

Environmental Report



Eaton Bishop Neighbourhood Area

April 2017



**Herefordshire
Council**

Eaton Bishop Parish Environmental Report

Contents

Non-technical summary

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

Appendix 1: Initial SEA Screening Report

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

Appendix 3: Consultation responses from Natural England and English Heritage

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

Appendix 5: Options Considered

Appendix 6: Consultation responses to the draft Environmental Report

Appendix 7: SEA Stage D reviewing modification following the draft NDP consultation

Appendix 8: feedback on the submission Environmental Report (reg16)

Appendix 9: Modifications following examination

Appendix 10: SEA Stage D – assessment following the examination modifications

Appendix 11: Environmental Report checklist

Non-technical summary

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

The Eaton Bishop Parish has undertaken to prepare an NDP and this process has been subject to environmental appraisal pursuant to the SEA Directive. The Parish comprises the settlement of Eaton Bishop and Ruckhall.

The Draft Eaton Bishop NDP includes 5 objectives and it is intended that these objectives will be delivered by 14 mostly criteria based planning policies (Now 13 policies) after deletion of policy EB3 post examination; with six site allocations proposed in the settlements of Eaton Bishop and Ruckhall.

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

The Eaton Bishop NDP was subject to an independent examination commencing in April 2017, modifications were suggested to add clarity to the policies and aid their implementation. None of these modifications were directly related to the SEA and no further changes to the NDP are recommended as a result of the reassessment of the SEA.

Following reassessment post examination, the conclusions set out in the draft Environmental Report are still valid. That is the Eaton Bishop NDP is in general conformity with both national planning policy contained within the National Planning Policy Framework and the strategic policies set out within the adopted Herefordshire Core Strategy. Therefore, no further changes are recommended as a result of this SEA (Stage D).

Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening has been carried out as the Parish falls within the hydrological catchment for the River Wye (including River Lugg) which is a European site (Special Area of Conservation). The River Wye runs along the northern border of the Parish. The HRA assesses the potential effects of the NDP on the River Wye SAC.

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

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This report forms the draft Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the Eaton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).
- 1.2 The Eaton Bishop NDP proposes six site allocations, four in Eaton Bishop and two in Ruckhall. Settlement boundaries are proposed for Eaton Bishop and Ruckhall settlement. Eaton Bishop village is identified within table 4.14 which is targeted for proportional levels of growth in Policy RA1 of the Herefordshire Local Plan (Core Strategy) and Ruckhall under table 4.15. The NDP will, however, provide general policies for guiding future development across the parish as a whole.

Purpose of the SEA

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

Parish Neighbourhood Plan Context

- 1.6 Eaton Bishop Parish comprises the settlement of Eaton Bishop and Ruckhall. The Parish lies approximately 6 miles west from Hereford.
- 1.7 The neighbourhood area boasts many natural features, not least 17 Special Wildlife Sites (9 of which border the parish) and 3 sites of special scientific interest. There are numerous built heritage assets, too, including listed buildings, Scheduled Monuments and non-designated assets.
- 1.8 The vision for Eaton Bishop in 2031 is as follows:
“To protect and enhance the rural nature of the Parish through incremental development in an appropriate and sustainable way in order to maintain and, where possible, enhance the quality of life for all of the village community.”
- 1.9 The 5 NDP objectives are as follows:
1. Involve the residents of the Parish, on an ongoing basis, by inviting participation in the process of planning, monitoring and delivery of development within the Parish.
 2. Endeavour that all development takes into account the views expressed by the community, whilst ensuring that it conforms with the Herefordshire Council Local Plan Core Strategy document. Also to ensure development preserves and is sympathetic to the character of the Parish and protects the landscape and environment through attention to the size and style of new housing.

3. Base all development upon sound environmental principles including, energy and water conservation, recycling and efficient sewerage management in order to minimise its impact on the local environment.
4. Allow for appropriate phased building development by retaining and developing the infrastructure of the Parish as required. In particular, by securing the provision of enhanced capacity for sewage treatment and other utilities, and encouraging a reduction in the use of private vehicles by supporting improvement to public transport along with other facilities and amenities in response to the future growth of the community.
5. Encourage new business ventures, which are perceived as beneficial to the economic health of the Parish and bringing local employment opportunities, provided that they are in scale with, and sensitive to, the rural character of the Parish.

Context of Neighbourhood Plans

- 1.10 NDPs are a relatively new type of planning document that form a key part of the Government's localism agenda. They enable local communities to develop plans that reflect local aspirations, in accordance with strategic policies.
- 1.11 The Eaton Bishop NDP must therefore conform to national planning policy set within the NPPF and strategic level local policy including the Herefordshire Local Plan (Core Strategy).
- 1.12 The Herefordshire Local Plan (Core Strategy) was adopted on the 16th October 2015.
- 1.13 Paragraph 216 of the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance set out the weight that may be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, including NDPs, and indicated that weight may be given to relevant policies in emerging NDPs according to:
 - The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
 - The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
 - The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).
- 1.14 This part of the NPPF is reinforced by Planning Practice Guidance published in March 2014, which is clear that an emerging NDP may be a material planning consideration once it has reached submission/local authorities publication stage (Regulation 16). This is reinforced by recent ministerial statements and case law (West Sussex), all of which have demonstrated that an emerging NDP may be a material consideration at the Regulation 16 stage¹.
- 1.15 Table 4.14 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy) lists Eaton Bishop and Table 4.15 Ruckhall among the settlements which it considers to be sustainable locations for growth, albeit smaller market homes which meet the needs of people with local connections or affordable housing in line with the provisions of Policy RA2. Housing allocations have been provided to accommodate housing up to 30 dwellings in line with the indicative housing target suggested in the Core Strategy.
- 1.16 Once made (adopted) by Herefordshire Council, the Eaton Bishop NDP will have a role in guiding future development proposals within the Parish, by setting out policies against which planning applications will be determined.

¹ For the avoidance of doubt, this NDP is currently at the Draft Plan Stage (Regulation 14) and cannot, therefore, be given weight in reaching decisions on planning applications

Structure of SEA

1.17 The structure of the document is as follows:

- Section 2 – Explains the SEA methodology and summarises the comments received in respect of the SEA Scoping Report
- Section 3 - Introduces the Eaton Bishop Neighbourhood Plan objectives and the SEA framework
- Section 4 - Appraises the objectives contained within the Neighbourhood Plan against the SEA framework
- Section 5 - Appraises the options considered within the Neighbourhood Plan against the SEA framework
- Section 6 – Appraises the policies contained within the Neighbourhood Plan against the SEA framework
- Section 7 – Discusses the implementation and monitoring of the Neighbourhood Plan
- Section 8 - Concludes the SEA report by outlining next steps

2.0 Methodology

2.1 The SEA process comprised several stages and which are summarised, in some detail, below.

2.2 Stage A involved 4 tasks and culminated in a Scoping Report:

- *Task A1:* Identified and reviewed relevant policies, plans and programmes and environmental protection objectives from European, National and Local sources.
- *Task A2:* Collected baseline information to provide a picture of past, present and likely future conditions within the area. This helped to establish indicators which will be used to monitor the effects and performance of the Eaton Bishop NDP.
- *Task A3:* Focused on the environmental issues identified from the baseline, highlighting key issues and problems within the neighbourhood area.
- *Task A4:* Used the information gathered from Tasks A1-A3 to develop a set of SEA objectives, sometimes referred to as the 'sustainability framework'.
- *Task A5:* Collated the results of Tasks A1-A4 within a Scoping Report, a document which was subject to a statutory 5 week consultation.

2.3 Stage B involved 4 tasks and assessed the effects of the NDP.

- *Task B1:* Tested NDP Objectives against the SEA Objectives
- *Task B2:* Developed and refined the NDP options and policies
- *Task B3/B4:* Predicted and evaluated the significant effects of the NDP

2.4 Stage C involved preparing an Environmental Report. This report presents information compiled during Stage B of the SEA process and constitutes the Draft Environmental Appraisal of the NDP. It accompanies the Draft Plan during its formal Regulation 14

consultation with people who live, work and carry out businesses in the neighbourhood area, as well as statutory bodies listed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

- 2.5 Producing an Environmental Report was therefore a legal requirement and the submission of this report to Herefordshire Council forms Stage D of the SEA process.

Scoping Report Consultation

- 2.6 With regard to the SEA scoping assessments, documents A1 to A4 were completed by a Herefordshire Council Planning Officer and sent to the Parish Council for comment, in readiness for a 5 week consultation with statutory bodies, pursuant to the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.
- 2.7 After the document was approved by the Parish Council, the Eaton Bishop SEA Scoping Report was available to four² statutory bodies for consultation from 31st March 2015 to 5th May 2015.

Consultation outcomes from Statutory Consultees

- 2.8 The consultation resulted in no responses, both of which are attached at Appendix 3.
- 2.9 Both responses were collated and incorporated within this document where relevant.

Natural England: No comments received

English Heritage: No comments received

Environment Agency: No comments received

Natural Resources Wales: No comments received

3.0 The SEA Framework

- 3.1 As mentioned previously, Stage A of the SEA identifies and reviews relevant policies, plans and programmes and environmental protection objectives from European, National and Local sources (refer to Table A1 in Appendix 2 for details of those documents that were reviewed in completing Stage A of SEA on the Eaton Bishop NDP).
- 3.2 The requirement to undertake this 'context review' is contained in Annexes 1(a) and (e) of the SEA Directive which states that an Environmental Report should include:

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

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

² Statutory consultation bodies: Natural England; English Heritage; Environment Agency Natural Resources Wales

Policy context

- 3.3 The Eaton Bishop NDP will deliver the Local Plan (Core Strategy) at parish level by adding locally specific detail to strategic policies. As a consequence, the Scoping Report for the NDP was based on the context review Herefordshire Council undertook for its Local Plan (Core Strategy).
- 3.4 The results of this assessment (context review) provide the source of the local baseline data and have been incorporated into the SEA framework. It should be noted that:
- No list of policies, plans and programmes can ever be exhaustive and that Herefordshire Council has selected those considered to be of particular relevance to the planning system;
 - New or revised plans and policies can emerge during the SEA process
- 3.5 The following strategies and plans have been reviewed and, where appropriate, incorporated within the SA Framework objectives:
- *The EC Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010)* - These regulations transpose the Habitats Directive in England, Wales and to a limited extent Scotland by ensuring that activities are carried out in accordance with the Habitats Directive, which is to protect biodiversity through the conservation of natural habitats and species of wild flora and fauna.
 - *The EC Water Framework Directive (2000)* - Commits all EU member states to achieve good qualitative and quantitative status of all water courses by 2015
 - *The Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981)* - The major legal instrument for wildlife protection in Britain, although other significant acts have been passed since. It has numerous parts and supplementary lists and schedules many of which have been amended since publication.
 - *Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services (2011)* - Forms part of the UK's Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework by setting out England's contribution towards the UK's commitments under the United Nations Convention of Biological Diversity.
 - *The Countryside and Right of Way Act (2000)* - Creates a statutory right of access on foot to certain types of open land, to modernise the public rights of way system, to strengthen nature conservation legislation, and to facilitate better management of AONBs
 - *The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006)* - Designed to help achieve a rich and diverse natural environment and thriving rural communities through modernised and simplified arrangements for delivering Government policy.
 - *Revised EU Sustainable Development strategy (2009)* - Sets out a single strategy on how the EU will more effectively meet its long-standing commitment to meet the challenges of sustainable development.
 - *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)* - Consolidates the suite of PPG/PPS into one succinct planning policy document.
 - *Planning Practice Guidance (2013)* - Sets out the vision, objectives and policies for the Herefordshire Local Plan (Core Strategy), which will guide development across the county up to 2031.

- *Herefordshire Local Transport Plan 3 (LTP) 2013-2015* - Sets out the Council's strategy for supporting economic growth, social inclusion and reducing the environmental impacts of transport, as well as the program of investment for the period April 2013 to April 2015.
- *Understanding Herefordshire Report (2014)* - Important to understand the place such as the local economy natural and built environment in which people live, learn and work as part of understanding their quality of life. Enable development for economy and housing to required levels and growth should be supported by sustainable transport measures.
- *Malvern Hills AONB Management Plan 2009-2014 (2009)* - Identifies the issues and challenges facing the special features of the area and contains 24 guiding principles and 46 strategic objectives which will help address them.
- *Wye Valley AONB management Plan 2009-2014 (2009)* - The Management Plan is the prime document which sets out the vision for the area and the priorities for its management.
- *Herefordshire Economic Development Strategy 2011-2016* - Aims to increase the economic wealth of Herefordshire by setting out proposals and to support business growth up to 2016.
- *Herefordshire Employment Land Study (2012)* - Includes employment land assessments for the plan period 2011-2031. The study includes Quantitative and Qualitative assessments of employment land, assessment of market demand and need, as well as providing forecasts and recommendations for future employment need over the plan period.
- *Herefordshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2009)* - The SHLAA aims to justify site allocations in plans by:
 - Identifying sites which are capable of delivering housing development
 - Assessing sites for their housing potential; and
 - Predicting when a site could be developed for housing.
- *Herefordshire Local Housing Market Assessment (LHMA) (2013)* - Builds on an earlier Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) developed for Herefordshire and Shropshire. Its purpose is to inform the Local Plan's policies regarding housing need and demand (for market and affordable housing) within each of the 7 Housing Market Areas (HMAs) in Herefordshire between 2011 and 2031.
- *Herefordshire Local Housing Requirements Study (2012)* - Technical assessment of the housing market and potential future local housing requirements which supports planning policy regarding the amount of growth, housing tenure and housing type needed within Herefordshire up to 2031.
- *Herefordshire Rural Housing Background Report (2013)* - Provides the justification for the proportional housing growth targets outlined in the Core Strategy
- *Herefordshire Draft Gypsies and Travellers Assessment (2013)* - Assesses the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers across Herefordshire.
- *Herefordshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan (2007)* - Focuses conservation efforts on the areas within Herefordshire that will result in the greatest benefit for ecological networks, habitats and species.

- *Building Biodiversity into the LDF (2009)* - Provides the Council's Local Plan (Core Strategy) with evidence in respect of biodiversity and geodiversity, identifying both opportunities and constraints across Herefordshire.
- *Herefordshire Green Infrastructure Strategy (2010)* - Develops a framework of natural and culturally important features and functions so that planning for a sustainable future is at the heart of planning within Herefordshire.
- *Renewable Energy Study (2010)* - Assesses the energy demand within Herefordshire and the ability for the county to accommodate renewable and low carbon energy technologies.
- *Herefordshire Playing Pitch Assessment (2012)* - Produces a strategic framework, audit and assessment and needs analysis of outdoor sports pitches and facilities for Herefordshire. The document arises as a result of a recommendation in the Herefordshire and Worcestershire Sports Facilities Framework to develop local standards for playing fields and sports pitches throughout Herefordshire.
- *Open Spaces Study (2006)* - The 2006 space audit and assessment of need is a snap shot of the quality, quantity and distribution of open space across Herefordshire.
- *Play Facilities Study (2012)* - The Play Facilities Study 2012 updates the previous play facilities analysis under the Open Spaces Study 2006 and provides guidance and a framework for the development, delivery and continued sustainability of providing new and improved play facilities for children and young people in Herefordshire to 2031.
- *Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and Water Cycle Study (2009)* - The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) provides a summary of flood risk in Herefordshire to inform the location of future development. The Water Cycle Study examines how water resources and water supply infrastructure, wastewater treatment, water quality, sewerage and flood risk could constrain growth across Herefordshire.
- *Eaton Camp Excavation Final Report-2013*. Reports on small scale excavations Eaton Camp a promontory iron age hill fort in Ruckhall highlights its historic local importance of the site strategically and socially to Eaton Bishop.
- *A Conservation Management Plan, for Eaton Camp, Ruckhall, Herefordshire. 2012*. Reports on Eaton Camp a promontory hill fort in Ruckhall an ancient scheduled monument being of national importance.

