

Environmental Report

Report for:

Hampton Bishop Neighbourhood Area

May 2019



Hampton 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 for scoping report

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

Appendix 5: Options Considered

Appendix 6: Consultation Responses to draft consultation

Appendix 7: SEA Stage D following amendments

Appendix 8: Consultation responses to the submission report

Appendix 9: Modifications following the examination

Appendix 10: SEA Stage D following 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.

Hampton Bishop Parish has undertaken to prepare an NDP and this process has been subject to environmental appraisal pursuant to the SEA Directive. Hampton Bishop Parish is a small rural parish adjoining the western edge of the built up area of Hereford. There is no post office or shop within the parish. The Bunch of Carrots is the local pub.

The submission Hampton Bishop NDP included 3 main objectives and it is intended that these objectives will be delivered by 11 criteria based planning policies; no site allocations are proposed.

The environmental appraisal of the Hampton 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 submission Plan itself.

The Hampton Bishop NDP has now been subject to an independent examination. Modifications were suggested to a small number of policies to aid clarity and implementation. No further changes to the NDP are recommended as a result of the reassessment of the SEA. The NDP was concluded to be in general conformity with national planning policy and the strategic policies as set out within the adopted Herefordshire Core Strategy.

Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening has been carried out on the Parish and has shown it falls within the catchment for the River Wye (including River Lugg). The River Wye runs along the western and southern borders. The River Lugg runs along the eastern border. The HRA assesses the potential effects of the NDP on the River Wye SAC, which is a European site (Special Area of Conservation).

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

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This report forms the final Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of Hampton Bishop Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).
- 1.2 The Hampton Bishop NDP does not propose any site allocations, although Hampton 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). The NDP will, however, provide general criteria based policies for guiding future development across the parish as a whole as there are no specifically allocated sites.

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 Hampton 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.

Hampton Bishop Parish Neighbourhood Plan Context

- 1.6 Hampton Bishop Parish is a small rural parish adjoining the western edge of the built up area of Hereford with a population of around 500 with 178 dwellings.
- 1.7 In spite of its proximity to Hereford, the Parish has experienced limited expansion over previous plan periods due to issues with flooding. A large proportion of the parish is in the flood plain with an extensive area lying within Flood Zone 3.
- 1.8 There are a number of historic farmsteads scattered across traditional rural landscape of orchards, pasture and arable fields. The parish includes a conservation area covering part of Hampton Bishop village and 36 statutory listed buildings and scheduled monuments.
- 1.9 The vision for Hampton Bishop by 2031 is as follows:

'By 2031 Hampton Bishop will be a thriving and sustainable community of a sensible size which has adequate protection from river and surface water flooding'
- 1.10 The 2 NDP objectives are as follows:
1. To help ensure that the future development is designed and managed to reduce problems associated with poor surface water drainage and flooding in and around the village.
 2. To promote high quality design in new buildings and extensions in order to maintain and enhance the historic settling of the Conservation Area and wider rural riparian landscape of the parish.

Context of Neighbourhood Plans

- 1.11 NDPs are a relatively new type of planning document that form a key part of the Government's localism agenda. They enable local communities to develop plans that reflect local aspirations, in accordance with strategic policies.

- 1.12 The Hampton 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).
- 1.13 The Herefordshire Local Plan (Core Strategy) was adopted on the 16 October 2015.
- 1.14 Paragraph 48 of the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance set out the weight that may be given to relevant policies in emerging plans, including NDPs, and indicated that weight may be given to relevant policies in emerging NDPs according to:
- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
 - The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
 - The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).
- 1.15 Table 4.14 of the Local Plan (Core Strategy) lists Hampton Bishop 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. It is listed within the Hereford HMA which proposes 18% growth.
- 1.16 Once made (adopted) by Herefordshire Council, the Hampton 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.

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 Hampton 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 Hampton 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.
- 2.6 This final Environmental Report represents the last stage of the SEA process following the examination.

Scoping Report Consultation

- 2.7 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.
- 2.8 After the document was approved by the Parish Council, the Hampton Bishop SEA Scoping Report was available to four¹ statutory bodies for consultation from 8 September to 13 October 2014.

Consultation outcomes from Statutory Consultees

2.8 The consultation resulted in 2 responses, both of which are attached at Appendix 3.

2.9 Both responses were collated and incorporated within this document where relevant:

Natural England: Agrees with the overall SEA however recommends that additional baseline data be sourced in regard to the status of the Lugg, biodiversity, the soil quality and agricultural land lost to development. They also noted the exclusion on the Wye SAC which should be included. Also agree with the need for HRA.

