

Upwell Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Strategic Environmental Assessment:

Addendum to Draft Environmental Report (March 2019)

October 2019

Prepared on behalf of the

Upwell Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group by

Collective Community Planning (www.collectivecommunityplanning.co.uk)

Introduction

In July 2004, an assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, known as Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), became a requirement under European Directive 2001/42/EC. A SEA screening opinion request was made to KL&WNC as to whether Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) would be required. This was supported by a short report and assessment. KL&WNC decided in May 2018, following consultation with Natural England, Environment Agency and Historic England, that the Upwell Neighbourhood Development Plan (UNDP) would be required to undergo a SEA.

With regards to the Habitats Regulations Assessment and whether an Appropriate Assessment would be required, there are no internationally designated nature conservation (SPA or SAC) sites within or sufficiently near to the Upwell Neighbourhood Plan area, apart from the Ouse Washes, so the plan is not likely to have a significant effect on European designations, and this was confirmed by the screening opinion.

In accordance with the Directive, transposed regulations and Government guidance, the SEA has been undertaken on the UNDP. By carrying out the SEA on the UNDP, the Parish Council aims to:

- identify alternative policy options for delivering sustainable growth in Upwell Parish;
- identify and describe the environmental, social and economic effects of alternative policy options;
- further enhance any beneficial environmental effects of the Neighbourhood Plan; and
- reduce and minimise any adverse environmental effects that may result from the Neighbourhood Plan.

Draft Environmental Report – March 2019

The draft Environmental Report for the SEA was used to inform the development of the UNDP by outlining the environmental effects of the draft policies proposed within the plan. The SEA report accompanied the pre-submission document consultation at Regulation 15.

The conclusion was that overall the plan as presented offered a number of positive environmental effects, particularly in relation to the economy, affordable housing and the protection and provision of open spaces. However, these positive effects would need to be balanced against the potential they pose to damage the local environment. In particular, the unavoidable loss of high-quality agricultural land. The promotion of tourism along the waterways would likely lead to some adverse effects on the water environment and any aquatic wildlife that depend on the waterways for food or habitat. However, as the

environmental assessment did not predict or evaluate any certain significant adverse environmental effects, mitigation recommendations were relatively limited and are shown in Figure 14 of the SEA, and below.

Figure 1: Mitigation Recommendations from draft Environmental Report (March 2019)

UNDP Policy	Recommendation
ET3	<p>Policy ET3 could be amended to include a requirement for any planning applications along the waterway to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a strategy for dealing with any resultant pollutants from entering the waterway; • an ecological appraisal, incorporating detailed site-specific mitigation recommendations; and • a waste management strategy for entering that waste from tourist activities is kept from entering the waterway as much as possible.
LR1	<p>Policy ET3 could be amended to include a requirement for any planning applications along the waterway to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a strategy for dealing with any resultant pollutants from entering the waterway; • an ecological appraisal, incorporating detailed site-specific mitigation recommendations; • a waste management strategy for entering that waste from tourist activities is kept from entering the waterway as much as possible; and • a detailed sustainable drainage and surface water run-off scheme/strategy for any built development.
A1	<p>Policy A1 could go one step further and require any planning application submitted to include a Heritage Statement outlining how the proposal ensures that no impacts on the historic environment arise through its design, layout, scale and massing. A Flood Risk Assessment incorporating a sustainable drainage strategy should be required to accompany any application to show that the surface water flooding present on the site will not pose any issues to the development, its residents or increase surface water flood risk beyond the site. Finally, a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be provided with any planning application to show the impact of the development and incorporate any landscaping measures to mitigate any impacts identified.</p>
A2	<p>Policy A2 could go one step further and require any planning application submitted to include a Heritage Statement outlining how the proposal ensures that no impacts arise on the historic environment through its design, layout, scale and massing.</p>
A3	<p>A Flood Risk Assessment incorporating a sustainable drainage strategy should be required to accompany any application to show that the surface water flooding present on the site will not pose any issues to the development, its residents or increase surface water flood risk beyond the site.</p>

A4	Policy A4 could go one step further and require any planning application submitted to include a Heritage Statement outlining how the proposal ensures that no impacts arise on the historic environment through its design, layout, scale and massing. A Flood Risk Assessment incorporating a sustainable drainage strategy should be required to accompany any application to show that the
UNDP Policy	Recommendation
	surface water flooding present on the site will not pose any issues to the development, its residents or increase surface water flood risk beyond the site.
A5	Policy A5 could require that a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment be provided with any planning application to show the impact of the development and incorporate any landscaping measures to mitigate any impacts identified.