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

SEA Objectives and baseline characteristics

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

| SEA Objective | |
|---------------|--|
| 1 | To maintain or enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) |
| 2 | To maintain or enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes |
| 3 | To improve the quality of surroundings |

| | |
|----|--|
| 4 | To conserve or where appropriate enhance the historic environment and culture heritage |
| 5 | To improve air quality |
| 6 | To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment |
| 7 | To reduce contributions to climate change |
| 8 | To reduce vulnerability to climate change |
| 9 | To improve water quality |
| 10 | To provide for sustainable sources of water supply |
| 11 | To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk |
| 12 | To conserve soil resources and quality |
| 13 | To minimise the production of waste |
| 14 | To improve the health of the population |
| 15 | To reduce crime and nuisance |
| 16 | To conserve natural and manmade resources |

- 3.8 The SEA objectives detailed above conform to the SEA Directive, and are derived from the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken for the Herefordshire Local Plan Core Strategy 2011-2031.
- 3.9 Baseline information gathered during Stage A of the SEA process provided details of the current environmental characteristics of the neighbourhood area and the status of its natural assets and features (refer to Appendix 2). This information was analysed as part of Task B2 of SEA, which looked at the extent to which the emerging NDP policies will help or obstruct these characteristics.
- 3.10 Following the completion of Task B2 of SEA it was apparent that the largest environmental issue within the Group Parish has an impact on the County as a whole is water quality; the River Wye (including the River Lugg), though currently meeting all its conservation objectives, will require effective management, in order to ensure that the quality of water does not deteriorate to the point that nutrient targets are missed further downstream.
- 3.11 The NDP proposes eight that sites are allocated for development and along with 14 (now 13) mostly criteria based policies. The River Wye passes through the northern edge of the parish, and is within the hydrological catchment. The watercourses within the village of Eaton Bishop are part of the hydrological catchment of the River Wye. On this basis, the delivery of the NDP should not exacerbate existing problems regarding water quality or have an unacceptable adverse impact. Impact on water resources and quality can be determined in further detail at planning application stage when more details of the proposal are available.

4.0 Assessing the NDP Objectives

- 4.1 The following are objectives listed in the NDP that aim to realise the vision for Eaton Bishop in 2031:
1. Involve the residents of the Parish, on an ongoing basis, by inviting participation in the process of planning, monitoring and delivery of development within the Parish. This objective has been deleted since examination.
 2. Endeavour that all development takes into account the views expressed by the community, whilst ensuring that it conforms with the Herefordshire Council Local Plan Core Strategy document. Also to ensure development preserves and is sympathetic to the character of the Parish and protects the landscape and environment through attention to the size and style of new housing. This has been changed since examination and first sentence has been removed.

3. Base all development upon sound environmental principles including, energy and water conservation, recycling and efficient sewerage management in order to minimise its impact on the local environment.
4. Allow for appropriate phased building development by retaining and developing the infrastructure of the Parish as required. In particular, by securing the provision of enhanced capacity for sewage treatment and other utilities, and encouraging a reduction in the use of private vehicles by supporting improvement to public transport along with other facilities and amenities in response to the future growth of the community.
5. Encourage new business ventures, which are perceived as beneficial to the economic health of the Parish and bringing local employment opportunities, provided that they are in scale with, and sensitive to, the rural character of the Parish.

4.2 The table below tests these NDP objectives against the SEA objectives, providing a summary of the results of Task B1 of SEA. The full results are available at Appendix 4 of this report.

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

4.4 It is impossible to appraise the full implications of NDP objective 4 at this stage given the lack of detail of schemes that may come to fruition as a result of the implementation of these objectives (i.e. type of business and design); however, it is accepted that the planning policies that relate to these objectives would move them towards a compatible outcome given their development criteria.

4.5 Although Task B1 of the SEA didn't identify any specific conflicts between the NDP objectives and the SEA framework, there are unknown factors which could become potential conflicts if not mitigated within the policy development.

4.6 The potential conflicts could be largely attributed to the possible rise in vehicular movements in remote locations once the NDP objectives have been realised on the ground and the attendant impacts on air quality and both contributions and vulnerability to climate change.

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

| NDP Options | SEA Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| Objective 1 | X | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Objective 2 | + | + | + | + | + | x | + | x | x | x | x | + | + | + | x | + |
| Objective 3: | + | + | + | x | + | x | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | x | x | + |
| Objective 4 | 0 | + | + | x | + | + | + | + | + | ++ | + | + | + | + | x | 0 |

| NDP Options | SEA Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| Objective 5 | 0 | + | + | x | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | x | x | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

5.0 Assessing the NDP Options

5.1 All options that were considered By Eaton Bishop Parish during the development of their Plan have been assessed as part of the SEA, the summary matrix of the assessment can be found in Table B2 options these tables are in Appendix 4.

5.2 The options covered were are followed;

- Do nothing.
- Allocate sites for housing
- Allocate Sites for housing
- Manage future housing using a settlement boundary
- Manage future housing through a development management policy

5.3 The options covered the topics that are likely to formulate the topics going forward in the Plan. These options were formulated from the Parish Plan but were also considered at public consultation events across the Parish in Autumn and Winter 2015. The results of which will feed into the identification of the preferred options and ultimately the draft policies.

5.4 A 'do nothing' option was also considered by the Parish, i.e. not undertaking a Neighbourhood Development Plan, however this was disregarded at an early stage by the Parish Council as it was highlighted within the Parish Plan that the majority of the community would support the work undertaken for a Neighbourhood Plan. Option 2-5 have a positive impact of the baseline data as they all consider planning for proportionate growth using suitable planning techniques such as allocating sites Option 2 and 4, identifying settlement boundaries in option 3 and 4.

5.5 Overall all of the policy options had mainly a positive effect on the SEA objectives and baseline, if the policies that are developed incorporated the elements of the options that are ensuring mitigation of new development and additional details are provided for the location and design of any proposed site then the assessment of the policies should result in a positive result. As these options were generally moving towards the SEA objectives any further alternatives would probably be moving away and therefore no further options are required to be assessed. A summary of assessment B is listed below.

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

Site Options

- 5.6 21 Site options have been considered for Eaton Bishop after a call for sites was undertaken. Eight of these sites from the 21 selected have been selected, due to the proximity to existing settlements, low flood risk potential, low impact on landscape character and suitable access routes into the proposed site. The parish has developed a call for sites assessment document in February 2016, which can be found on the Eaton Bishop website.
- 5.7 The Eaton Bishop and Ruckhall village site options majority had a generally positive or unknown impact upon the Baseline data and SEA objectives; in particular Option 2,4,5,7,16 and Option 20 would have the least impact upon the environment and move towards the SEA objectives. This is due to the development being limited to small are scale projects in line with agreed criteria although the details of proposals what the criteria is have yet to be decided.
- 5.8 Many sites assessed fall outside Eaton Bishops and Ruckhall's settlement boundary, therefore falling into open countryside and mostly sited on greenfield land. Although some sites were small and meet criteria stated in RA3 policy, further assessment would have to be taken up at planning application stage where there is more detail to assess the proposal. There were two options 8 and 15, proposed large scale development of 50 plus housing, in open countryside. If developed this would have a significant detrimental effect on the SEA baseline and Eaton Bishop parish and conflicting with policy RA3 of the Core Strategy. Therefore shouldn't be considered for development.
- 5.9 Overall the six chosen sites options all had a generally positive effect but with some unknown factors. Further clarification of environmental impact can be determined at planning application stage. A summary of the site option assessment is located in the table below, the full assessment can be found in appendix 4.

| NDP site options | SEA Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| Site option 1 | - | - | - | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | ? | - | 0 | 0 | - |
| Site option 2 | + | + | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Site option 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | ? | ? | ? | ? | - | - | - | - | - |
| Site option 4 | + | + | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Site option 5 | + | + | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Site option 6 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| Site option 7 | + | + | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Site option 8 | - | - | - | - | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | - | - | - |
| Site option 9 | - | - | - | - | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | - | ? | 0 | 0 | ? |
| Site option 10 | - | - | - | - | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | - | ? | 0 | 0 | ? |
| Site option 11 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | ? |
| Site option 12 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | ? |
| Site option 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site option 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site option 15 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | ? | ? | ? | ? | - | - | - | - | - |
| Site option 16 | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | + | + | + |
| Site option 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | ? |
| Site option 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | x | x | x | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site option 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | x | x | x | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Site option 20 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Site option 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | x | x | x | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

6.0 Appraisal of the policies

- 6.1 A key part of developing a plan such as the Eaton Bishop NDP is developing a range of options and testing these, so that a preferred way forward can be selected.
- 6.2 The following emerging set of draft policies can be appraised for the purposes of Stage B of the SEA:
- EB1- Supporting New Housing within the Eaton Bishop and Ruckhall Settlement Boundaries
 - EB2- Site Allocations
 - EB3- Phasing (This policy been removed since examination)
 - EB4- Encouraging a mix of new housing
 - EB5-Green infrastructure and protecting local landscape character and biodiversity
 - EB6- Protecting built heritage and archaeology requiring high quality design
 - EB7- Protecting existing community facilities and supporting new infrastructure
 - EB8- Managing flood risk
 - EB9- New business development in former agricultural buildings and other rural business buildings
 - EB10- Poly tunnels and large agricultural buildings and other rural business buildings
 - EB11- Design guidance for large agricultural buildings and other rural business buildings
 - EB12- Intensive livestock units
 - EB13- Supporting community energy schemes
- 6.3 In the context of Task B1 of SEA, the previous section of this report identified that many of the NDP objectives are compatible with the SEA framework, while others had either a neutral impact, no relationship with the SEA objectives or if needed; further information such as location of development. Additional policy safeguards within the NDP and Local Plan (Core Strategy) would help mitigate any possible conflicts.
- 6.4 With regard to Task B2 of SEA, the NDP policies were measured against both the SEA framework and the baseline characteristics identified during Stage A of the process. For full details of this appraisal are attached at Appendix 4.
- 6.5 The policies largely score as positive or neutral against the SEA objectives and will not, therefore, have an adverse impact on the baseline characteristics or immediate environmental impacts. This is because they are criteria based policies which only consider schemes on their own merits, as and when planning applications are submitted to the local planning authority.
- 6.6 There are some unknown factors, particularly where the confirmed size, type and design of specific piece of development is not yet known.

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

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

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

Stage D Post regulation 14 Consultation

- 6.10 Following the Draft plan consultation (Regulation 14) Eaton Bishop NDP steering group amending criteria in a majority of the policies in response to the comments received at regulation 14 consultation. The amendments were mainly minor wording changes to ensure consistency with the Framework and to provide more clarity for decision makers to policies EB1 and EB7. No policies have needed to be re-assessed as the criteria altered the Policy a new policy EB9 was added to provide criteria for wastewater and water supply. This moved towards the SEA baseline and likely to ensure suitable development in the NDP plan period.
- 6.11 It has been concluded that the screening of the new policy made will not have a significant adverse impact on the SEA objectives and therefore the conclusions of the SEA remain the same as with the Draft Plan, no significant effect is likely from the implementation of the Eaton Bishop NDP policies.
- 6.12 The full results of the re-assessed policies can be found in Appendix 7 and Appendix 8 of this Environmental Report.

Stage D of the SEA – assessment of the modifications post examination

- 6.13 Following the draft plan consultation at regulation 14 and the Submission NDP consultation (Reg16), the plan has now been subject to an independent examination during March –April 2017 by Rosemary Kidd. She has reported that the NDP has met the Basic Conditions subject to a number of minor modifications to the policies and maps. These can be seen in Appendix 9.
- 6.14 The policies which have been modified during the examination and subsequently reassessed are listed below. Many of these modifications add clarity to the text to aid the implementation rather than major changes in policy direction or stance.

- 6.15 The modifications have been accepted by Herefordshire Council and have been made to the plan. A reassessment of the policies with their modifications has been undertaken, the results of which are contained within Appendix 10. There were some minor wording changes throughout the text and policies, these were so minimal it was not necessary to rescreen policies EB6 and EB14. Policy EB3 was deleted as the examiner found the phasing policy was unclear and hard to implement, as there was not sufficient justification to support the policy. EB1, EB4 (now EB3), EB5 (now EB4), EB7 (now EB6), EB8 (now EB7), EB10 (now EB9) and EB11 (now EB10) were all rescreened due to the changes, and none have been found to have a detrimental impact on the SEA baseline.
- 6.15 It has been concluded that the modifications made will not have a significant adverse impact on the SEA objectives and therefore the conclusions of the SEA remain the same as previously reported.

7.0 Implementation and monitoring

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

8.0 Next steps

- 8.1 This report will accompany the post examination version of the Eaton Bishop NDP. The plan will move to referendum and subject to a successful outcome, final adoption in August / September 2017.
- 8.2 Any changes made to the NDP as a result of a future review will trigger the need to undertake a further SEA.

Appendix 1

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

**The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulation 2012 (Reg. 32)
Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (d)**

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Neighbourhood Area: | Eaton Bishop Neighbourhood Area |
| Parish Council: | Eaton Bishop Parish Council |
| Neighbourhood Area Designation Date: | 17/09/2014 |

Introduction

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

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

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

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



Initial HRA Screening

River Wye (including the River Lugg) SAC:

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Does the Neighbourhood Area have the River Wye (including the River Lugg) in or next to its boundary? | Y | The River Wye runs along the northern border of the Parish. |
| Is the Neighbourhood Area in the hydrological catchment of the River Wye (including the River Lugg) SAC? | Y | The Parish is within the hydrological catchment of the River Wye |
| If yes above, does the Neighbourhood Area have mains drainage to deal with foul sewage? | Y | There is mains drainage at Eaton Bishop. |

Downton Gorge SAC:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Is the Neighbourhood Area within 10km of Downton Gorge SAC? | N | Downton Gorge is 31.4km away from the Parish. |
|---|---|---|

River Clun SAC:

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

Usk Bat Sites SAC:

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Is the Neighbourhood Area within 10km of the SAC boundary? | N | Usk Bat Sites are 31.4km away from the Parish. |
|--|---|--|

Wye Valley & Forest of Dean Bat Sites SAC:

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Is the Neighbourhood Area within 10km of any of the individual sites that make up the Wye Valley & Forest of Dean Bat Sites? | N | Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites are 27.5km away from the Parish. |
|--|---|--|

Wye Valley Woodlands SAC:

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Is the Neighbourhood Area within 10km of any of the individual sites that make up the Wye Valley Woodlands Site? | N | Wye Valley Woodlands are 24km away from the Parish. |
|--|---|---|

HRA Conclusion:

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

European Site

(List only those which are relevant from above)