English Heritage: Have no substantive objection to the contents of the documents.

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 Hampton 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"

Policy context

3.3 The Hampton 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.

- 3.6 Appendix 1 of the Hampton 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 Parish is flooding and this will have an impact on the County as a whole regarding 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 it should be noted also that any policies relating to SEA objective 10 and 11 are particularly robust.

- 3.11 The NDP does not propose that sites be allocated for development and contains only criteria-based policies. On this basis, the delivery of the NDP should not exacerbate existing problems regarding water quality or have an unacceptable adverse impact.
- 3.12 Baseline characteristics within the SEA detail the current environmental status of environmental characteristics in the neighbourhood plan area from different sources. The source of Baseline Information used in Table A2 in Appendix 2, and analysed in Table B2 can be found in Appendix 4 Baseline characteristics in relation to the Hampton Bishop NDP SEA objectives can be found in stage A SEA assessments.
- 3.13 There are three objectives for which there is no local baseline data available and therefore this provides a limitation on the baseline data and whether the NDP policies are able to move towards or away from this data, this also means that there are no future trends to link the SEA objective too.

4.0 Assessing the NDP Objectives

- 4.1 The following are objectives listed in the NDP that aim to realise the vision for Hampton Bishop in 2031:
1. To help ensure that the future development is designed and managed to reduce problems associated with poor surface water drainage and flooding in and around the village.
 2. To promote high quality design in new buildings and extensions in order to maintain and enhance the historic settling of the Conservation Area and wider rural riparian landscape 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 the NDP objectives which have a relationship with the SEA framework are positively compatible with it or have a neutral or unknown effect or were not relevant.
- 4.4 Task B1 of the SEA didn't identify any major conflicts between the NDP objectives and the SEA framework, however some impacts are unknown due to the overarching nature of the policy and will have to be addressed on a case by case basis at planning stages:

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

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

5.0 Assessing the NDP Options

- 5.1 All options that were considered by Hampton 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;
- Option 1: NDP Preparation
 - A. Prepare an NDP
 - B. Do nothing
 - Option 2: Village Boundary
 - A. Use a settlement boundary to manage development at Hampton Bishop
 - B. Do not use a settlement boundary to manage village development
 - Option 3: Housing Delivery
 - A. Allocate further sites for housing other than what is on commitment sites
 - B. Deliver additional housing through managed windfall development, with no site allocation other than the commitment sites
 - Option 4: Type of village boundary
 - A. Restrictive boundary, limiting development to that identified in the plan
 - B. Permissive boundary. Including areas of open land for possible later development
- 5.3 These options were formulated at public consultation events across the Parish. The results of which will feed into the identification of the preferred options and ultimately the draft policies.
- 5.4 Option one looked at two options. A was to prepare and NDP, B was a 'do nothing' option was also considered, 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.
- 5.5 The second option concerning the village boundary options looked at using a settlement boundary and not using a settlement boundary to manage development in the village. It was decided that a settlement boundary would be used (option 2A). Pursuing option 2B would have given greater uncertainty over future development within the area. The designation of a settlement boundary will give additional certainty and helps to define those areas considered as the built form and open countryside. This can aid the direction of further growth to maintain the quality of the landscape and surroundings. There is less certainty over the positive effects on the baseline as any growth will be adjudged by criteria based policy. If required mitigation criteria can be added to policies to ensure all SEA objectives are achieved.
- 5.6 The third option looked at the options of housing delivery. 3A was to allocate further sites for housing other than what is on commitment sites or 3B was to deliver additional housing through managed windfall development, with no site allocation other than the commitment sites. 3B was selected as the preferable option due to the existing commitments within the parish meeting the proportional growth requirements.
- 5.7 Option 4 looked at the type of village boundary and the option of A, a restrictive boundary, limiting development to that identified in the plan or B, a permissive boundary, including areas of open land for possible later development. Option A was followed and supported by the criteria based policy, however it does not give the same level of certainty as the other options as it will be more reactionary than proactive in terms of growth proposals. However providing

criteria is added to the policies to safeguard or mitigate against any harm, the option will have a positive effect on the baseline.