Modifications resulting from SEA recommendations and Regulation 14 consultation

The recommendations included proactive suggestions for improving and enhancing the beneficial effects that the plan presents. In response, Policies ET3 and LR1 of the NDP were strengthened to reflect the need to reduce the risk of waste and/ or pollution entering the waterways.

Most of the other recommendations required specific assessments to be included in policies, especially the site allocations policies A1 to A5. However, the Health Check report advised against specifying particular assessments as this could conflict with the validation requirements of KL&WNC. These suggestions were therefore not adopted, although it should be noted that all such policies require evidence, or the demonstration of an impact, which suggest the need for such assessments anyway.

The pre-submission Environmental Report therefore resulted in changes to Policies ET3 and LR1.

Furthermore, in response to the representations made during the Regulation 14 presubmission consultation a number of other modifications were made to the plan. Apart from minor changes, these have been considered for the SEA through this Addendum. Each modification has been categorised in terms of type and impact into the following:

- Technical clarification & contextual amends
- Procedural clarification - amended supporting text but not policy wording updates
- Change to policy wording which does not significantly alter how the policy would be interpreted or implemented
- Other change to policy wording which alters the purpose or aim of the policy

The modifications are summarised are at **Appendix A** of this SEA Addendum.

Conclusions regarding environmental impact of modifications

Many of the proposed modifications were screened out from further Strategic Environmental Assessment consideration. For the most part, this was owing to the modifications consisting of minor changes to policy wording, or procedural/technical clarifications within the supporting text, which did not materially alter the overall policy principles or purpose. Only those modifications resulting in a change to policy wording which alters the purpose or aim of the policy have been considered further as they were 'screened in'. This is shown at Appendix A.

The likely impact on the SEA objectives of the changes that were *screened in* has been assessed as to whether that impact could, on its own or cumulatively with others, be significant. The modifications that were screened in are set out in **Appendix B** along with a judgement as to whether the modification is significant in terms of SEA objectives or the overall conclusions of the draft Environmental Report.

Most of the modifications are expected to have minor positive impacts on the SEA objectives compared to the assessment in the draft Environmental Report, though none of these impacts are assessed as significant. One of the modifications is expected to have a very minor negative impact, but this is also assessed as not significant. Significant cumulative impacts on the SEA objectives are also unlikely.

The iterative assessment process has demonstrated that the modifications do not significantly impact on the overall assessment of the Plan, or trigger the need for new mitigation measures to manage effects. Furthermore, the modifications are not expected to result in any significant negative effects on the SEA objectives. There are therefore no further recommendations for mitigation

Appendix A. Changes from Pre-submission to Submission related to SEA

The following table shows that although a number of changes were made to the plan following Regulation 14, none were significant enough either individually or cumulatively to warrant changing the conclusion of the draft SEA, which was that the plan would not have a significant adverse effect.

Change	Technical clarification & contextual amends	Procedural clarification - amended supporting text but not policy wording updates	Change to policy wording which does not significantly alter how the policy would be interpreted or implemented	Other change to policy wording which alters the purpose or aim of the policy	Change - SEA screening in or out
Additional text to Policies LR1 and ET3 to reflect recommendations in SEA to mitigate against pollution/ waste entering the waterways					In
Policy A1. Text added to require stand-off buffers with neighbouring properties					In
Policy EN1. Text added to reflect the need to consider all sources of flooding and the use of SuDS.					In
Policy A1. Refer the foul sewer crossing the site.					Out
Policy P1. Amendment to reflect the need to ensure infrastructure capacity is available or can be made available					Out
Policy ET2. Included reference to flood risk					Out
Policy ET3 supporting text amended to refer to flood management authorities					Out