River Wye (including the River Lugg) SAC

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

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

| SEA features | Total | Explanation | SEA required |
|--|--------------|--|---------------------|
| Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) | 0 | There are no AQMAs within the Parish | N |
| Ancient Woodland | 5 | Ruckhall Wood (border); Priors Shell Wood (border); Old Hill Coppice (border); Newton Coppice (border); Bucknells Wood (border) | Y |
| Areas of Archaeological Interest (AAI) | 0 | There are no AAIs within the Parish | N |
| Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) | 0 | There are no AONBs within the Parish | N |
| Conservation Areas | 0 | There are no Conservation Areas within the Parish | N |
| European Sites (SAC) | 1 | River Wye | Y |
| Flood Areas/Zones | | Flood Zones follow the River Wye and Cage Brook | Y |
| Listed Buildings | Numerous | There are numerous Listed Buildings within the Parish | Y |
| Local Sites (SWS/SINCS/RIGS) | 17 (SWS) | River Wye; Cage Brook; Little Marsh Common; Honey Moor Common; Cagebrook Valley & Woodlands; Eaton Bishop Church; Field near Eaton Camp; Warlow Pool; Pond near Longmoor Cottage (border); Field near Bage Mill (border); Bucknall's Wood (border); Two ponds at Castle Farm (border); First pond near Bunshill (border); pool near Magna castra (border); Two pools at Stretton Sugwas Gravel Workings (border); Kings Acre Reserve (border); Clehonger Village Pond (border) | Y |
| Long distance footpaths/trails | 1 | Wye Valley Walk (border) | Y |
| Mineral Reserves Sites | 10 | South of Canon Bridge; South of Roman Road to A438 and area between River Wye and A438 (border); Kings Acre, Linden House (border); Kings Acre Caraven Park (border); Between Lower Breinton Farm and Court Farm (border); Hunderton Rough to Clehonger to Allensmore (border); South of River Wye and Bridge Sollars to Lulham (border); North west of Credenhill (border); Courtlands Farm (border); Cobhall Farm (border) | Y |
| National Nature Reserve (NNR) | 0 | There are no NNRs within the Parish | N |

| | | | |
|---|----------------|--|---|
| Registered & Unregistered Parks and Gardens | 8 Unregistered | Cagebrook House; Lower Eaton; Sugwas Court (border); New Weir (border); Canon Bridge House (border); Wyecliffe Court (border); Warham House (border); Belmont House (border) | Y |
| Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAM) | 5 | Eaton Camp; New Weir Roman Site (border); Moated site south west of church (border); Site of Romano-British town of Magna (border); Churchyard cross in St Marys churchyard (border) | Y |
| Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) | 3 | River Wye (Unfavourable Recovering); Cage Brook Valley (Favourable (part) Unfavourable No Change (part) Unfavourable Declining (part); Littlemarsh Common (Unfavourable Declining) | Y |

Decision Notification:

The initial screening highlights that the Neighbourhood Development Plan for the Eaton Bishop Neighbourhood Area:

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

Assessment date: 13/08/2014

Assessed by: James Latham

Appendix 1: European Sites

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

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

Usk Bat Site

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

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

Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites

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

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

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

NDPs closest to the European Site will need to consider:
Woodland habitat buffer.

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


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

Wye Valley Woodlands

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

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

Appendix 2: Wye Catchment Map




Eaton Bishop SEA Map 1

Scale: 1:20,000



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



Key:

- Ancient Woodlands
- Special Areas of Conservation
- Scheduled Ancient Monuments
- Unregistered Parks & Gardens
- Three Rivers Ride
- Wye Valley Walk
- Listed Buildings
- Parish Boundaries




**Herefordshire
Council**

Eaton Bishop SEA Map 2

Scale: 1:20,000



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




Key:

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

Herefordshire Council

Appendix 2

Strategic Environmental Assessment



Eaton Bishop Neighbourhood Area

Scoping Report

March 2015

Consultation on the Scoping Report

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

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

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

The three consultation bodies are as follows:

1. Natural England;
2. English Heritage;
3. Environment Agency.



Template A1: Identification and review of local Neighbourhood Area relevant plans, policies and programmes

Parish Council Name: Eaton Bishop Parish.

Neighbourhood Development Plan Name: Eaton Bishop Plan

Date completed: December 2014

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

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

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

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

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

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

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|---|---------------------------|------|---|--|---|---|
| Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystem services | National Strategy | 2011 | Forms part of the UK's Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework by setting out England's contribution towards the UK's commitments under the United Nations Convention of Biological Diversity. | Sets out to halt overall biodiversity loss, support healthy well-functioning ecosystems and establish coherent ecological networks, with more and better places for nature for the benefit of wildlife and people. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity | The NDP should take account of the provisions of the strategy, making the most of opportunities to enhance wildlife habitats or restore degraded ecosystems in the process. |
| National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) | National planning policy. | 2012 | Consolidates the suite of PPG/PPS into one succinct planning policy document. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and human health • Soil • Water | The NDP should take into account the relevant policies set within the NPPF. |
| Planning Practice Guidance | Government Guidance | 2014 | Provides guidance to local planning authorities and others on the operation of the planning system. | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and | The NDP should take into account the planning guidance provided within these documents. |

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

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|--|---------------------------------|------|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> human health Soil Water | |
| Herefordshire Core Strategy, Pre-submission document 2011-2031 | Development Plan Document (DPD) | 2013 | Sets out the vision, objectives and policies for the Herefordshire Local Plan (Core Strategy), which will guide development across the county up to 2031. | <p>Outlines the emerging suite of countywide planning policies relating to housing, economic development and the environment, which the NDP will need to be in conformity with where relevant.</p> <p>The Core Strategy includes a range of objectives, five of which directly relate to rural areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To meet the housing needs of all sections of the community To improve access to services in rural areas To strengthen the economic viability of the villages and their rural hinterlands To achieve sustainable communities and protect the environment To conserve, promote, | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air Biodiversity Climate factors Cultural heritage and the landscape Flora and fauna Material assets Population and human health Soil Water | <p>The NDP should take account of relevant policies set within in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Where necessary, the NDP should provide services, facilities and employment opportunities that are accessible to both local and neighbouring communities.</p> <p>Eaton Bishop is within the Hereford HMA. This should take into consideration the criteria set within this RA1 and RA2 policy.</p> |

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

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|----------------------|------------------|------|----------|--|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | | | <p>utilise and enjoy our natural, built, historic and cultural assets for the fullest benefit of the whole community</p> <p>To achieve a thriving rural Herefordshire, the Core Strategy seeks to enhance the role the villages have traditionally played in as accessible, sustainable centres for their rural catchments.</p> <p>Seeks proportional growth of up to 18% in Eaton Bishop (Hereford HMA) over the plan period.</p> | | |

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

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

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

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|--|------------------|------|---|---|---|---|
| Malvern Hills AONB Management Plan 2009-2014 | Corporate | 2009 | Identifies the issues and challenges facing the special features of the area and contains 24 guiding principles and 46 strategic objectives which will help address them. | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and human health • Soil • Water | The Eaton Bishop Plan Neighbourhood Area is not within or adjacent to the Malvern Hills AONB. |
| Wye Valley AONB management Plan 2009-2014 | Corporate | 2009 | The Management Plan is the prime document which sets out the vision for the area and the priorities for its management. | - | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and human health • Soil • Water | The Eaton Bishop Plan Neighbourhood Area is not within or adjacent to the Wye Valley AONB. |

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

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

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|--|------------------|------|--|---|--|--|
| Herefordshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) | Evidence | 2009 | <p>The SHLAA aims to justify site allocations in plans by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifying sites which are capable of delivering housing development Assessing sites for their housing potential; and Predicting when a site could be developed for housing. | In terms of Eaton Bishop no SHLAA assessment has been undertaken. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air Biodiversity Climate factors Cultural heritage and the landscape Flora and fauna Population and human health Soil Water | <p>The SHLAA assesses the potential availability of land for housing in Eaton Bishop.</p> <p>The settlements of Eaton Bishop and Ruckhall did not have a SHLAA assessment undertaken, therefore a local site assessment exercise should be undertaken for these parishes. Where site allocations for settlements should be proposed.</p> |

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|--|------------------|------|---|---|--|---|
| Herefordshire Local Housing Market Assessment (LHMA) | Evidence | 2013 | Builds on an earlier Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) developed for Herefordshire and Shropshire. Its purpose is to inform the Local Plan's policies regarding housing need and demand (for market and affordable housing) within each of the 7 Housing Market Areas (HMAs) in Herefordshire between 2011 and 2031. | <p>Eaton Bishop fall within the Hereford HMA. Here, the study reveals that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 57% of households are unable to afford market housing. • There is an annual requirement for 98 affordable dwellings between 2011 to 2031. <p>The study identifies that by 2031 Hereford HMA, additional need for :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5440 market houses • 2929 affordable houses. <p>The study highlights that within the Hereford HMA the overall estimated housing need by size 2011-2031 is as follows: 1 Bed - 30.3%, 2 bed - 34%, 3 bed – 32.3% 4 bed- 3.5%.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Population and human health • Soil • Water | <p>The LHMA provides an indication of housing needs and affordability within the Bromyard HMA.</p> <p>It provides evidence that could be used to inform policies or market and affordable housing requirements in the NDP.</p> <p>As Eaton Bishop falls within RA1 and RA2 policy, development will be proportionate to the rural HMA (Housing Market Areas) characteristics.</p> |

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

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

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

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|---|------------------|------|--|---|---|---|
| | | | | provide more 3 bedroom homes, with more 1 and 2 bed homes required in the affordable sector. | | |
| Herefordshire Rural Housing Background Report | Evidence | 2013 | Provides the justification for the proportional housing growth targets outlined in the Core Strategy | The village of Eaton Bishop as an RA1 settlement, which means it is considered a sustainable location for proportional growth of up to 18%. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and human health • Soil • Water | The Eaton Bishop NDP will need to be in conformity with the provisions of Policy RA1 and RA2. |

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

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

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

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

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

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

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|----------------------|------------------|------|---|--|---|--|
| Open Spaces Study | Evidence | 2006 | The 2006 space audit and assessment of need is a snapshot of the quality, quantity and distribution of open space across Herefordshire. | <p>The study reveals that within Eaton Bishop falls within the Golden Valley area, in this there are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No parks or gardens, within Golden Valley area. As it is quite a rural area. • 2.92 ha of amenity green space provision within the Golden Valley area. And has the lowest levels of amenity green space in the county. • Extensive over provision of natural and semi natural green space. • Extensive under provision of parks and gardens and outdoor sport. • Under provision of amenity green space. • Average provision for children and young people. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and human health | The open space audit and assessment of does not give a specific indication of open space shortfalls and surpluses in Eaton Bishop. |

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

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

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|--|------------------|------|--|--|--|--|
| Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and Water Cycle Study | Evidence | 2009 | <p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) provides a summary of flood risk in Herefordshire to inform the location of future development.</p> <p>The Water Cycle Study examines how water resources and water supply infrastructure, wastewater treatment, water quality, sewerage and flood risk could constrain growth across Herefordshire.</p> | <p>Eaton Bishop Neighbourhood Area falls within the Lower Middle Wye catchment. This is regarded as one of the highest areas at risk of fluvial flooding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Lower Middle Wye has a standard run percentage run off by sub catchment. This is potentially highly unsuitable for infiltration source control • The Lower Middle Wye has a very slow flood response (Tp-time to peak) time at around 11+ hours. • The WCS states that parishes within Eaton Bishop require a holistic integrated approach to flood risk management. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Material assets • Population and human health • Water | <p>New development proposed through the Eaton Bishop NDP should be assessed against the capacity of local infrastructure.</p> <p>Up-to-date flood risk information should be gathered from the Environment Agency, in order to ensure that any flood risks are considered when preparing the Eaton Bishop NDP.</p> |

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

| Plans and Programmes | Type of document | Date | Overview | Key message, target/objective/indicator | SEA topic(s) ¹ | Implications for the NDP and SEA |
|---|------------------|------|--|--|---|---|
| Eaton Camp Excavation Final Report | Evidence | 2013 | Reports on small scale excavations Eaton Camp a promontory iron age hill fort in Ruckhall highlights its historic local importance of the site strategically and socially to Eaton Bishop. | This iron age hill fort is situated within Ruckhall highest point stands 90meters with steep north and south facing slopes. It is defined by the River Wye (to the north) and Cage brook to the south of the site. Overall the excavation uncovered iron age small objects, crucible, ceramics, flint, human and animal remains. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets | The study provides evidence that could be taken into account when preparing policies and allocating sites for the Eaton Bishop NDP, particularly in Ruckhall. |
| A Conservation Management Plan for Eaton Camp, Ruckhall, Herefordshire. | Evidence | 2012 | Reports on Eaton Camp a promontory hill fort in Ruckhall an ancient scheduled monument of being of national importance. | <p>Raise local and national significance and conservation value of Eaton Camp site. The site has multiple ownerships including the National Trust.</p> <p>Raises issues to improve access and ecological management on the site.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Climate factors • Cultural heritage and the landscape • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population and human health | The study provides evidence that could be taken into consideration when preparing policies for the Eaton Bishop NDP, particularly in Ruckhall. |

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

Appendix A2 – Baseline information for Eaton Bishop

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

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|---------------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| SEA Topic covered by objective: <i>Biodiversity, flora and fauna</i> | | | | | | | |
| 13. Value, maintain, restore and expand county biodiversity. | Natural environment | Net change in condition of SSSIs across Herefordshire. | <p>The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data.</p> <p>2010/11: 27% of Herefordshire's SSSI land was in favourable condition.</p> <p><i>There are three SSSI's within Eaton Bishop 13.08.14 River Wye (Unfavourable Recovering); Cage Brook Valley (Favourable (part) Unfavourable No Change (part) Unfavourable Declining (part));</i></p> | <p>2006: 22%</p> <p>2007: 22%</p> <p>2008: 22%</p> <p>2010: 24 %</p> <p>Proportion of SSSI land that was in unfavourable condition but recovering increased between 2010 and 2012 going from 41% to 65%.</p> <p>Proportion in unfavourable and declining condition had also decreased from 4% to 1%.</p> | <p>% of SSSI land in favourable condition (Increase)</p> <p>% of SSSI land in unfavourable condition but recovering (Increase)</p> <p>% of SSSI land in unfavourable condition and declining (Decrease)</p> | <p>Herefordshire's SSSIs are in extremely poor condition relative to England as whole, where 96.1% of all SSSI land was in favourable condition in April 2014.</p> <p>The proportion of SSSI in unfavourable condition but recovering is greater than England as a whole, where the figure currently stands at 58.6%.</p> | <p>Understanding Herefordshire: An integrated needs assessment (June 2013).</p> <p>NE & DEFRA Website December 2014</p> |

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

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|---------------------|---|--|--------|-----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | Littlemarsh Common (Unfavourable Declining) | | | | |
| 13. Value, maintain, restore and expand county biodiversity. | Natural environment | After use of mineral sites especially wildlife habitat creation | <i>There is no countywide or locally specific data available at present.</i> | - | Percentage of opportunities taken | Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations. | - |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------|
| 13. Value, maintain, restore and expand county biodiversity. | Natural environment | Phosphate levels within the River Wye SAC and adjoining tributaries that receive increased phosphates from proportional growth. | The existing status of the Wye SAC between Hay and the Lugg confluence is currently meeting its phosphate target and is meeting the conservation targets. | The River Wye SAC was subject to a review of consents in 2010, as a number of sections of the river were found to have greater phosphate levels than those identified in Natural England's favourable condition tables. | The roll out of the Nutrient Management Plan will determine future targets. | New development within the area could lead to the water quality failing the phosphate levels and conservation objectives. | Nutrient Management Plan (2014) |