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

NDP Options	SEA Objectives															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Option 1 – A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+				+
Option 1 – B	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X
Option 2 – A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+				+
Option 2 – B	?	?	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?				+
Option 3 – A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	+				+
Option 4 – A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+				+
Option 4 – B	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	++	+				+

6.0 Appraisal of the policies

- 6.1 A key part of developing a plan such as the Hampton 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:

- Policy HB1: Development in Areas of Flood Risk
- Policy HB2: Design for Flood Resilience and Resistance
- Policy HB3: Design to Reduce Surface Water Run Off
- Policy HB4: Protecting Heritage Assets and Archaeology
- Policy HB5: Protection of Historic Farmstead
- Policy HB6: Hampton Bishop Settlement Boundary
- Policy HB7: Building Design Principles for New Development
- Policy HB8: Landscape Design Principles
- Policy HB9: Green Infrastructure
- Policy HB10: Development on the Urban Fringe of the City of Hereford
- Policy HB11: Improving Traffic Management and Accessibility in Hampton Bishop

Stage B of SEA

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

- 6.4 With regard to Task B2 of SEA, the NDP policies were measured against both the SEA framework and the baseline characteristics identified during Stage A of the process; here, there was no baseline data available in respect of SEA Objectives 3 and 9. 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 location of specific piece of development (i.e tourist facilities or business units) 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	x	x	+	+	++	0	x	x	x	0
Policy 2	x	?	+	?	x	x	?	0	?	+	++	0	x	x	x	?
Policy 3:	+	+	+	0	+	x	0	0	+	++	++	0	+	0	x	++
Policy 4	0	+	?	++	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Policy 5	+	+	+	+	?	+	?	?	?	?	+	?	?	x	x	x
Policy 6	?	++	+	++	?	?	?	?	?	0	x	x	?	x	x	x
Policy 7	++	++	++	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	x
Policy 8	++	+	++	+	+	x	+	+	+	?	?	+	x	+	x	+
Policy 9	+	++	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	x	?	0	?	+	+	+
Policy 10	+	++	+	++	?	?	?	?	0	?	+	0	?	0	x	+
Policy 11	x	?	++	?	?	+	?	?	?	?	0	x	x	+	x	?

- 6.7 The results of Task B3, as shown at Appendix 4, demonstrates 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 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 Hampton 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 The policies in the Hampton Bishop NDP are not 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 of the SEA (Reg16)

- 6.10 The submission Hampton Bishop NDP has been revised following the consultation. An additional objective has been added regarding traffic management. A policy concerning the protection of historic farmsteads have been included and the specific policy regarding local green spaces has been removed. Five other policies had minor amendments made. These have been assessed.

NDP Policies	SEA Objectives															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
HB1	0	0	0	0	0	0	x	x	+	+	++	0	x	x	x	0

NDP Policies	SEA Objectives															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
HB2	x	+	+	?	x	x	?	0	?	+	++	0	x	x	x	?
HB3	+	+	+	0	+	x	0	0	+	++	++	0	+	0	x	++
HB4	0	+	?	++	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
HB5 (new)	+	++	++	++	x	x	x	x	x	x	+	+	x	x	x	++
HB6	++	++	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	x	x	x
HB7	+	++	+	++	?	x	+	x	+	x	+	x	x	x	x	+
HB8	++	++	++	+	+	x	+	+	x	+	+	++	x	x	+	++
HB9	++	+	++	+	+	x	+	+	+	x	++	+	x	+	x	+
HB10	+	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	x	+	+	?	+	+	+
HB11	+	++	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	x	x	x	x	x	x	+

6.11 The fundamental issue within the Hampton Bishop area is regarding the flooding, surface water flooding and resilience and the plan majors on these issues. Due to the presence of known flooding issues and development which has taken place within the parish (mainly adjacent to the boundary of Hereford city) no site allocations are proposed. A settlement boundary has been defined to guide development. The policies of the plan indicate that the parish are fully aware of the environmental issues within the area.

Stage D of the SEA – assessment of the modifications post examination (May 2019)

6.12 Following the submission consultation, the plan has now been subject to an independent examination during the winter 2018/19 by Ann Skippers. She has reported that the NDP has met the Basic Conditions subject to a number of modifications. These can be seen in Appendix 9.

6.13 Amended have been made to 5 policies with a further 2 having minor typographical changes. Many of these modifications have been made to ensure clarity within the policy for the decision maker. The following policies have therefore been reassessed:

- HB1
- HB4
- HB6
- HB8
- HB11

6.14 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 remains the same as the previous report.