Policy LR1. Refer to Middle Level Commissioners in supporting text					Out
Policy EN1. Remove requirement to consult middle level commissioners					Out

Change	Technical clarification & contextual amends	Procedural clarification - amended supporting text but not policy wording updates	Change to policy wording which does not significantly alter how the policy would be interpreted or implemented	Other change to policy wording which alters the purpose or aim of the policy	Change - SEA screening in or out
Policy P1. Added text on flood management to supporting text					Out
Policy P1. Added to supporting text a note that new footways should be positioned outside of any protected watercourse and maintenance access strips					Out
Policy A3. Changes to supporting text on the circumstances that could cause the waterway to overtop					Out
Policy A1. Add buffers around site to prevent amenity impact on neighbours					Out
Policy EN1. Add water butts to policy					Out
Policy A1 to A5. Text added to supporting text to aid clarity on types of flood risk					Out
Policy ET3. Included tourism assets within the policy					Out

Policy LR2. Amended policy to accord with local plan policy					In
Policy A1. Site A1 to make tramway a walking and cycling route					In
Policy H1. Amend supporting text to reflect reduced housing need					Out
Policy H2. Amended to refer to rural exception sites rather than also entry-level (which is adequately covered in the NPPF)					In
Policy H3. Add text encouraging innovative design					In

Change	Technical clarification & contextual amends	Procedural clarification - amended supporting text but not policy wording updates	Change to policy wording which does not significantly alter how the policy would be interpreted or implemented	Other change to policy wording which alters the purpose or aim of the policy	Change - SEA screening in or out
Various minor changes to policies A1 to A5 to link with other thematic policies in the NDP					Out
Policy A1. Change from 3 to 2 phases					Out
Policy A4. Clarify extent of required road widening					Out
Removed requirements for specific assessments from a number of policies					Out
Various policies. Amend ' <i>support in principle</i> ' wording to provide clarity. Amend 'should be' to 'will be' etc					Out

Policy ET2. Amended text to delete reference to HGV <i>routing</i> , which would be difficult to control, replacing with HGV <i>use</i> .					In
Policy LR1. Include reference to viability report (alongside a business plan). Remove requirement for parish council to be involved. Clarify that any housing will be out of flood risk zones. Minor text changes to clarify that this is essentially a marina led development.					Out
Policy LR2. Clarify when off-site provision is acceptable.					Out
Policy LR3. Delete supporting text referencing onstreet parking					Out
Policy EN1. Clarify that water-butts only required with new or extended buildings					Out
Policy EN2. Add map of Agricultural Land Classification given its importance					Out

Change	Technical clarification & contextual amends	Procedural clarification - amended supporting text but not policy wording updates	Change to policy wording which does not significantly alter how the policy would be interpreted or implemented	Other change to policy wording which alters the purpose or aim of the policy	Change - SEA screening in or out
Policy EN2. Minor changes for clarification of the use of the sequential approach					Out
Policy H1. Explanation in supporting text that KL&WNC support the quantum of housing proposed					Out

Policy H1, Change to 'at least' 45 dwellings, Similar changes made to Policies A1 to A5					In
Policy H1. Remove text referring to other sites that might come forward during the plan period as it could be seen as inviting non-allocated sites					Out
Policy H2. Delete text requiring applicants to demonstrate the local need in terms of housing mix					Out
Policy H2. Added supporting text on how housing suitable for older people can be defined					Out
Policy H3. Delete 'especially within conservation areas'					Out
Policy H3. Remove references to residential car parking as this is mainly covered in H4.					Out
Policy H3. Clarify that the 50% of footprint includes outbuildings					Out
Policy H4. Add text from H3 with respect to flexibility to promote good design					Out
Policy P3. Add text to explain improvements only needed where current provision is not acceptable					Out
Policy P4. Delete text concerning protecting the area around local green spaces					Out
Change	Technical clarification & contextual amends	Procedural clarification - amended supporting text but not policy wording updates	Change to policy wording which does not significantly alter how the policy would be interpreted or implemented	Other change to policy wording which alters the purpose or aim of the policy	Change - SEA screening in or out the policy