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

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 13. Value, maintain, restore and expand county biodiversity. | Natural environment | Changes in the areas of designated nature conservation sites as a consequence of planning permission. | Eaton Bishop has: SSSI: 3 SWS: 17 There are no NNRs, SINCs and LNRs within the parish. | As of 2012, there had been no change in the areas of designated nature conservation sites as a consequence of the planning permissions granted. | To capitalise on opportunities to enhance the areas of value to nature conservation as much as possible. | Herefordshire Biological Records Centre (HBRC) holds limited data on some individual sites. | Herefordshire Council Initial Screening Report for the Neighbourhood Plan 2013 |
| 13. Value, maintain, restore and expand county biodiversity. | Natural environment | Proportion of local sites where positive conservation management has or is being implemented. | The Parish Area has the following landscape types: Principled settled farmlands, wet pasture meadows and wooded forest. | - | No specific targets identified. | Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations. | Herefordshire Landscape Character Assessment (2004 updated 2009) |
| SEA Topic covered by objectives: <i>Material assets</i> | | | | | | | |
| 14. Use natural resources and energy more efficiently. | Resource consumption and climate change | Maintaining Herefordshire Council's County Site and Monuments Register. | Countywide data would be too large to incorporate into this template. Whilst there is no qualitative, locally specific data available at | - | No specific targets identified, but need to ensure that the register is kept up to date. | Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations. | Herefordshire Environmental Records Register (search December 2014). |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|---|--|--|--------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | present, there are 5 scheduled monuments in Eaton Bishop according to the latest version of the register. | | | | |
| 14. Use natural resources and energy more efficiently. | Resource consumption and climate change | Monitoring changes to historic landscapes. | Historic Landscape Character assessments have only been undertaken for Hereford City. Rapid townscape Assessments (2010) were only undertaken for Hereford, Ledbury and Ross. | - | No specific targets identified. | Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations. | Historic Landscape Character Assessment for Hereford. Rapid townscape Assessments (2010) |
| SEA Topic covered by objective: <i>Population, Biodiversity, Flora and Fauna</i> | | | | | | | |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|---------------------|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| 15. Value, protect, enhance and restore the landscape quality of Herefordshire, including its rural areas and open spaces. | Natural environment | Number of developments meeting and surpassing national design standards. | <i>There is no countywide or locally specific data available at present.</i> | - | No specific targets identified. | Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations. | - |
| 15. Value, protect, enhance and restore the landscape quality of Herefordshire, including its rural areas and open spaces. | Natural environment | The need for, frequency and outcomes of planning enforcement investigations/ planning appeals concerning aspects of local loss of heritage assets and locally important buildings particularly within a conservation area. | Countywide data would be too large to incorporate into this template. <i>There are no outstanding enforcement actions or appeals concerning local loss of heritage assets and locally important buildings within Eaton Bishop present.</i> | <i>No historic records of any planning enforcement action or appeals concerning locally important buildings .There is no conservation area within Eaton Bishop parish.</i> | To wherever possible improve upon or otherwise maintain current status. | Current status must be verified by Dvt Mgt and Enforcement Officers, but the NDP can help to avoid enforcement action and appeals during the plan period. | Council Dvt Mgt records (searched December 2014) |
| SEA Topic covered by objective: <i>Climatic Factors</i> | | | | | | | |

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

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|---|--|--|--|--------|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 16. Reduce Herefordshire's vulnerability to the impacts of climate change as well as its contribution to the problem. | Resource consumption and climate change. | Number of decentralised energy schemes granted permission. | <i>There is no countywide or locally specific data available at present.</i> | - | To contribute towards the national target. | Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations. | - |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|---|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|
| 16. Reduce Herefordshire's vulnerability to the impacts of climate change as well as its contribution to the problem. | Resource consumption and climate | Total CO2 emissions per capita | <p>Latest figure dates back to 2010: 1.61 million tonnes (mtCO²)</p> <p><i>There is no locally specific data available at present.</i></p> | <p>Between 2005 and 2010 Herefordshire's total and per capita carbon emission reduced by 7% and 8% respectively; while UK's total and per capita carbon emission reduced by 8% and 12% respectively within the same period. This trend hides an increase in emissions between 2009 and 2010 when total emissions in the county increased by 5% the same as across the UK (+5%).</p> | To reduce the overall carbon emissions. | CO ² emissions produced are decreasing. | Understanding Herefordshire: An integrated needs assessment (June 2013). |

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

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|---|---------------------|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| 18. Minimise local and global pollution and protect or enhance environmental resources. | Natural environment | Percentage of river length assessed as good or very good chemical quality and ecological quality as required by the Water Framework Directive | Latest figure dates back to 2005: 84% <i>There is no locally specific data available at present.</i> | Figure steadily improved before going into decline: Herefordshire 1999 85.9%, 2000 89.5%, 2001 92.2%, 2002 91.8% | To ensure that rivers meet their conservation objectives and do not fall below the required standard of quality. | None identified. | The State of Herefordshire (2007) Water Framework Directive (2000) |
| SEA Topic covered by objective: <i>Soil</i> | | | | | | | |
| 19. Ensure integrated, efficient and balanced land use. | Built environment | Percentage of all new development completed on previously developed land. | 2010/11: 67% 2011-13: 57% <i>There is no locally specific data available at present.</i> | Completions on PDL had risen to 71% by 2005. | To increase the number of homes built on PDL in line with the provisions of national planning policy. | The number of brownfield completions has fallen slightly in recent years, though this is probably the offshoot of tough market conditions. | Herefordshire Council AMR (2010/11) and (2011-2013) |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|-------------------|--|---|--------|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 19. Ensure integrated, efficient and balanced land use. | Built environment | Housing densities in urban and rural areas | <i>There is no countywide or locally specific data available at present.</i> | - | No specific targets identified. | Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations. | - |
| 19. Ensure integrated, efficient and balanced land use. | Built environment | Level of development in urban areas compared to rural. | <i>There is no countywide or locally specific data available at present.</i> This indicator would not be applicable to rural NDPs. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| SEA Topic covered by objective: <i>Cultural heritage</i> | | | | | | | |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|-------------------|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| 20. Value, protect and enhance the character and built quality of settlements and neighbourhoods and the county's heritage assets, including conservation areas, historic environment and cultural heritage. | Built environment | Number and percentage of listed buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments on Buildings at Risk Register (English Heritage). | Up-to-date countywide information will be presented in the next AMR and which is due to be published in 2014. However, this data would be too large to incorporate into this template. There are numerous listed buildings within the parish and five SAMs. None are currently recorded in the Buildings at Risk Register. | There were 79 heritage assets in Herefordshire that were considered to be at high risk and included in the Heritage at Risk Register 2014. | To wherever possible improve upon or otherwise maintain current status. (If heritage is at risk include-promote opportunities to achieve the removal of heritage assets from the at risk register. | None of Eaton Bishops listed buildings or SAMs are considered to be at risk at present. | Buildings at Risk Register (English Heritage; search December 2014) |

| SA Objective ¹ | SA Theme | Proposed indicator | Current status | Trends | Targets | Issues and constraints | Baseline (information) source |
|--|-------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| 20. Value, protect and enhance the character and built quality of settlements and neighbourhoods and the county's heritage assets, including conservation areas, historic environment and cultural heritage. | Built environment | The need for, frequency and outcomes of planning enforcement investigations/ planning appeals concerning aspects of local loss of heritage assets, locally important buildings within the parish and particularly within a conservation area. | Countywide data would be too large to incorporate into this template. There are no outstanding enforcement actions or appeals concerning local loss of heritage assets locally important buildings particularly within a conservation area within Eaton Bishop. | No historic records of any planning enforcement action or appeals concerning locally important buildings, there is no conservation area within Eaton Bishop. | To wherever possible improve upon or otherwise maintain current status | Current status must be verified by Dvt Mgt and Enforcement Officers, but the NDP can help to avoid enforcement action and appeals during the plan period. | Council Dvt Mgt records (searched December 2014) |

Appendix A3 – Environmental issues identified from the Eaton Bishop baseline

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

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

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

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

Appendix A4: SEA Framework

SEA Scoping Stage A, Task A4 - SEA Framework SEA Objectives, Indicators, Targets

Parish Council Name: Eaton Bishop

Neighbourhood Development Plan Name: Eaton Bishop Neighbourhood Plan

Date completed: December 2014

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

| SEA Topics | SA Objective | SEA Objective | Sub-objectives / Appraisal Questions (Will the option/proposal/site...) | Indicators | Targets |
|------------|-------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>landscapes, open spaces, parks and gardens and their settings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage local stewardship of local environments, for example by promoting best practices in agricultural management • Ensure that environmental impacts caused by mineral operations and the transport of minerals are minimised. • Promote the use of rural areas and open space by all, encourage easy non-car based access, and accommodate the needs of disabled users. | | |
| Landscape | Not covered in SA | <p>To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes</p> <p>To improve quality of surroundings</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect and enhance the landscape everywhere and particularly in designated areas • Value and protect diversity and local distinctiveness • Improve landscape and ecological quality and character of the countryside • Improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open space • Improve satisfaction of people with their neighbourhoods as places to live | <p>Changes in the areas of designated nature conservation sites as a consequence of planning permission.</p> <p>Proportion of local sites where positive conservation management has or is being implemented.</p> <p>Monitoring changes to historic landscapes.</p> <p>Area resulting in a loss of open space as a result of planning permission</p> | <p>To capitalise on opportunities to enhance the areas of value to nature conservation as much as possible.</p> <p>No specific targets identified.</p> <p>No specific targets identified.</p> <p>No specific targets identified</p> |

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

| SEA Topics | SA Objective | SEA Objective | Sub-objectives / Appraisal Questions (Will the option/proposal/site...) | Indicators | Targets |
|-----------------|---|---|---|--|--|
| Air and Climate | <p>Minimise local and global pollution and protect or enhance environmental resources.</p> <p>Reduce Herefordshire's vulnerability to the impacts of climate change as well as its contribution to the problem.</p> | <p>To improve air quality</p> <p>To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</p> <p>To reduce contributions to climate change</p> <p>To reduce vulnerability to climate change</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimise water, air, soil, groundwater, noise and light pollution from current activities and the potential for such pollution. Protect or enhance the quality of watercourses. Provide opportunities to improve soil quality or reduce contaminated land. Reduce the county's contribution to climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from transport, domestic, commercial and industrial sources. Increase the proportion of energy generated from renewable and low carbon sources including by micro-generation, Combined Heat and Power (CHP), district heating and in transportation. | <p>Transport patronage by mode</p> <p>Number of decentralised energy schemes granted permission.</p> <p>Total CO2 emissions per capita</p> | <p>To increase the take up of alternative modes to the private car.</p> <p>To contribute towards the national target.</p> <p>To reduce the overall carbon emissions.</p> |
| Water | Reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to public well- | <p>To improve water quality</p> <p>To provide for sustainable sources of water supply</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce flood risk both presently and taking into account climate change. | Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on flood defence grounds. | To have no applications permitted contrary to EA advice. |

| SEA Topics | SA Objective | SEA Objective | Sub-objectives / Appraisal Questions (Will the option/proposal/site...) | Indicators | Targets |
|------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| | <p>being, the economy and the environment.</p> <p>Minimise local and global pollution and protect or enhance environmental resources.</p> | To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent inappropriate development of the floodplain, and include flood protection systems. • Include sustainable urban drainage systems where appropriate. • Minimise water, air, soil, groundwater, noise and light pollution from current activities and the potential for such pollution. • Protect or enhance the quality of watercourses. | <p>Percentage of river length assessed as good or very good chemical quality and ecological quality</p> <p>Phosphate levels within the River Wye SAC and adjoining tributaries that receive increased phosphates from proportional growth.</p> | <p>To ensure that rivers meet their conservation objectives and do not fall below the required standard of quality as set out in the Water Framework Directive.</p> <p>To meet the targets set out in the Nutrient Management Plan (2014)</p> |
| Soil | <p>Minimise local and global pollution and protect or enhance environmental resources.</p> <p>Ensure integrated, efficient and balanced land use.</p> | <p>To conserve soil resources and quality</p> <p>Ensure integrated, efficient and balanced land use.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimise water, air, soil, groundwater, noise and light pollution from current activities and the potential for such pollution. • Provide opportunities to improve soil quality or reduce contaminated land. • Ensure new developments are in appropriate locations, optimising the use of previously developed land and buildings, primarily focussed on the urban areas and are accessible by walking, cycling or sustainable transport and/or | <p>Percentage of all new development completed on previously developed land.</p> <p>Amount of land identified as best and most versatile agricultural land lost to development.</p> | <p>To increase the number of homes built on PDL in line with the provisions of national planning policy.</p> <p>Measure the number of hectares of best and most versatile soil lost through development.</p> |

| SEA Topics | SA Objective | SEA Objective | Sub-objectives / Appraisal Questions (Will the option/proposal/site...) | Indicators | Targets |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | | will increase the share of these transport modes, thereby reducing the need to travel. | | |
| Population and Human Health | Value, protect, enhance or restore the landscape quality of Herefordshire, including its rural areas and open spaces. | To improve health of the population To reduce crime and nuisance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value, enhance and protect natural environmental assets including AONB's, historic landscapes, open spaces, parks and gardens and their settings. Encourage local stewardship of local environments, for example by promoting best practices in agricultural management. Ensure that environmental impacts caused by mineral operations and the transport of minerals are minimised. Promote the use of rural areas and open space by all, encourage easy non-car based access, and accommodate the needs of disabled users. | Number of developments meeting and surpassing national design | No specific targets identified. |
| Material Assets | Use natural resources and energy more | To conserve natural and manmade resources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximise energy efficiency and minimise the consumption of non- | The need for, frequency and outcomes of planning enforcement investigations/ planning appeals concerning the aspects of local loss | Measure the number of hectares of best and most versatile soil lost through development. |

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

Appendix 3

Eaton Bishop Regulation SEA Stage A Consultation

No comments have been received by any statutory body for SEA stage A consultation.

Appendix 4

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

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

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

| NDP objectives | SEA Objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Conclusions | Recommendations | SMART Test of NDP objective | After SMART objectives |
|--|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|-----------------|---|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | | | | |
| Involve the residents of the Parish, on an ongoing basis, by inviting participation in the process of planning, monitoring and delivery of development within the Parish. | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | Overall this objective is not directly linked to land use and just focuses on community consultation within the parish. | N/A | This objective has no relation to the baseline objective. | N/A |
| Endeavour that all development takes into account the views expressed by the community, whilst ensuring that it conforms with the Herefordshire Council Local Plan Core Strategy document. Also to ensure development preserves and is sympathetic to the character of the Parish and protects the landscape and environment through attention to the size and style of new housing. | + | + | + | + | + | X | + | X | X | X | X | + | + | + | X | + | Overall this objective moves towards the SEA baseline and helps to safeguard the local landscape and natural environment against inappropriate development. | N/A | The objective moves towards the baseline data. | Endeavour that all development takes into account the views expressed by the community, whilst ensuring that it conforms with the Herefordshire Council Local Plan Core Strategy document. Also to ensure development preserves and is sympathetic to the character of the Parish and protects the landscape and environment through attention to the size and style of new housing. |
| Base all development upon sound environmental principles including, energy and water conservation, recycling and efficient sewerage management in order to minimise its impact on the local | + | + | + | X | + | X | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | X | X | + | Overall this objective moves towards the SEA baseline and ensures development is sustainable with the promotion of energy, waste and water conservation to mitigate and minimise impact on the local environment. | N/A | The objective moves towards the baseline data. This objective will help alleviate impact from new development on the natural environment. It will also help to reduce vulnerability and impact on climate change. | Base all development upon sound environmental principles including, energy and water conservation, recycling and efficient sewerage management in order to minimise its impact on the local environment. |

