of 56,000 and a net growth in dwellings target of 57,100 over the period 2001 – 2021 which is a ratio of just under 1 job per dwelling. This ratio of one job per dwelling would provide an indicative target of 7,700 net job growth in Braintree District between 2001 to 2021 and a further 1,925 net job growth from 2021 to 2026, giving an overall target of 9,625 net job growth between 2001-2026.</p>				<p><b><i>SA/SEA Environmental Report. The policy's identified targets are based on an independent study, 'Braintree District Futures 2025' commissioned by Cambridge Econometrics as part of the District Council's LDF Evidence Based and exceed the indicative targets of the RSS. The appraisal of Policy CS4 focuses on specific proposed locations in terms of accommodating the scale within the Policy and determined by the Cambridge Econometrics study without undue negative impact.</i></b></p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

<p>Paragraph 6.10 3<sup>rd</sup> bullet point</p>	<p>Consideration should be given to the designation of a new business park close to the A120, in the vicinity of Braintree, to provide for <del>new</del> demand generated by <del>airport related expansion</del> at the proximity to Stansted and by the recent dualled A120 between the M11 and Braintree.</p>	<p>Update for the current situation</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><i>Statement on how the focused change affects the predicted impacts in the original appraisal of Policy CS4 in the SA/SEA of the Core Strategy Submission Draft.</i></p> <p><b><u>Additional Appraisal</u></b></p> <p><b><i>The focused change does not affect the predicted impacts in the original appraisal of Policy CS4 in the SA/SEA of the Draft Submission Core Strategy, which states that ‘the provision of employment land throughout the district in accordance with Policy CS4 should contribute to maintaining the economy of the District (SO5) and achieving a better balance between homes and jobs’. The removal of text referring to airport related expansion will not affect any of the predicted impacts of Policy CS4 appraisal where it was and is viewed that sustainable developments is more specifically focused on the relationship between jobs and homes in an area’s locality.</i></b></p>
<p>Paragraph 6.14, final line</p>	<p>Uses to include employment, housing and the reuse of historic factory buildings, including <del>the re-use</del> of the powerhouse as a museum.</p>	<p>To allow for flexibility</p>	<p>No – was appraised as uncertain and this will not change</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p><i>State that the potential positive impacts resulting from the museum inclusion will not apply in the SA/SEA of the Core Strategy Submission Draft Policy CS4.</i></p> <p><b><u>Additional Appraisal</u></b></p>

					<b><i>The appraisal of Policy CS4 in the Core Strategy Submission Draft SA/SEA Environmental Report highlighted uncertain impacts in regards to cultural assets in the District. Although the presence of a museum in the re use of the powerhouse in Silver End was highlighted as having the potential for positive impacts on this objective, it was and remains the view that ‘until the specific design of sites is known, the impacts will be uncertain’.</i></b>
Paragraph 6.18	The first strategic employment site is an 18.5hectare Innovation and Enterprise Business Park at Great Notley, close to the A120, as recommended in the Employment Land Review. This is a sustainable location for employment, accessible by footpaths and cycleways and public transport and close to a potential workforce at Great Notley and Braintree. Uses will be restricted to B1 and B2 Use Classes (light industrial, business and general industrial uses), B8 (storage and distribution) and hotel development. <del>The uses will exclude B8 (storage and distribution) warehousing for the following reasons: – Provision has been made for warehousing on other industrial areas in Braintree, including the Skyline Development, adjacent to the</del>	To reflect current position	Yes	Yes	<i>Re-appraise Policy CS4 with B8 and C1 uses.</i>

	<p>A120. Further B8 uses will be permitted as part of the employment allocation proposed at the north-east Braintree growth location. Warehousing would be unlikely to provide a high density of jobs per floorspace Warehousing would be inappropriate in this growth location adjacent to the Country Park. (The Council intends to ensure that the visual attractiveness of the Country Park is protected and is therefore opposed to the provision of warehousing on the southern side of the Country Park.) In order to ensure a mix of uses on the site, the overall quantum of B8 use on the site should be restricted to no more than 40% of the total floor area and the largest unit size to 7,500 sq m'.</p>				
<p>Policy CS4, Table, row 2, column 2.</p>	<p>Site for housing, football stadium, college campus, educational provision, health care provision, services and community uses.</p>	<p>A reference to housing and health care provision recognises the mix of uses proposed on the site.</p>	<p>Yes – although originally in the Issues and Options SA/SEA of October</p>	<p>Yes, as the site had previously been appraised as including the college campus, with no</p>	<p>Re-appraise the Panfield Lane Growth Location element of Policy CS4 in light of the changes.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Appraisal</u></b></p> <p><b><i>As a result of the focused change, there may be a weakening of impacts on education and skills as previously appraised in the Core Strategy Submission Draft SA/SEA Environmental Report. Despite this, any impacts will only be</i></b></p>