NDP Policies	SEA Objectives															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
HB1	0	0	0	0	0	0	x	x	+	+	++	0	x	x	x	0
HB4	0	+	?	++	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
HB6	++	++	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	x	x	x
HB8	++	++	++	+	+	x	+	+	x	+	+	++	x	x	+	++
HB11	+	++	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	x	x	x	x	x	x	+

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 Hampton Bishop NDP. The plan will move the referendum and subject to a successful outcome, final adoption in the summer 2019.
- 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:	Hampton Bishop Neighbourhood Area
Parish Council:	Hampton Bishop Parish Council
Neighbourhood Area Designation Date:	07/05/2013

Introduction

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

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

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



Initial HRA Screening

River Wye (including the River Lugg) SAC:

Does the Neighbourhood Area have the River Wye (including the River Lugg) in or next to its boundary?	Y	The River Wye runs along the western and southern borders. The River Lugg runs along the eastern border
Is the Neighbourhood Area in the hydrological catchment of the River Wye (including the River Lugg) SAC?	Y	The Parish is within the River Lugg hydrological catchment area.
If yes above, does the Neighbourhood Area have mains drainage to deal with foul sewage?	N	There is no mains drainage at Hampton Bishop

Downton Gorge SAC:

Is the Neighbourhood Area within 10km of Downton Gorge SAC?	N	Downton Gorge is 33.28km 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 42.15km 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	The Group Parish is 18.7km away from Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Wye Valley Woodlands SAC:

Is the Neighbourhood Area within 10km of any of the individual sites that make up the Wye Valley Woodlands Site?	N	The Parish is 21.6km away from the Wye Valley Woodlands
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	---------------------------------------------------------

HRA Conclusion:

The assessment above highlights that the following European Sites will need to be taken into account in the future Neighbourhood Development Plan for the Hampton 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 Hampton 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	0	There are no AQMA's within the Group Parish	N
Ancient Woodland	1	Rotherwas Park Wood (border)	Y
Areas of Archaeological Interest	0	There are no AAI's within the Parish	N
Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty	0	There are no AONB's within the Parish	Y
Conservation Areas	3	Hampton Bishop village is a Conservation Area. There is also Hampton Park Conservation Area on the western border of the Parish, and Mordiford Conservation Area along the eastern border of the Parish	Y
European Sites	1	The River Wye and River Lugg SAC runs along the Western, northern and eastern borders	Y
Flood Areas		The Whole of the Parish is within a Flood Zone except the north east of the Parish, and also the area around Court Farm	Y
Listed Buildings	Numerous	There are numerous Listed Buildings throughout the Parish	Y
Local Sites (SWS/SINCS/RIGS)	1 SINCS 4 SWS	SINCS: Land north of Hampton Park Road (border) SWS: River Wye; River Lugg; Rotherwas Park Wood (border); Lugg Meadows	Y
Long distance footpaths/trails (e.g. Herefordshire Trail)	1	Wye Valley Walk	Y
Mineral Reserves	1	Lugg Bridge Farm on Roman Road to Upper Lodge	Y
National Nature Reserve	0	There are no NNR's within the Parish	N
Registered & unregistered parks and gardens	1 Registered 6 Unregistered	Registered: Sufton Court (border) Unregistered: Old Sufton; Longworth (border); Lugwardine Court (border); New Court, Lugwardine (border); Hampton Dene; Rotherwas Park (border)	Y
Scheduled Ancient Monuments	3	Ring Ditches and Rectilinear enclosures east of Tupsley; Churchyard cross in St Andrews Churchyard; Churchyard cross in Holy Rood Churchyard	Y
Sites of Special Scientific Interest	3	River Wye (Unfavourable Recovering); River Lugg (Unfavourable Recovering); Lugg & Hampton Meadows (Favourable)	Y

Decision Notification:

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

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

Assessment date: 04/06/2013

Assessed by: James Latham

Appendix 1: European Sites

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

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

Usk Bat Site

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

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

Wye Valley and Forest of Dean Bat Sites

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

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

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

NDPs closest to the European Site will need to consider:

Woodland habitat buffer.