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

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

| SEA Objectives | Baseline carried over from Stage A |
|---|--|
| <p>1- To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna)</p> <p>2- To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes</p> <p>3- To improve quality of surroundings</p> <p>4- To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and culture heritage</p> <p>5- To improve air quality</p> <p>6- To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</p> <p>7- To reduce contributions to climate change</p> <p>8- To reduce vulnerability to climate change</p> <p>9- To improve water quality</p> <p>10- To provide for sustainable sources of water supply</p> <p>11- To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk</p> <p>12- To conserve soil resources and quality</p> <p>13- To minimise the production of waste</p> <p>14- To improve health of the population</p> <p>15- To reduce crime and nuisance</p> <p>16- To conserve natural and manmade resources</p> | <p>1-The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data.2010/11: 27% of Herefordshire's SSSI land was in favourable condition. There are three SSSI's within Eaton Bishop 13.08.14 River Wye (Unfavourable Recovering); Cage Brook Valley (Favourable (part) Unfavourable No Change (part) Unfavourable Declining (part); Littlemarsh Common (Unfavourable Declining) The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data. The existing status of the Wye SAC between Hay and the Lugg confluence is currently meeting its phosphate target and is meeting the conservation targets. 2010/11: 17 Habitat Action Plans and 14 Species Action Plans are currently in operation across Herefordshire. Eaton Bishop has: 3 SSSI, 17 SWS. The River Wye SAC borders the northern boundary of the Parish. There are no NNRs and SINCs within the parish.</p> <p>2-There are no outstanding enforcement actions or appeals concerning locally important buildings within Eaton Bishop at present. Eaton Bishop does not have a conservation area.</p> <p>3-In terms of Eaton Bishop itself, the study reveals there are no play facilities in the parish. I</p> <p>4-Whilst there is no qualitative, locally specific data available at present, there is five scheduled monuments in Eaton Bishop, according to the latest version of the register.</p> <p>5-Between 2005 and 2010 Herefordshire's total and per capita carbon emission reduced by 7% and 8% respectively; while UK's total and per capita carbon emission reduced by 8% and 12% respectively within the same period. This suggests that air quality is improving.</p> <p>6-% of Herefordshire residents who travel to work by: Car: 70.1%, Foot: 14.7%,Bicycle: 4.3%,Bus: 2%, Train: 0.8%,Motorbike: 0.8%,Taxi: 0.3%,Other: 7%.</p> <p>7-Herefordshire latest figure of C02 emissions per capita-dates back to 2010: 1.61 million tonnes (mtCO²)</p> <p>8-Reduce the risk of flooding-There have been no approvals contrary to EA advice since reporting began in 2004.The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data.</p> <p>9-Percentage of river length assessed as good or very good chemical quality and ecological quality as required by the Water Framework Directive. Latest figure dates back to 2005: 84%.</p> <p>10-Eaton Bishop falls into the Herefordshire Conjunctive Use Water Resource Zones (WRZs), one of 6 zones covering Herefordshire. 39% of demand is from non-household use.</p> <p>11-Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on flood defence grounds. The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data.</p> <p>12-Around the village of Eaton Bishop the soil classification is Grades 2 and 3. The edge of the parish of the parish is Grade 3 (Good to moderate).</p> <p>13-There are numerous listed buildings within the parish and five SAMs. None are currently recorded in the Buildings at Risk Register⁸. There are no outstanding enforcement actions or appeals concerning locally important buildings within Eaton Bishop parish at present. The Parish Area has the following landscape types: Principled settled farmlands, wet pasture meadows and wooded forest</p> |

| NDP Options | SEA objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Summary in relation to baseline | Overall commentary and any initial cumulative effects/ Recommendations | Conformity with Core Strategy |
|---|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | | | |
| Baseline | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | | | |
| Option 1- Do nothing | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | Do nothing option is essential not to produce a neighbourhood plan and rely on the criteria policies within the Core Strategy to guide further development. Specific policies and proposals for the parishes would not exist. | All developments would need to be in conformity with the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal and policies met the SEA objectives. | n/a |
| Option 2- Allocate sites for housing | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | Allocation of sites for housing or other uses would give certainty to future development. Specific environmental issues could be investigated during the site search and be positively addressed within the policy wording. This option could have a positive effect on the baseline. | Pursuing this option would give greater certainty over future development within the area particularly within Welsh Newton, where proportional growth is expected. If required mitigation criteria can be added to site allocations policies to ensure all SEA objectives are achieved. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Option 3- Manage future housing using a settlement boundary | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | The designation of a settlement boundary will give additional certainty and help define those areas considered as the built form and open countryside. This can aid the direction of further growth to maintain the quality of the landscape and surroundings. There is less certainty over the positive effects on the baseline as any growth with be adjudged by criteria based policy. | Any settlement boundary would need to be designated to ensure that sufficient capacity was included to permit the proportional growth requirements within Policy RA2 of the Core Strategy. Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against effects on any SEA objectives. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Option 4 - Allocate site and identify a settlement boundary | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | Allocation of sites for housing or other uses would give certainty to future development. Specific environmental issues could be investigated during the site search and be positively addressed within the policy wording. The designation of a settlement boundary will give additional certainty and help define those areas considered as the built form and open countryside This option could have a positive effect on the baseline. | Pursuing this option would give greater certainty over future development within the area particularly within Welsh newton, where proportional growth is expected. If required mitigation criteria can be added to site allocations policies to ensure all SEA objectives are achieved. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA. |
| Option 5- Manage future housing through a development management policy | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | Criteria based policy does not give the same level of certainty as the other options as it will be more reactionary than proactive in terms of growth proposals. However provide criteria is added to the policy to safeguard or mitigate against any harm, the option will have a positive effect on the baseline. | Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against effects on any SEA objectives. Further determination of environmental impact can be assessed at planning application stage. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA |
| Site option 1- Honeymoon House, Eaton Bishop | - | - | - | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | ? | - | 0 | 0 | - | Overall this site has a negative and uncertain impact towards the baseline data. It has the potential to accommodate 2 dwellings, due to the size, location and scale unlikely to impact the sac. But will impact on local cider trees and townscape. Further clarification of | This development may cause the impact and loss of cider trees and impact on landscape features and south western views from Eaton Bishop. Preference to build on brownfield land and re use | This option would not meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | environmental impact can be clarified at planning application stage. | of building in accordance to policy RA3. | as it falls under RA3 policy and proposal is for new development on greenfield land. |
| Site option 2- Land to the South of the Pippins, Eaton Bishop –Selected Site EB2/1 | + | + | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | + | + | + | + | This site option is contained within the proposed settlement boundary on a 0.57 hectare site and has a capacity for up to 8 dwellings. Access appears straightforward and site is located opposite existing development. Location and scale of the site is unlikely to have a significant environmental impact. Is likely to have a positive impact on the baseline data. | Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against effects on any SEA objectives. Further determination of environmental impact can be assessed at planning application stage. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA |
| Site option 3- Meadow End, Eaton Bishop | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | ? | ? | ? | ? | - | - | - | - | - | Overall this site has a negative and uncertain impact towards the baseline data. Due to the size of 35-50 in open countryside, location and scale may impact local wildlife and rural landscape. This likely to have a significant impact on Eaton Bishops existing infrastructure and services, impacting on traffic, water consumption and facility usage. | This development should not be carried forwards as it is a large housing site within open countryside impact of construction and traffic would have a detrimental impact to the surrounding environment. Preference to build on brownfield land and re use of building in accordance to policy RA3. | This option would not meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA as it falls under RA3 policy and proposal is for new development on greenfield land. |
| Site option 4- The Carpenters, Eaton Bishop Selected site EB2/2 | + | + | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | + | + | + | + | This site option is contained within the proposed settlement boundary 0.86 hectare site and has a capacity for up to 8 dwellings. Access appears straightforward and site is located opposite existing development. Location and scale of the site is unlikely to have a significant environmental impact. is likely to have a positive impact on the baseline data. | Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against effects on any SEA objectives. Further determination of environmental impact can be assessed at planning application stage. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA |
| Site option 5 Hillcrest, Ruckhall EB2/3 | + | + | + | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | + | + | + | + | This site option is an infill site within the proposed settlement boundary of ruckhall and has a capacity for up to a dwelling. Access appears straightforward and site is infill in between existing development. Location and scale of the site is unlikely to have a significant environmental impact. is likely to have a positive impact on the baseline data. | Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against effects on any SEA objectives. Further determination of environmental impact can be assessed at planning application stage. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA |
| Site option 6- 1, Orchard Cottage, Eaton Bishop | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | Overall this site has an uncertain impact towards the baseline data as more detail is needed. The proposal has the potential of 3 dwellings in open countryside It may impact on neighbouring hedgerows. Further clarification of environmental impact can be clarified at planning application stage. | Preference to build on brownfield land and re use of building in accordance to policy RA3. It must meet point 1,2,5,6,7 of RA3 policy to be considered for development. | This option would not meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA as it falls under RA3 policy and proposal is for new |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | clarified at planning application stage. | | detail. |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|---------|
| Site option 12 Church Field, Near Green Court, Eaton Bishop | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | ? | Overall this site has a uncertain impact towards the baseline data. Due to the size of 2 in open countryside, location and scale may impact local wildlife and landscape. It may put additional pressure to Eaton Bishops existing infrastructure and facilities Further clarification of environmental impact can be clarified at planning application stage. | This development is not considered part of the Eaton Bishop settlement boundary, therefore falls under ra3 policy. Preference to build on brownfield land and re use of building in accordance to policy RA3. | This can be clarified at planning application stage. Proposal would need further detail. | |
| Site option 13 Lane Head Farm – Site 1, Eaton Bishop | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Overall this site has a neutral impact towards the baseline data. Scale and location of the development is unlikely to have a significant environmental impact. Further clarification of environmental impact can be clarified at planning application stage. | This development is not considered part of the Eaton Bishop or Ruckhall settlement boundary, therefore falls under ra3 policy. Preference to build on brownfield land and re use of building in accordance to policy RA3. | This can be clarified at planning application stage. Proposal would need further detail. | |
| Site option 14 Lane Head Farm – Site 2, Eaton Bishop | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Overall this site has a neutral impact towards the baseline data. Scale and location of the development is unlikely to have a significant environmental impact. Further clarification of environmental impact can be clarified at planning application stage. | Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against effects on any SEA objectives. Further determination of environmental impact can be assessed at planning application stage. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA | |
| Site option 15 Broad stone, Eaton Bishop | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | ? | ? | ? | ? | - | - | - | - | - | Overall this site has a negative and uncertain impact towards the baseline data. Due to the size of 50-75 in open countryside, location and scale may impact local wildlife and rural landscape. This likely to have a significant impact on Eaton Bishops existing infrastructure and services, impacting on traffic, water consumption and facility usage. | This development should not be carried forwards as it is a large housing site within open countryside impact of construction and traffic would have a detrimental impact to the surrounding ng environment. Preference to build on brownfield land and re use of building in accordance to policy RA3. | This option would not meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA as it falls under RA3 policy and proposal is for new development on greenfield land. | |
| Site option 16 Land to the South of the Pippins, Eaton Bishop – Site 2 Selected site EB2/5 | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | ? | + | + | + | + | + | This site option is contained within the proposed settlement boundary and has a capacity for up to 8 dwellings on a 0.76 ha site. Access may be an issue but small lane could be utilised to make site viable. The site is located opposite existing development. Location and scale of the site is unlikely to have a significant environmental impact. is likely to have a positive impact on the baseline data.. | Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against effects on any SEA objectives. Further determination of environmental impact can be assessed at planning application stage. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA | |
| Site option 17 Corner Field, Opposite Phone Box, | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | ? | Overall this site has a uncertain impact towards the baseline data. Scale and location of the development is unlikely to have a significant environmental impact. Impact of historic asset of Eaton Camp is likely to have | This development is not considered part of the Eaton Bishop or Ruckhall settlement boundary, therefore falls under ra3 policy. Preference to build on brownfield land and re use of building in | This can be clarified at planning application stage. | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| Ruckhall | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | a negative impact, further clarification of environmental impact can be clarified at planning application stage. | accordance to policy RA3. | Proposal would need further detail. |
| Site option 18 Old Post Office, Ruckhall | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | x | x | x | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Overall this site has a neutral impact towards the baseline data. It has the potential to accommodate required housing target identified in the core strategy and is within or adjacent to the built form by infill development in Ruckhall. Further clarification of environmental impact can be clarified at planning application stage. | Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against effects on any SEA objectives. Further determination of environmental impact can be assessed at planning application stage. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA | |
| Site option 19 Paddock, c/o Yew Tree Farm, Ruckhall | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | x | x | x | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Overall this site has a neutral impact towards the baseline data. It has the potential to accommodate required housing target identified in the core strategy and is within or adjacent to the built form by infill development in Ruckhall. Further clarification of environmental impact can be clarified at planning application stage. | Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against effects on any SEA objectives. Further determination of environmental impact can be assessed at planning application stage. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA | |
| Site option 20 The Orchard, c/o Yew Tree Farm, Ruckhall Selected site EB2/6 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | This site option is an infill site within the proposed settlement boundary of Ruckhall and has a capacity for up to 2 dwellings on a 0.33 hectare site. Access is on a bend of a main road and site is infill in between existing development. Location and scale of the site is unlikely to have a significant environmental impact. Controlled development is likely to have a positive impact on the baseline data. | Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against effects on any SEA objectives. Further determination of environmental impact can be assessed at planning application stage. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA | |
| Site option 21- Glenwood, Ruckhall | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | x | x | x | ? | ? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Overall this site has a neutral impact towards the baseline data. It has the potential to accommodate required housing target identified in the core strategy and is within or adjacent to the built form. Further clarification of environmental impact can be clarified at planning application stage. | Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against effects on any SEA objectives. Further determination of environmental impact can be assessed at planning application stage. | This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA | |

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

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

| SEA Objectives | Baseline carried over from Stage A |
|---|---|
| <p>1- To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna)</p> <p>2- To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes</p> <p>3- To improve quality of surroundings</p> <p>4- To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and culture heritage</p> <p>5- To improve air quality</p> <p>6- To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment</p> <p>7- To reduce contributions to climate change</p> <p>8- To reduce vulnerability to climate change</p> <p>9- To improve water quality</p> <p>10- To provide for sustainable sources of water supply</p> <p>11- To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk</p> <p>12- To conserve soil resources and quality</p> <p>13- To minimise the production of waste</p> <p>14- To improve health of the population</p> <p>15- To reduce crime and nuisance</p> <p>16- To conserve natural and manmade resources</p> | <p>1-The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data.2010/11: 27% of Herefordshire's SSSI land was in favourable condition. There are three SSSI's within Eaton Bishop 13.08.14 River Wye (Unfavourable Recovering); Cage Brook Valley (Favourable (part) Unfavourable No Change (part) Unfavourable Declining (part); Littlemarsh Common (Unfavourable Declining) The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data. The existing status of the Wye SAC between Hay and the Lugg confluence is currently meeting its phosphate target and is meeting the conservation targets. 2010/11: 17 Habitat Action Plans and 14 Species Action Plans are currently in operation across Herefordshire. Eaton Bishop has: 3 SSSI, 17 SWS. The River Wye SAC borders the northern boundary of the Parish. There are no NNRs and SINC's within the parish.</p> <p>2-There are no outstanding enforcement actions or appeals concerning locally important buildings within Eaton Bishop at present. Eaton Bishop does not have a conservation area.</p> <p>3-In terms of Eaton Bishop itself, the study reveals there are no play facilities in the parish. I</p> <p>4-Whilst there is no qualitative, locally specific data available at present, there is five scheduled monuments in Eaton Bishop, according to the latest version of the register.</p> <p>5-Between 2005 and 2010 Herefordshire's total and per capita carbon emission reduced by 7% and 8% respectively; while UK's total and per capita carbon emission reduced by 8% and 12% respectively within the same period. This suggests that air quality is improving.</p> <p>6-% of Herefordshire residents who travel to work by: Car: 70.1%, Foot: 14.7%,Bicycle: 4.3%,Bus: 2%, Train: 0.8%,Motorbike: 0.8%,Taxi: 0.3%,Other: 7%.</p> <p>7-Herefordshire latest figure of C02 emissions per capita-dates back to 2010: 1.61 million tonnes (mtCO²)</p> <p>8-Reduce the risk of flooding-There have been no approvals contrary to EA advice since reporting began in 2004.The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data.</p> <p>9-Percentage of river length assessed as good or very good chemical quality and ecological quality as required by the Water Framework Directive. Latest figure dates back to 2005: 84%.</p> <p>10-Eaton Bishop falls into the Herefordshire Conjunctive Use Water Resource Zones (WRZs), one of 6 zones covering Herefordshire. 39% of demand is from non-household use.</p> <p>11-Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on flood defence grounds. The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data.</p> <p>12-Around the village of Eaton Bishop the soil classification is Grades 2 and 3. The edge of the parish of the parish is Grade 3 (Good to moderate).</p> <p>13-There are numerous listed buildings within the parish and five SAMs. None are currently recorded in the Buildings at Risk Register⁸. There are no outstanding enforcement actions or appeals concerning locally important buildings within Eaton Bishop parish at present. The Parish Area has the following landscape types: Principled settled farmlands, wet pasture meadows and wooded forest</p> |