		Since the publication of the document the College at Braintree have confirmed they have no money to fund relocation.	2008 ('One Vision – One District).	health facilities.	<p><b><i>marginal as Braintree College will still exist at its current location and any positive impacts resulting from its re location to Panfield Lane would only result through any modernisation of facilities. Where this is unknown at this stage, the impacts will remain uncertain as specified in the Core Strategy Submission Draft SA/SEA Environmental Report.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>Additional Appraisal</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Impacts on health will become more positive as a result of the focused change, where health care provision is now included on site. These positive impacts will be seen in the long term in line with the timescale of development at Panfield Lane Growth Location.</i></b></p>
Policy CS4, Table, row 3, column 2	Innovation and Enterprise Business Park B1, B2, B8 and C2 C1 hotel use	To reflect current position and correct drafting error.	Yes	Yes	<p>Re-appraise Policy CS4 with B8 and C1 uses.</p> <p><b><u>Additional Appraisal</u></b></p> <p><b><i>The impacts of the focused change regarding sustainable levels of prosperity and economic growth are therefore negative where the total floor area potential for B1 and B2 employment uses on this site may be significantly reduced despite shortages in employment opportunities in these sectors throughout the District, and the smaller amount of jobs traditionally created</i></b></p>



					<i>through B8 uses.</i>
--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------

**No Action for Chapter 7**

**Focused Changes Proposed for Chapter 8**

<b>Section</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b><i>Would the original text have affected the original appraisal?</i></b>	<b><i>Does the original appraisal need to be reviewed in line with formal changes to the text?</i></b>	<b><i>What action we need to take...</i></b>
Paragraph 8.12, first two sentences.	The Habitat Regulation Assessment suggested a SANG provision rate of 4ha per 1000 increase in population. More recent advice from Natural England recommends 8ha per 1000 increase in population. Notwithstanding this change,	To update the current advice position from Natural England	Yes	Yes	Re appraise Policy CS8 and CS10 in light of increased SANG provision.  <b><u>Additional Appraisal</u></b>  <b><i>The focused change increases the required</i></b>

	<p>The majority of SANGs in the Braintree District will be created from existing open space which at present does not have any public access, or has limited access, existing open space which is already accessible but could be changed in character and/or land in other uses which could be converted into SANGs.</p>			<p><b><i>amount of Standard Accessible Natural Greenspace per 1000 increase in population by 100%; however it is still the view of the SA/SEA that this requirement is more appropriately located within the Core Strategy as supporting text for Policy CS10.</i></b></p> <p><b><u><i>Additional Appraisal</i></u></b></p> <p><b><i>Despite this, the focused change may positively impact on either human health through recreation or biodiversity in the appraisal of Policy CS8. It is stated within the supporting text that ‘the majority of SANGs in the Braintree District will be created from existing open space which at present does not have any public access, or has limited access, existing open space which is already accessible but could be changed in character and/or land in other uses which could be converted into SANGs.’ The impacts of this would have more positive impacts on human health through recreation than previously appraised in the Core Strategy Submission Draft SA/SEA Environmental Report, however, possibly to the detriment of any biodiversity interest of natural green space areas; the impacts of which could become more negative through increased recreational use. Positive</i></b></p>
--	---	--	--	---

Policy CS8, 5 <sup>th</sup> paragraph, 2 <sup>nd</sup> line	Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) will be encouraged used wherever possible to reduce flood risk, promote groundwater recharge, enhance biodiversity and provide amenity benefit, unless following adequate assessment, soil conditions and/or engineering feasibility dictate otherwise.	Clarification as suggested by the Environment Agency.	Yes	Yes	Re appraise Policy CS8 in line with this change.  <b><u>Additional Appraisal</u></b>  <b><i>In conjunction with the focused change 'policy CS8, 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point' and the positive impacts this will have on biodiversity due to creation of new wildlife corridors; the statement that SUDS will be used wherever possible (changed from 'encouraged')</i></b> could further strengthen the positive impacts on biodiversity resulting from Policy CS8. Also, in line with added policy, the emphasis on SUDS creation could increase the positive impact on minimising flood risk beyond those predicted in the Core Strategy Submission Draft SA/SEA Environmental Report.
Policy CS9, after 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet point	Add new bullet point which states: Promote and encourage the contribution that historical assets can make towards driving regeneration, economic development, tourism and leisure provision in the District	To show consideration for the contribution that historical assets can make.	No	Yes	Re-assess impacts on economic growth of Policy CS9 in line with change.
					<b><i>biodiversity interest where previously, simply mitigation would lead to neither net gains nor losses.</i></b>