Policy A1. Clarify that stand-off distances from neighbours is to protect amenity					Out
Policy A3. Clarify text on the likelihood of flooding and the advice from the Internal Drainage Board					Out
Policy A4. Clarify that modest sized housing should be determined in the context of the immediate setting					Out
Policy A5. Clarify that the car parking can be part of the open space requirement					Out

Appendix B: Modifications resulting in a change to policy wording which alters the purpose or aim of the policy

Pre-submission version of policy	submission version of policy	Summary of change	SEA objectives, likely beneficial or adverse Impact, and likely significant or not

<p>Policy LR1</p> <p>The development of the site will need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a marina first and foremost; • Be based on an agreed masterplan and business plan for the site; • Access the highway onto Dovecote Road; • Provide suitable landscaping to soften the visual impact when viewed from Dovecote Road; and • Provide evidence on flood risk, including any impact on the frontage drainage ditch. 	<p>The development of the site will need to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Deliver a marina, supported by associated leisure and recreation development; b. Be based on an agreed masterplan for the site; c. Access the highway onto Dovecote Road; d. Demonstrate the avoidance of pollution and waste entering the waterways; e. Provide suitable landscaping to soften the visual impact when viewed from Dovecote Road; and f. Provide evidence on flood risk and management of surface water run-off, including any impact on the frontage drainage ditch and waterways. 	<p>Additional text to Policies LR1 and ET3 to reflect recommendations in SEA to mitigate against pollution/ waste entering the waterways</p>	<p>SEA6: To protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the area SEA7: To protect and enhance water quality and resources, as well as soil quality for agricultural use</p> <p>Very minor positive impact which is unlikely to be significant, especially given other environmental regulations that are in place.</p>
<p>Policy ET3</p> <p>Specifically, developments which promote the attraction and use of Welle Creek and other waterways will be supported in principle, subject to other criteria and policies in the Neighbourhood Plan</p>	<p>Specifically, developments which promote the attraction and use of Welle Creek and other waterways will be supported, subject to other planning criteria and policies in the development plan, and subject to demonstrating the avoidance of pollution and waste entering the waterways.</p>	<p>Additional text to Policies LR1 and ET3 to reflect recommendations in SEA to mitigate against pollution/ waste entering the waterways</p>	<p>SEA6: To protect and enhance the biodiversity and geodiversity of the area SEA7: To protect and enhance water quality and resources, as well as soil quality for agricultural use</p> <p>Very minor positive impact which is unlikely to be significant, especially given</p>

Pre-submission version of policy	submission version of policy	Summary of change	SEA objectives, likely beneficial or adverse impact, and likely significant or not
			other environmental regulations that are in place.
<p>Policy A1</p>	<p>New bullet added Ensure there is sufficient stand-off distances with existing dwellings on adjacent land so as to protect their amenity</p>	<p>Policy A1. Text added to require stand-off buffers with neighbouring properties</p>	<p>SEA8: To minimise any increase in noise, vibration and visual intrusion from growth.</p> <p>Very minor and highly localised positive impact for neighbours of site A1, which is not considered significant given its limited nature and the material consideration of amenity impact that prevails for all applications.</p>
<p>Policy EN1 New developments must provide evidence accompanying all planning applications to show that proposed developments will not adversely affect existing flood prevention measures (e.g. dykes, ditches, etc.) and that new development will not increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere off-site.</p>	<p>Planning applications where appropriate must provide evidence relating to the risk of flooding from all potential sources to show that proposed developments will not adversely affect existing flood prevention measures (e.g. dykes, ditches, etc.) and will not increase the risk of flooding on site or elsewhere off-site. The evidence to be provided will include the proposed method of foul and surface water drainage and any required mitigation, including the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for surface water management wherever feasible</p>	<p>Policy EN1. Text added to reflect the need to consider all sources of flooding and the use of SuDS.</p>	<p>SEA2: To reduce the risk, vulnerability and exposure of people and property to current and future flooding in the area</p> <p>Very minor positive impact which is not considered significant given national policy for managing flood risk that would apply anyway.</p>