| NDP Policies | SEA objectives | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Summary in relation to baseline | Overall commentary and any initial cumulative effects/ Recommendations | Conformity with Core Strategy |
|--------------|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|--|---|--|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | | | |
| Baseline | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | | | |
| EB1 | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | + | + | ? | ? | + | + | + | + | + | + | Overall this policy moves towards the SEA baseline. This policy supports new housing development within the settlement boundaries allocated for Eaton Bishop and Ruckhall. | The proposed settlement meets the SEA baseline and size of settlement boundaries likely to accommodate the housing target growth indicated in the Core Strategy. Further determination of environmental impact on more detailed matters can be determined at planning application stage on a case by case basis. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA |
| EB2 | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | + | + | X | X | + | Overall these sites would have a positive effect on the baseline and it support proportional growth in line with the Core Strategy. The small scale and location of the allocated sites conform to policies RA1 and RA2 as it is contained in the settlement. Further clarification on environmental impact can be determined at planning application stage. | There are not considered to be any significant locational issues at this stage because the plan proposes that six sites for Eaton Bishop and 2 within Ruckhall, which fall inside the proposed settlement boundary. potential sites be allocated for housing and, in any event, other safeguarding policies exist within the NDP to provide adequate mitigation. Further determination of environmental impact on more detailed matters can be determined at planning application stage on a case by case basis | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA |
| EB3 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | X | X | 0 | Overall this policy moves towards the SEA baseline. Phasing development will help Eaton Bishop grow in a sustainable way. | None. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA |
| EB4 | 0 | + | + | X | + | + | X | X | X | X | X | + | + | X | X | 0 | This policy is compatible with the baseline. The policy supports mix housing sizes will help provide housing to suit various housing needs. | Need to ensure that this approach is consistent with the evidence outlined in the Local Housing Market Assessment Report (LHMA). | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA |
| EB5 | + | + | + | X | + | X | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | Overall this policy moves towards the SEA baseline. This policy is likely to mitigate environmental impact caused from development. | Although majority of this policy is covered in the core strategy. This policy adds more criteria to make it more specific to Eaton Bishop. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA |
| EB6 | + | + | + | + | + | X | X | X | X | X | X | + | + | X | X | + | Overall this policy moves towards the SEA baseline. This policy will help safeguard historic environment and protect heritage assets from unsuitable development. | LD4 of the Core Strategy ensures historic landscape and environment. However this policy adds further criteria to make it more specific to Eaton Bishop. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA |
| EB7 | + | + | + | X | + | X | X | X | X | X | X | + | + | + | + | + | Overall this policy moves towards the SEA baseline. This policy would not lead to development itself but ensures community assets are protected and development which | None. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | benefits the local community supported. | | |
| EB8 | + | + | + | X | + | X | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | X | X | + | Overall this policy moves towards the SEA baseline and will ensure development is protected against flood risk and flood alleviation measures are sought where possible. | Majority of this policy criterion is already covered by the Core Strategy SD3 policy. But this adds further criteria to make it more specific to Eaton Bishop. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA |
| EB9 | + | + | + | X | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | Overall this policy moves towards the SEA baseline. This policy adds further criteria in addition of RA4 to ensure environmental impact is limited. | Majority of this policy criterion is already covered by the Core Strategy RA4 policy. But this adds further criteria to make it more specific to Eaton Bishop. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA |
| EB10 | + | + | + | X | + | 0 | X | X | ? | ? | + | 0 | 0 | X | X | 0 | This policy would not lead to development itself but contains criteria to ensure that any proposed poly tunnel or large agricultural buildings give careful consideration to environmental impact. | Further clarification of environmental impact on water resources can be clarification at planning application stage and assessed on a case by case basis. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA |
| EB11 | + | + | + | X | + | X | + | + | X | X | X | + | + | X | X | + | Overall this policy moves towards the SEA baseline. This policy would not lead to development itself but sets out design criteria for large agricultural buildings and rural business buildings. | Overall this policy meets the SEA baseline. This policy will help mitigate impact caused from development safeguarding noise, light, habitats, views and ensure development is sustainable and keeping with its surrounding environment. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA |
| EB12 | + | + | + | X | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | X | X | + | This policy is compatible with the baseline. This policy would not lead to development itself but sets out criteria to ensure livestock units will be carefully considered in order to minimise their environmental impact. | Majority of this policy criterion is already covered by the Core Strategy. But this policy tends to be more specific in relation to intensive livestock units. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA |
| EB13 | + | + | + | X | + | X | + | + | X | X | X | + | + | X | X | + | Overall this policy moves towards the SEA baseline. This policy would not lead to development itself but supports community energy schemes, setting out criteria. | Further determination of environmental impact can be determined at planning application stage and will depend on scale, type and location of the proposed scheme. | This policy meets the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA |

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

Key:

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

towards
EB1

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and would only lead to small scale development in line with the proportional growth within the Core Strategy. | N/A |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and would only lead to small scale development in line with the proportional growth within the Core Strategy. | N/A |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and would only lead to small scale development in line with the proportional growth | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|-----|
| | | | | within the Core Strategy. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | ? | ? | ? | More detail is required to determine environmental impact. This can be clarified at planning application stage. | N/A |
| To improve air quality | ? | ? | ? | More detail is required to determine environmental impact. This can be clarified at planning application stage. | N/A |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | ? | ? | ? | More detail is required to determine environmental impact. This can be clarified at planning application stage. | N/A |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | 0 | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and would only lead to small scale development in line with the proportional growth within the Core Strategy. | N/A |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | 0 | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and would only lead to small scale development in line with the proportional growth within the Core Strategy. | N/A |
| To improve water quality | ? | ? | ? | More detail is required to determine environmental impact. This can be clarified at planning application stage. | N/A |
| To provide for sustainable sources of | ? | ? | ? | More detail is required to determine environmental impact. This can be clarified at planning application stage. | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|-----|
| water supply | | | | | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and would only lead to small scale development in line with the proportional growth within the Core Strategy. | N/A |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and would only lead to small scale development in line with the proportional growth within the Core Strategy. | N/A |
| To minimise the production of waste | 0 | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and would only lead to small scale development in line with the proportional growth within the Core Strategy. | N/A |
| To improve health of the population | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and would only lead to small scale development in line with the proportional growth within the Core Strategy. | N/A |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and would only lead to small scale development in line with the proportional growth within the Core Strategy. | N/A |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives and would only lead to small scale development in line with the proportional growth within the Core Strategy. | N/A |
| Overall commentary | Overall this Policy moves towards the SEA objectives and is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. The vacant areas within the settlement boundary lie outside the flood risk zone, therefore development within the | | | | |

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

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| and any cumulative effects | settlement boundary is not at risk of fluvial flooding. However they are still at risk of pluvial and surface water flooding. |
|-----------------------------------|---|

EB2

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

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

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|---|-----|
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | ? | ? | ? | More detail is required to determine environmental impact. This can be clarified at planning application stage. | N/A |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | ? | ? | ? | More detail is required to determine environmental impact. This can be clarified at planning application stage. | N/A |
| To improve water quality | ? | ? | ? | More detail is required to determine environmental impact. This can be clarified at planning application stage. | N/A |
| To provide for sustainable sources | ? | ? | ? | More detail is required to determine environmental impact. This can be clarified at planning application stage. | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----|
| of water supply | | | | | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | 0 | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To minimise the production of waste | 0 | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | This policy compliments policy RA2 of the Core Strategy and would only lead to small scale development. Policy safeguards exist in the Core strategy to ensure that environmental considerations are taking into account and open spaces and the character of townscape and landscape area are protected. | | | | |

EB3

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

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

| | time periods) | | | | and mitigation opportunities |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----|
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To improve water quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|----------|---|-----|
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Overall this Policy moves towards the SEA objectives and is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | | | | |

EB4

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

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

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|---|-----|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | 0 | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To improve air quality | + | + | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | + | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To reduce contributions to | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|---|-----|
| climate change | | | | | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To conserve natural and manmade | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| resources | | | | | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Overall this Policy moves towards the SEA objectives and is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will encourage a mix of housing to help meets the needs of various groups and individuals within the Eaton Bishop community. | | | | |

EB5

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

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----|
| townscapes | | | | | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To improve water quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----|
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To improve health of the population | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Overall this Policy moves towards the SEA objectives and is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will help to protect and support green infrastructure, biodiversity and local landscape character. | | | | |

EB6

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

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | ++ | This is a criteria based policy which seeks to preserve and enhance the landscape, environment and habitats. | N/A |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | ++ | This is a criteria based policy which seeks to preserve and enhance the landscape, environment and habitats. | N/A |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This is a criteria based policy which seeks to preserve and enhance the landscape, environment and habitats. | N/A |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and | + | ++ | ++ | This is a criteria based policy which seeks to preserve and enhance the landscape, environment and habitats. | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|-----|
| cultural heritage | | | | | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This is a criteria based policy which seeks to preserve and enhance the landscape, environment and habitats. | N/A |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This is a criteria based policy which seeks to preserve and enhance the landscape, environment and habitats. | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|----|--|-----|
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | + | This is a criteria based policy which seeks to preserve and enhance the landscape, environment and habitats. | N/A |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | ++ | This is a criteria based policy which seeks to preserve and enhance the landscape, environment and habitats. | N/A |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Overall this Policy moves towards the SEA objectives and is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This is a criteria based policy which seeks to preserve and enhance the landscape, environment which will protect heritage and cultural assets. | | | | |

EB7

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

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

| | | | | | |
|--|----|---|---|---|-----|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | ++ | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce contributions to | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|---|-----|
| climate change | | | | | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To improve health of the population | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |
| To conserve natural and manmade | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| resources | | | | | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Overall this Policy moves towards the SEA objectives and is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. | | | | |

EB8

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | 0 | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to safeguard and mitigate against flooding issues. | Policy criteria are already covered by the Core Strategy |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and | + | + | ++ | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to safeguard and mitigate against flooding issues. | Policy criteria are already covered by the Core Strategy |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|----|----|--|--|
| townscapes | | | | | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to safeguard and mitigate against flooding issues. | Policy criteria are already covered by the Core Strategy |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to safeguard and mitigate against flooding issues. | Policy criteria are already covered by the Core Strategy |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to safeguard and mitigate against flooding issues. | Policy criteria are already covered by the Core Strategy |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | + | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to safeguard and mitigate against flooding issues. | Policy criteria are already covered by the Core Strategy |
| To improve water quality | + | ++ | ++ | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to safeguard and mitigate against flooding issues. | Policy criteria are already covered by the Core Strategy |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--|----|----|--|--|
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | + | ++ | ++ | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to safeguard and mitigate against flooding issues. | Policy criteria are already covered by the Core Strategy |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | ++ | ++ | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to safeguard and mitigate against flooding issues. | Policy criteria are already covered by the Core Strategy |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to safeguard and mitigate against flooding issues. | Policy criteria are already covered by the Core Strategy |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to safeguard and mitigate against flooding issues. | Policy criteria are already covered by the Core Strategy |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to safeguard and mitigate against flooding issues. | Policy criteria are already covered by the Core Strategy |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Overall this Policy moves towards the SEA objectives and is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy helps minimise flood risk and help to manage flood risk listing flood resilient criteria. | | | | |

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

EB9

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | N/A |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | 0 | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | N/A |
| To improve quality of surroundings | 0 | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|---|-----|
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To improve air quality | 0 | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | N/A |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | N/A |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | 0 | 0 | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | N/A |
| To improve water | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|-----------|---|-----|
| quality | | | | environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | N/A |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | N/A |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | N/A |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | ++ | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | N/A |
| To improve health of the population | 0 | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|-----|
| To reduce crime and nuisance | 0 | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | N/A |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | N/A |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Overall this Policy moves towards the SEA objectives and is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy itself would not result in development but provides criteria to minimise environmental impact from new business in former agricultural buildings. | | | | |

EB10

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

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|----|---|-----|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | ++ | The principles of this policy are compatible with Core Strategy policy RA4 and RA6. Policy safeguards exist which will help avoid or mitigate against impacts on the natural and built environment. | N/A |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | + | The principles of this policy are compatible with Core Strategy policy RA4 and RA6. Policy safeguards exist which will help avoid or mitigate against impacts on the natural and built environment. | N/A |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | The principles of this policy are compatible with Core Strategy policy RA4 and RA6. Policy safeguards exist which will help avoid or mitigate against impacts on the natural and built environment. | N/A |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | The principles of this policy are compatible with Core Strategy policy RA4 and RA6. Policy safeguards exist which will help avoid or mitigate against impacts on the natural and built environment. | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----|
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | 0 | 0 | 0 | The principles of this policy are compatible with Core Strategy policy RA4 and RA6. Policy safeguards exist which will help avoid or mitigate against impacts on the natural and built environment. | N/A |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To improve water quality | ? | ? | ? | More detail is required to determine environmental impact. This can be clarified at planning application stage. | N/A |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | ? | ? | ? | More detail is required to determine environmental impact. This can be clarified at planning application stage. | N/A |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | + | + | The principles of this policy are compatible with Core Strategy policy RA4 and RA6. Policy safeguards exist which will help avoid or mitigate against impacts on the natural and built environment. | N/A |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | 0 | 0 | + | The principles of this policy are compatible with Core Strategy policy RA4 and RA6. Policy safeguards exist which will help avoid or mitigate against impacts on the natural and | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----|
| | | | | built environment. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | 0 | 0 | + | The principles of this policy are compatible with Core Strategy policy RA4 and RA6. Policy safeguards exist which will help avoid or mitigate against impacts on the natural and built environment. | N/A |
| To improve health of the population | x | x | x | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | x | x | x | No relationship | N/A |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | 0 | 0 | + | The principles of this policy are compatible with Core Strategy policy RA4 and RA6. Policy safeguards exist which will help avoid or mitigate against impacts on the natural and built environment. | N/A |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | The principles of this policy are compatible with Core Strategy policy RA5 and RA6. Policy safeguards exist which will help avoid or mitigate against impacts on the natural environment. | | | | |

EB11

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

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

| | terms of the three time periods) | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-----|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | + | This policy will not lead to development but indicates the design criteria to minimise environmental impact caused from development. | N/A |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | ++ | This policy will not lead to development but indicates the design criteria to minimise environmental impact caused from development. | N/A |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | ++ | This policy will not lead to development but indicates the design criteria to minimise environmental impact caused from development. | N/A |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|-----|
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This policy will not lead to development but indicates the design criteria to minimise environmental impact caused from development. | N/A |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This policy will not lead to development but indicates the design criteria to minimise environmental impact caused from development. | N/A |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | + | + | + | This policy will not lead to development but indicates the design criteria to minimise environmental impact caused from development. | N/A |
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This policy will not lead to development but indicates the design criteria to minimise environmental impact caused from | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|-----|
| | | | | development. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | + | This policy will not lead to development but indicates the design criteria to minimise environmental impact caused from development. | N/A |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This policy will not lead to development but indicates the design criteria to minimise environmental impact caused from development. | N/A |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Overall this Policy moves towards the SEA objectives and is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will not lead to development but indicates the design criteria to minimise environmental impact caused from development. | | | | |

EB12

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

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

| | term (1 – 5 years) | term (6 – 10 years) | (11 years +) | | |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|-----|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will not directly lead to development but provides criteria for intensive livestock units to ensure their impact on the environment will be minimal. | N/A |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | 0 | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will not directly lead to development but provides criteria for intensive livestock units to ensure their impact on the environment will be minimal. | N/A |
| To improve quality of surroundings | 0 | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will not directly lead to development but provides criteria for intensive livestock units to ensure their impact on the environment will be minimal. | N/A |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|-----|
| environment and cultural heritage | | | | | |
| To improve air quality | 0 | 0 | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will not directly lead to development but provides criteria for intensive livestock units to ensure their impact on the environment will be minimal. | N/A |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | + | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will not directly lead to development but provides criteria for intensive livestock units to ensure their impact on the environment will be minimal. | N/A |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | ? | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will not directly lead to development but provides criteria for intensive livestock units to ensure their impact on the environment will be minimal. | N/A |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will not directly lead to development but provides criteria for intensive livestock units to ensure their impact on the environment | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|-----|
| | | | | will be minimal. | |
| To improve water quality | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will not directly lead to development but provides criteria for intensive livestock units to ensure their impact on the environment will be minimal. | N/A |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will not directly lead to development but provides criteria for intensive livestock units to ensure their impact on the environment will be minimal. | N/A |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will not directly lead to development but provides criteria for intensive livestock units to ensure their impact on the environment will be minimal. | N/A |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will not directly lead to development but provides criteria for intensive livestock units to ensure their impact on the environment | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|----------|--|-----|
| | | | | will be minimal. | |
| To minimise the production of waste | 0 | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will not directly lead to development but provides criteria for intensive livestock units to ensure their impact on the environment will be minimal. | N/A |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will not directly lead to development but provides criteria for intensive livestock units to ensure their impact on the environment will be minimal. | N/A |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Overall this Policy moves towards the SEA objectives and is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. Overall this policy is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy will not directly lead to development but provides criteria for intensive livestock units to ensure their impact on the environment will be minimal. | | | | |

EB13

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

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

| | effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | | mitigation opportunities |
|---|--|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (11 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | 0 | + | + | This policy aims to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels and encourage more renewable forms of energy within the community. This could have a small impact the natural environment depending on siting but policy safeguards exist to avoid or mitigate against effects on the environment. | N/A |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | 0 | + | + | This policy aims to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels and encourage more renewable forms of energy within the community. This could have a small impact the natural environment depending on siting but policy safeguards exist to avoid or mitigate against effects on the environment. | N/A |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This policy aims to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels and encourage more renewable forms of energy within the community. This could have a small impact the natural environment depending on siting but policy safeguards exist to avoid or mitigate against effects on the environment. | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|--|-----|
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To improve air quality | 0 | + | + | This policy aims to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels and encourage more renewable forms of energy within the community. This could have a small impact the natural environment depending on siting but policy safeguards exist to avoid or mitigate against effects on the environment. | N/A |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This policy aims to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels and encourage more renewable forms of energy within the community. This could have a small impact the natural environment depending on siting but policy safeguards exist to avoid or mitigate against effects on the environment. | N/A |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | + | + | + | This policy aims to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels and encourage more renewable forms of energy within the community. This could have a small impact the natural environment depending on siting but policy safeguards exist to avoid or mitigate against | N/A |

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

| | | | | effects on the environment. | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|--|-----|
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This policy aims to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels and encourage more renewable forms of energy within the community. This could have a small impact the natural environment depending on siting but policy safeguards exist to avoid or mitigate against effects on the environment. | N/A |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | + | + | This policy aims to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels and encourage more renewable forms of energy within the community. This could have a small impact the natural environment depending on siting but policy safeguards exist to avoid or mitigate against effects on the environment. | N/A |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|----------|--|-----|
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | No relationship | N/A |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | 0 | + | + | This policy aims to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels and encourage more renewable forms of energy within the community. This could have a small impact the natural environment depending on siting but policy safeguards exist to avoid or mitigate against effects on the environment. | N/A |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Overall this Policy moves towards the SEA objectives and is not over and above the Core Strategy in terms of SEA objectives. This policy aims to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels and encourage more renewable forms of energy within the community. | | | | |

Key:

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

| SEA Objective / Policy | 1. To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | 2. To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | 3. To improve quality of surroundings | 4. To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and culture heritage | 5. To improve air quality | 6. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | 7. To reduce contributions to climate change | 8. To reduce vulnerability to climate change | 9. To improve water quality | 10. To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | 11. To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | 12. To conserve soil resources and quality | 13. To minimise the production | 14. To improve health of the population | 15. To reduce crime and nuisance | 16. To conserve natural and manmade resources |
|-------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---|
| Objective 1 | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Objective 2 | + | + | + | + | + | X | + | X | X | X | X | + | + | + | X | + |
| Objective 3 | + | + | + | X | + | X | ++ | ++ | ++ | + | + | + | + | X | X | + |
| Objective 4 | 0 | + | + | X | ++ | ++ | + | + | ++ | ++ | + | + | + | + | X | 0 |
| Objective 5 | 0 | + | + | X | 0 | 0 | ? | ? | X | X | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Policy EB1 | + | + | + | ? | ? | ? | + | + | ? | ? | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Policy EB2 | + | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | ? | ? | ? | ? | 0 | + | + | X | X | + |
| Policy EB3 | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | X | X | 0 |
| Policy EB4 | 0 | + | + | X | + | + | X | X | X | X | X | + | + | X | X | 0 |
| Policy EB5 | + | + | + | X | + | X | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Policy EB6 | + | + | + | ++ | + | X | X | X | X | X | X | + | + | X | X | + |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|
| Policy EB7 | + | + | + | X | + | X | X | X | X | X | X | + | + | + | + | + |
| Policy EB8 | + | + | + | X | + | X | + | + | ++ | ++ | ++ | + | + | X | X | + |
| Policy EB9 | + | + | + | X | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | + |
| Policy EB10 | + | + | + | X | + | 0 | X | X | ? | ? | + | 0 | 0 | X | X | 0 |
| Policy EB11 | + | + | + | X | + | X | + | + | X | X | X | + | + | X | X | + |
| Policy EB12 | + | + | + | X | 0 | + | + | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | X | X | + |
| Policy EB13 | + | + | + | X | + | X | + | + | X | X | X | + | + | X | X | + |
| Summary of effects of whole plan on each SEA Objective | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Cumulative effects of whole plan (1 + 2 + 3...) | <p>Overall the Neighbourhood Plan policies and objectives have a positive impact towards the SEA baseline data. And are in general conformity with the Core Strategy Overall all of the policies and objectives meet the Core Strategy requirements for the purposes of the SEA. Policies and objectives strive to preserve and maintain natural and built historic environment that can help mitigate impact from the housing policies. This plan ensures appropriate sized development is developed according to Core Strategy. It adds housing development certainty by allocating settlement boundaries for Eaton Bishop and Ruckhall with housing sites allocation. The six allocated housing sites or Eaton Bishop all fall within the settlement boundary have relatively good access and likely to accommodate up to 28 dwellings and 2 within Ruckhall village. If these sites come into fruition it will be in line with housing target figure of 33 housings, as 3 have already been built in 2011-2014.</p> <p>The 12 sites identified within the settlement boundaries of Eaton Bishop and Ruckhall lie outside the flood risk zone, therefore development within the settlement boundary is not at risk of fluvial flooding. However they are still at risk of pluvial and surface water flooding. Water supply and flood risk issues in each proposed housing scheme can be determined at planning application stage, and will be tested on a case by case basis.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commentary for significant cumulative effects | No significant cumulative effects have been identified. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Appendix 5

Options for Eaton Bishop NDP

Option 1- Do nothing

Option 2- Allocate sites for housing

Option 3- Manage future housing using a settlement boundary

Option 4 - Allocate site and identify a settlement boundary

Site option 1- Honeymoon House, Eaton Bishop

Site option 2- Land to the South of the Pippins, Eaton Bishop – Site 1

Site option 3- Meadow End, Eaton Bishop

Site option 4- The Carpenters, Eaton Bishop

Site option 5 Hillcrest, Ruckhall

Site option 6- 1, Orchard Cottage, Eaton Bishop

Site option 7- Well House, Eaton Bishop

Site option 8- Lane Head Farm, Lower Eaton

Site option 9- Brown's Field, Eaton Bishop

Site option 10- West Entrance to Ruckhall

Site option 11 Church Field, Eaton Bishop

Site option 12 Church Field, Near Green Court, Eaton Bishop

Site option 13 Lane Head Farm – Site 1, Eaton Bishop

Site option 14 Lane Head Farm – Site 2, Eaton Bishop

Site option 15 Broadstone, Eaton Bishop

Site option 16 Land to the South of the Pippins, Eaton Bishop – Site 2

Site option 17 Corner Field, Opposite Phone Box, Ruckhall

Site option 18 Old Post Office, Ruckhall

Site option 19 Paddock, c/o Yew Tree Farm, Ruckhall

Site option 20 The Orchard, c/o Yew Tree Farm, Ruckhall

Site option 21- Glenwood, Ruckhall

Appendix 6

Template D1: SEA Consultation Feedback

This consultation feedback is **only** for comments received on the SEA of your Neighbourhood Development Plan

Parish Council Name: Eaton Bishop Parish Council

Neighbourhood Development Plan Name: Eaton Bishop Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation date: 25 July 2016 until 17 September 2016.

Consultation title: Regulation 14 Consultation

| Response Date | Consultee | Summary of Comments | Response to Comments |
|----------------------|------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| 31/08/16 | Natural England | Natural England welcomes the production of an Environmental Report. Having reviewed the report Natural England confirms that it meets the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) European Directive and national regulations, and that we concur with its conclusions. | Duly noted. |

Appendix 7

Template D2: Compatibility test for amendments to objectives following Draft Plan Stage

Parish Council Name: Eaton Bishop Parish Council

Neighbourhood Development Plan Name: Eaton Bishop Neighbourhood Plan

Date completed: October 2016

Objectives versus SEA Objectives (SMART and Compatibility Test)

Key:

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

Introduction:

The following matrix appraises the amended (**insert name of neighbourhood plan**) NDP Objectives in terms of their SMART criteria and their compatibility with the SEA Objectives. These have been developed from Government guidance on SEA and from the local evidence base gathered for identifying the NDP issues.

SMART criteria:

- S – Specific:** NDP objectives should specify what is intended to be done in detail and should not be open to a wide range of misinterpretations
- M – Measurable:** It should be possible to monitor NDP objectives in a quantifiable way, by the use of indicators. Indicators should be measurable with limited resource implications.
- A – Attainable/achievable:** NDP objectives should be achievable and deliverable, related to the scale of growth proposed
- R – Realistic:** NDP objectives should relate to the overall vision of the plan. Likewise, chosen indicators should relate to objectives and their outcomes.
- T – Time-Bound:** Objectives should be specific to the NDP period or another specified time-frame. Objectives should be associated with a target and indicators should specify when the target should be achieved.

No objectives have been changed as a result of regulation 14 consultation, therefore no re screening is required.

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

Formatted: Top: 1.5 cm

Template D3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended Neighbourhood Development Plan policies and sites

Parish Council Name: Eaton Bishop Parish Council

Neighbourhood Development Plan Name: Eaton Bishop Neighbourhood Plan

Date completed: October 2016

Key:

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

towards
Policy EB9

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (10 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to manage water treatment and supply. | - |

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to manage water treatment and supply. | - |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to manage water treatment and supply. | - |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and culture heritage | X | X | X | | |
| To improve air quality | X | X | X | | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to manage water treatment and supply. | - |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | + | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to manage water treatment and supply. - | - |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|----|----|---|---|
| To improve water quality | + | ++ | ++ | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to manage water treatment and supply. | - |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | ++ | ++ | ++ | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to manage water treatment and supply. | - |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to manage water treatment and supply. | - |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to manage water treatment and supply. | - |
| To minimise the production of waste | + | ++ | ++ | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to manage water treatment and supply. | - |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | - | - |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | - | - |
| To conserve natural and manmade | + | + | + | This policy would not lead to development itself but set out criteria to manage water treatment | - |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|-------------|--|
| resources | | | | and supply. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | <p>This policy has been added in response to Welsh WATER COMMENTS AND drainage comments for Eaton Bishop. This policy gives greater certainty to water management within Eaton Bishop Neighbourhood Area. This policy will help to support new development and ensure sufficient capacity is available. This policy will help to mitigate against any detrimental impact on water facilities on waste water treatment and water supply.</p> | | | | |

Appendix 8

Template D1: SEA Consultation Feedback

This consultation feedback is **only** for comments received on the SEA of your Neighbourhood Development Plan

Parish Council Name: Eaton Bishop Parish Council

Neighbourhood Development Plan Name: Eaton Bishop Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation date: 25 October 2016 to 6 December 2016.

Consultation title: Regulation 16 Consultation

No comments have been made regarding the reg 16 SEA assessments.