Pre-submission version of policy	submission version of policy	Summary of change	SEA objectives, likely beneficial or adverse Impact, and likely significant or not
<p>Policy LR2 Residential developments will be expected to make a contribution towards the provision or improvement of open and community space or facilities. Rather than providing new facilities, contributions towards upgrading or improving existing facilities may be acceptable provided that those facilities are in close proximity and well related to the development.</p>	<p>Unless on-site open and recreational space is specifically required as part of a site allocations policy, contributions towards upgrading or improving existing facilities and green spaces will be acceptable provided that those facilities and green spaces are in close proximity, accessible and well-related to the development and demonstrably in need of improving or upgrading</p>	<p>Policy LR2. Amended policy to accord with local plan policy</p>	<p>SEA10: To contribute to improved local health and wellbeing, Including through the provision of open, community and recreational spaces</p> <p>No likely impact resulting from the modification</p>
<p>Policy A1 Preserve the clearly visible route of the former tramway</p>	<p>Preserve the clearly visible route of the former tramway and integrate it into the development. Evidence will need to be provided as part of the masterplan to show how the tramway can be exploited, such as a shared walking and cycling route</p>	<p>Policy A1. Site A1 to make tramway a walking and cycling route if feasible</p>	<p>SEA9: To improve sustainable access for all to and within the Parish SEA10: To contribute to improved local health and wellbeing, Including through the provision of open, community and recreational spaces</p> <p>Very minor and highly localised positive impact for people walking or cycling, which is not considered significant given its limited nature.</p>

Policy H2 Proposals comprising affordable housing development, including entry-level	Proposals comprising affordable housing development that are outside of the	Policy H2. Amended to refer to affordable housing rather than also	SEA11: To ensure local people have access to the types of housing
---	---	--	---

Pre-submission version of policy	submission version of policy	Summary of change	SEA objectives, likely beneficial or adverse Impact, and likely significant or not
schemes , but that are outside of the settlement boundaries (exception sites) may be permitted where....	settlement boundaries may be permitted where...	entry-level specifically (criteria for which is adequately covered in the NPPF)	required to meet their needs No impact given that criteria already exist in national policy for entry-level exception sites.
Policy H3 Proposals should therefore be of an appropriate density, height, variety, scale and layout.....	Proposals should therefore be of an appropriate density, height, variety, scale and layout. This is not intended to discourage innovation, which will be welcomed.	Policy H3. Add text encouraging innovative design	SEA5: To maintain and enhance the character and quality of the built and historic environment, particularly in and around the Conservation Area. Neutral impact which is not considered significant given the national policy promoting good quality design.

<p>Policy ET2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on residential amenity; • it will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the transport network, especially in relation to HGV routing; • where it is a new site it can accommodate all parking for staff within its site, unless shown to be not feasible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will not have an unacceptable impact on flood risk from all sources, and navigation of the waterways; • it will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the transport network, especially in relation to HGV use; • where it is a new site it can accommodate all parking for staff within its site, unless shown to be not feasible 	<p>Policy ET2. Amended text to delete reference to HGV <i>routing</i>, which would be difficult to control, replacing with HGV <i>use</i>.</p>	<p>SEA8: To minimise any increase in noise, vibration and visual intrusion from growth</p> <p>Potential very minor negative impact which is not considered significant given the low HGV use arising within the parish.</p>
Pre-submission version of policy	submission version of policy	Summary of change	SEA objectives, likely beneficial or adverse Impact, and likely significant or not
<p>Policy H1</p> <p>As part of this Neighbourhood Plan, sufficient land will be allocated to meet the housing need of an additional 45 dwellings over the plan period to 2038</p>	<p>As part of this Neighbourhood Plan, sufficient land will be allocated to meet the housing need of at least 45 additional dwellings over the plan period to 2038</p>	<p>Policy H1, change to ‘at least’ 45 dwellings, Similar changes made to Policies A1 to A5</p>	<p>SEA11: To ensure local people have access to the types of housing required to meet their needs</p> <p>Very minor positive impact from the potential small additional number of homes available. This will be limited by the size of the allocated sites and the need for good layout and design and openspace, and so impact is considered not to be significant.</p>