Appendix 9

| Policy | Modification recommended | Justification |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| Recommended Modification 1 | Revise the date on the front cover to 2017 - 2031. | Interests of accuracy and clarity |
| Recommended Modification 2 | Revise the Parish Policies Map as to Proposals Map and show the plan boundary, the boundary of the Inset Maps and the location of priority habitats. Retitle the Village Policies Maps as Inset Maps and show the settlement boundaries, site allocations and community facilities. Revise the keys of the Maps to refer to the relevant policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. | For clarity, consistency and accuracy. |
| Recommended Modification 3 | Include a brief description of the location of and significance of the unregistered parks and gardens and the River Wye SAC in Section 2. | Clarification of the text and to add more detail/certainty |
| Recommended Modification 4 | Delete objective one, the first sentence of objective two and objective 4. Delete "Also to" from the second sentence of objective two. Renumber the objectives and update Appendix III. | For clarity, consistency and accuracy. |
| Recommended Modification 5 | <p>Revise Policy EB1 as follows:</p> <p>Add the following at the end of paragraph 6.1.4 to read "<i>Taking into account the existing commitments of seven dwellings, the net housing requirement is at least 26 new dwellings over the plan period.</i>"</p> <p>Revise the first paragraph of Policy EB1 to read: "<i>New housing development of at least 26 net additional dwellings will be supported on the Proposals Map in the plan period up to 2031.</i>"</p> <p>Delete the second and third sentences of the third paragraph of Policy EB1: "In particular, linear development character of the villages."</p> <p>Delete paragraph 4 of Policy EB1: "Where possible, development should be restrictedRuckhall."</p> <p>Delete "etc" from the fifth paragraph of Policy EB1.</p> <p>Replace the words "are required to" in paragraph 5 of Policy EB1 and "will be required to" in paragraph 6 of Policy EB1 with the word "should".</p> <p>Revise the final paragraph of Policy EB1 to read: "<i>Outside the identified settlement boundaries, housing development will only be supported exceptionally where it is in accordance with the NPPF and Core Strategy Policies RA3 and RA4. Affordable rural housing schemes will be supported where they accord with Core Strategy Policy H2 on Rural Exception Sites.</i>"</p> <p>Revise the Executive Summary to refer to 90% of the development being in Eaton Bishop and 10% in Ruckhall.</p> | <p>Strengthen and clarification of policy</p> <p>Clarification of the text and to add more certainty</p> <p>For the policy to offer greater flexibility</p> <p>Reflect relevant legislation</p> |

| | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| Recommended Modification 6 | Delete Policy EB3. | Policy unlikely to be implementable Lack of evidence and framework provision. |
| Recommended Modification 7 | <p>Revise Policy EB4 by replacing paragraphs one and two with:</p> <p><i>“New housing development should provide a mix of house types, sizes and tenures to meet the needs of those seeking affordable homes to rent and market homes to purchase including first time buyers, young families and older people. Bungalows and properties designed to meet the needs of older people are particularly encouraged.”</i></p> <p><i>“Where a need for affordable housing has been demonstrated, new housing development on sites of more than 10 dwellings should include an element of affordable housing in accordance with the requirements of Core Strategy Policy H1. The type and size of affordable housing shall be based on evidence from the latest Local Housing Needs Survey.”</i></p> <p>Delete paragraph 3 of Policy EB4.</p> | <p>Strengthen and clarification of policy Ensure the policy has a better reflection of relevant legislation in the NPPF and Core Strategy.</p> <p>Encourage sustainable development.</p> |
| Recommended modification 8 | <p>Revise Policy EB5 as follows:</p> <p>Revise Green Infrastructure paragraph 1 to read “New developments <i>should include....</i>”</p> <p>Revise Green Infrastructure paragraph 2 to read “<i>Support will be given to enhancements such as.....</i>”</p> <p>Revise Green Infrastructure paragraph 3 to read: “<i>Nature conservation sites and habitats, and important species shall be retained and protected in accordance with their status as set out in Core Strategy Policy LD2. The following sites are located in the Plan area: List sites and their status and show on Proposals Map.</i>”</p> <p>Revise the second sentence of criterion 3 of the Landscape Design section to read: “Existing hedgerows should be <i>retained</i> and enhanced where practical and the planting of new hedgerows....”</p> <p>Revise the first sentence of criterion 4 to read: “Mature and established trees should be <i>retained where practical</i> and incorporated into....”.</p> <p>Revise the second sentence of criterion 5 to read “Development <i>proposals should avoid</i> the removal of existing local orchards or areas of woodland unless it can be clearly demonstrated</p> <p>Revise the first sentence of criterion 6 to read “<i>Where feasible</i>, all new development should incorporate....”</p> <p>Revise the first sentence of criterion 7 to read “<i>Public footpaths should be retained</i> through development sites....”.</p> | <p>To ensure it fully reflects the thrust of national policy and guidance, along with the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Interests of consistency and accuracy.</p> |
| Recommended | Revise Policy EB6 as follows: | For clarity, consistency and accuracy. |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| modification 9 | <p>Delete “Proposals should fit in with the neighbouring settlements and enhance physical and visual connections and linkages with them” from criterion 1.</p> <p>Delete “to both the Parish Council and Herefordshire Council” from criterion 2.</p> <p>Delete “to assist the local economy and sustainability objectives” from criterion 5.</p> | Should be modified to reflect national policy and guidance. |
| Recommended modification 10 | <p>Revise Policy EB7as follows:</p> <p>Include the playing field in the bulleted list in paragraph 1 of Policy EB7.</p> <p>Revise the second paragraph of Policy EB7 to read: “The change of use of the village hall or church or playing field to residential use will only be supported if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • an equivalent or enhanced community facility has been provided within the settlement boundary or within a nearby accessible location; or • • the developer has satisfactorily demonstrated that there is no longer a need for the premises by the community as they have been unused for a minimum of two years and during that period it has been actively marketed without securing a viable community use.” <p>Include the following text in the justification: <i>“The facility must have been actively marketed for a minimum of two years through a commercial land and premises agent using advertisements and promotional activity on the internet and in regional property journals, without securing a viable alternative community use.”</i></p> <p>Include the following text in the justification: <i>“Any new community facilities should have a safe access on foot and cycle with adequate car parking. They should be located within the settlement boundary or close by.”</i></p> <p>Revise the third paragraph of Policy EB7 to list the infrastructure priorities: “.....to support the following priorities to local infrastructure: set out priorities in a bulleted list.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of the community facilities referred to in Policy EB7 should be shown on the Proposals Maps. | <p>Lack of evidence and framework provision.</p> <p>Encourage flexibility within the policy.</p> |
| Recommended modification 11 | <p>Revise Policy EB8 as follows:</p> <p>Revise the third paragraph on Reducing the Flood Risk as follows: “.....rainwater filtration) should be provided within development sites wherever possible.”</p> <p>Revise the first line of the section on Flood Resilience to read: “Development in areas liable to flooding....”</p> <p>Revise the last line of the final paragraph of Policy EB8 to read: “<i>This could include boundary walls and</i></p> | Interests of accuracy and clarity. |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | fencing such as solid gates with waterproof seals, and where possible integral drains or fencing. <i>The lower levels should be constructed to be more resistant to flooding.</i> " | |
| Recommended modification 12 | Revise Policy EB10 as follows: Revise the second paragraph to read " that the proposals address the factors set out in <i>Core Strategy Policies RA5 and RA6</i> and the following criteria:" In criterion 1 replace "fragile road network" with "local road network". Revise criterion 2 to read ".....industrial buildings and parking.". | Interests of accuracy and clarity. Positive wording provides a better reflection of the Plan. |
| Recommended modification 13 | Revise Policy EB11 as follows: Correct the title of the SPD in paragraph 6.4.5 to "Polytunnels SPD". Revise paragraph 6 of Policy EB11 to read: " <i>The siting of poly-tunnels, agricultural units and associated developments should be sited so that they do not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenity of residents of nearby dwellings.</i> " Delete paragraph 8 of Policy EB11. | Interests of accuracy and clarity. Should be modified to reflect national policy and guidance. |
| Recommended modification 14 | Revise the title of Policy EB14 to "Community Energy Schemes". Add the following to the beginning of paragraph 6.4.8 " <i>The Plan seeks to encourage new community led energy schemes in appropriate locations to help increase the supply of renewable and low carbon energy.</i> " | Interests of accuracy and clarity. |

Appendix 10

D3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the amended Neighbourhood Development Plan policies following Examination

Parish Council Name: Eaton Bishop

Date completed: April 2017

Key:

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

~~Policies~~
Policy SB1

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (10 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve quality of | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions | |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|---|--|
| surroundings | | | | following examination. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and culture heritage | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. The changes to this policy adds more certainty to the sea objectives. | |
| To improve air quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. The changes to this policy adds more certainty to the sea objectives. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. The changes to this policy adds more certainty to the sea objectives. | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | 0 | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. The changes to this policy adds more certainty to the sea objectives. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | 0 | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. The changes to this policy adds more certainty to the sea objectives. | |
| To improve water quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. The changes to this policy adds more certainty to the sea objectives. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. The changes to this | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| water supply | | | | policy adds more certainty to the sea objectives. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To minimise the production | 0 | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve health of the population | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Changes to policy EB1 helps bring this policy closer to national policy and the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. Therefore this does not alter the conclusions that the policy will have no significant effect. | | | | |

PolicyEB4 (now EB3)

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

| | terms of the three time periods) | | | | opportunities |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (10 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | 0 | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and culture heritage | X | X | X | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | 0 | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|---|--|
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | + | + | 0 | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To minimise the production | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Changes to policy EB3 helps bring this policy closer to national policy and the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. Therefore this does not alter the conclusions that the policy will have no significant effect. | | | | |

PolicyEB5 (Now EB4)

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (10 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | ++ | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve quality of | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions | |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|---|--|
| surroundings | | | | following examination. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and culture heritage | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | n/a | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve water quality | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To minimise the production | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve health of the population | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Changes to policy EB4 helps bring this policy closer to national policy and the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. Therefore this does not alter the conclusions that the policy will have no significant effect. | | | | |

Policy EB7 (Now EB6)

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

| | | years) | | | |
|---|----|--------|---|---|--|
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | ++ | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and culture heritage | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | X | X | X | N/A | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To minimise the production | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve health of the population | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative | Changes to policy EB6 helps bring this policy closer to national policy and the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. Therefore this does not alter the conclusions that the policy will have no significant effect. | | | | |

| | |
|----------------|--|
| effects | |
|----------------|--|

PolicyEB8 (Now EB7)

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (10 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. The changes to this policy adds more certainty to the sea objectives. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | ++ | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and | X | X | X | N/A | |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|---|----|----|---|--|
| culture heritage | | | | | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve water quality | + | ++ | ++ | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | + | ++ | ++ | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | ++ | ++ | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To minimise the production | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions | |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | | | following examination. | |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Changes to policy EB7 helps bring this policy closer to national policy and the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. Therefore this does not alter the conclusions that the policy will have no significant effect. | | | | |

Policy EB10 (Now EB9)

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|--|---|----------------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (10 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and | + | + | ++ | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |

| | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|---|--|
| fauna) | | | | | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and culture heritage | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To improve water quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. Changes to this policy post examination, add further certainty to the | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| | | | | SEA baseline on water quality. | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | 0 | 0 | 0 | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. Changes to this policy post examination, add further certainty to the SEA baseline on watersupply. | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | 0 | 0 | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To minimise the production | 0 | 0 | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | 0 | 0 | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Changes to policy EB9 helps bring this policy closer to national policy and the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. Therefore this does not alter the conclusions that the policy will have no significant effect. | | | | |

Policy EB11 (Now EB10)

| SEA Objective | Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods) | | | Summary Explanation | Enhancement and mitigation opportunities |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| | Short term (1 – 5 years) | Medium term (6 – 10 years) | Long term (10 years +) | | |
| To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes | + | + | ++ | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve quality of surroundings | + | + | ++ | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and culture heritage | X | X | X | N/A | |

| | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|---|--|
| To improve air quality | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To reduce contributions to climate change | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To reduce vulnerability to climate change | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To improve water quality | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To provide for sustainable sources of water supply | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To conserve soil resources and quality | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| To minimise the production | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|----------|----------|---|--|
| To improve health of the population | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To reduce crime and nuisance | X | X | X | N/A | |
| To conserve natural and manmade resources | + | + | + | This policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. | |
| Overall commentary and any cumulative effects | Changes to policy EB9 helps bring this policy closer to national policy and the Core Strategy and meets the basic conditions following examination. Therefore this does not alter the conclusions that the policy will have no significant effect. | | | | |

Appendix 11

| Objectives and context | Where referenced in NDP/SEA |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Neighbourhood Development Plan's purpose and objectives are made clear. • The Neighbourhood Area's environmental issues and constraints, including acknowledgement of those in the Local Plan (Core Strategy) SA, where relevant, and local environmental protection objectives, are considered in developing objectives and targets. • SEA objectives are clearly set out and linked to indicators and targets where appropriate. • Links with other locally related plans, programmes and policies are identified, explained and acknowledgement for those set out in the SA of the Local Plan (Core Strategy) is given, where relevant. • Conflicts that exist between SEA and Neighbourhood Development Plan objectives; and between SEA objectives and other local plan objectives are identified and described. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1 (paras 1.10 – 1.19) • Sections 2 and 3; and Tables A2 and A3 • Section 3 (para 3.7) • Section 3 (para 3.1) • Section 4 (paras 4.5) |
| Scoping | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory Consultees are consulted in appropriate ways and at appropriate times on the content and scope of the Environmental Report. • The assessment focuses on significant issues. • Technical, procedural and other difficulties encountered are discussed; assumptions and uncertainties are made explicit. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2 (paras 2.8 – 2.12) & Appendix 3 • Sections 2 and 6 • Sections 2 and 6 |

| Alternatives | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realistic alternatives are considered for key issues, and the reasons for choosing them are documented. Alternatives include 'do minimum' and/or 'business as usual' scenarios wherever relevant. The environmental effects (both adverse and beneficial) of each alternative are identified and compared. Inconsistencies between the alternatives and other relevant local plans, programmes or policies are identified and explained. Reasons are given for selection or elimination of alternatives. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5 Section 5 (paras 5.2 – 5.9) Section 5 & Appendix 5 N/A Section 5 (paras 5.2 – 5.9) |
| Baseline information | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant aspects of the current state of the local, neighbourhood area environment and their likely evolution without the Neighbourhood Development Plan are described. Acknowledgement to the information in the SA of the Local Plan (Core Strategy) is given, where relevant. Environmental characteristics of the local, neighbourhood area, likely to be significantly affected are described, including areas wider than the physical boundary of the designated neighbourhood area, where it is likely to be affected by the Neighbourhood Development Plan. Difficulties such as deficiencies in information or methods are explained. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 1 and 6 Initial screening report and Section 1 Section 2 |

| Prediction and evaluation of likely significant environmental effects | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects identified include the types listed in the Directive (biodiversity, population, human health, fauna, flora, soil, water, air, climate factors, material assets, cultural heritage and landscape), as relevant; and other local likely environmental effects are also covered, as appropriate. • Both positive and negative effects are considered, and the duration of effects (short, medium or long-term) is addressed. • Likely secondary, cumulative (growing in quantity and strength) and synergistic (acting together) effects are identified, where practicable. • Inter-relationships between effects are considered, where practicable. • The prediction and evaluation of effects makes use of relevant accepted standards, regulations, and thresholds (i.e. data gathered for the evidence base). • Methods used to evaluate the effects are described. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tables A2, A3 and A4 (Appendix 2) • Tables B2 and B3 (Appendix 4) and Table D3 (appendix 7) • Table B4 (Appendix 4) • Section 6 • Section 6 • Section 2 |
| Mitigation measures | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and offset any significant adverse effects of implementing the Neighbourhood Development Plan are indicated. • Issues to be taken into account when determining planning applications or other projects, for example funding bids, are identified. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 6 • Section 6 |

| The Environmental Report | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is clear and concise in its layout and presentation. • Uses simple, clear language and avoids or explains technical terms. • Uses maps and other illustrations, where appropriate. • Explains the methodology used. • Explains who was consulted and what methods of consultation were used. • Identifies sources of information, including expert judgement and matters of opinion. • Contains a non-technical summary covering the overall approach to the SEA, the objectives of the Neighbourhood Development Plan, the main options considered, and any changes to the Neighbourhood Development Plan resulting from the SEA. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A • N/A • N/A • Section 2 • Section 2 • Section 2 • Included at page 1 |
| Consultation | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SEA is consulted on as an integral part of the plan-making process of the Neighbourhood Development Plan. • Consultation Bodies and the public likely to be affected by, or having an interest in, the Neighbourhood Development Plan are consulted in ways and at times, which give them an early and effective opportunity within appropriate time frames to express their opinions on the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan and Environmental Report. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2 • Section 7 |

| Decision-making and information on the decision | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environmental report and the opinions of those consulted are taken into account in finalising and adopting the Neighbourhood Development Plan. An explanation is given of how they have been taken into account. Reasons are given for choosing the Neighbourhood Development Plan as adopted, in the light of other reasonable alternatives considered. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sections 2 and 8 Section 2 Section 2 |
| Monitoring measures | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures proposed for monitoring the Neighbourhood Development Plan are clear, practicable and linked to the indicators and objectives used in the SEA. Monitoring is used, where appropriate, during implementation of the Neighbourhood Development Plan to make good deficiencies in baseline information in the SEA. Acknowledgement that monitoring enables unforeseen adverse effects to be identified at an early stage. (These effects may include predictions which prove to be incorrect.) Proposals are made for action in response to significant adverse effects arising from the monitoring of the Neighbourhood Development Plan. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 7 Section 7 Section 7 Section 7 |