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


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

Wye Valley Woodlands

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

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

Appendix 2: Wye Catchment Map




Hampton Bishop SEA Map 1

Scale: 1:25,000



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
- Scheduled Ancient Monuments
- Conservation Areas
- Registered Parks and Gardens
- Unregistered Parks and Gardens
- Special Areas of Conservation
- Wye Valley Walk
- Listed Buildings
- Parish Boundaries

Herefordshire Council

Hampton Bishop SEA Map 2

Scale: 1:25,000



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.

er and Shelwick CP

Weston Begg

Lugwardine CP

Bartestree CP

HEREFORD

Hamp Meadow

Hampton Bishop CP

Court Fm

Hampton Bishop

Bridge

Lower Bullingham CP

Dinedor CP

Fownhon

Holme Lacy CP

Key:

- Special Wildlife Sites
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest
- Minerals Sites
- Sites Important in Nature Conservation
- Flood Zone 2
- Flood Zone 3
- Parish Boundaries



**Herefordshire
Council**

Appendix 2

Strategic Environmental Assessment



Hampton Bishop Neighbourhood Area

Scoping Report

October 2014

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.



Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	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.
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.

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	Implications for the NDP and SEA
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.
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.

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	Implications for the NDP and SEA
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.
Revised EU Sustainable Development strategy	EU Strategy.	2009	Sets out a single strategy on how the EU will better meet its long-standing commitment to meet the challenges of sustainable development.	Recognises the need to gradually change current unsustainable consumption and production patterns and move towards a better integrated approach to policy making. The Strategy sets overall objectives, targets and concrete actions for seven key priority challenges, predominantly environmental.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climatic factors • Cultural heritage • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population • Soil • Water 	The NDP should take account of the objectives of the strategy, making the aim of sustainable development an integral part of its proposals.

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

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	Implications for the NDP and SEA
Planning Practice Guidance	Government Guidance	2014	Provides guidance to local planning authorities and others on the operation of the planning system.	Offers up-to-date, electronic guidance on every aspect of planning from air quality and design to land stability and rural housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climatic factors • Cultural heritage • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population • Soil • Water 	The NDP must be pro-growth and facilitate the provision and development of sustainable development.
Herefordshire Pre Submission Core Strategy 2011-2031	Development Plan Document (DPD)	2014	Sets out the vision, objectives and policies for the Herefordshire Local Plan (Core Strategy), which will guide development across the county up to 2031.	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climatic factors • Cultural heritage • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population • Soil • Water 	<p>The NDP should take account of relevant policies set within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Where necessary, the NDP should provide services, facilities and employment opportunities that are</p>

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	Implications for the NDP and SEA
				<p>The Pre Submission 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, utilise and enjoy our natural, built, historic and cultural assets for the fullest benefit of the whole community 		<p>accessible to both local and neighbouring communities.</p> <p>¹Approximately 22 dwellings will need to be delivered within Hampton Bishop, though these targets are indicative and provide a starting point for work on the NDP.</p>

¹ Figures do not include extant planning permissions from 2011 onwards.

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	Implications for the NDP and SEA
				<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 Hampton Bishop (Hereford HMA) over the plan period, subject to EiP outcome.</p>		

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	Implications for the NDP and SEA
Herefordshire Local Transport Plan (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 of 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 • Climatic factors • Population 	The LTP does not explore current transport issues in the Hampton Bishop neighbourhood area.

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	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 • Material assets • Population 	None of merit.

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	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 Hampton 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 	None of merit; however it would be appropriate for the NDP to examine employment need locally and determine 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)	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. 	Neither existing nor previous versions of SHLAA identify sites within or adjacent to Hampton Bishop.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air Biodiversity Climatic factors Cultural heritage Flora and fauna Population Soil Water 	<p>If site allocations are pursued then the Hampton Bishop NDP should be informed by a housing land assessment, undertaken in line with Guidance Note 21: Site assessment and allocation sites.</p> <p>.</p>

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	Implications for the NDP and SEA
Herefordshire Local Housing Market Assessment (LHMA)	Evidence	2013	Builds on an earlier Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) developed for Herefordshire and Shropshire. Its purpose is to inform the Local Plan's policies regarding housing need and demand (for market and affordable housing) within each of the 7 Housing Market Areas (HMAs) in Herefordshire between 2011 and 2031.	<p>The LHMA uses 7 HMAs as the geography for presenting data. Hampton Bishop falls within the Hereford HMA. Here, the study reveals that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 58% of households are unable to afford market housing. • There is an annual requirement for 417 affordable dwellings between 2012 and 2017. • Higher proportion of the HMA population is of working age (62%) compared to the county average of (61%). • The proportion of the population above retirement age is slightly below average (19% compared to 22% across Herefordshire). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climatic factors • Cultural heritage • Flora and fauna • Population • Soil • Water 	<p>The LHMA provides an indication of housing needs and affordability within the Hereford HMA.</p> <p>It provides evidence that could be used to inform policies or market and affordable housing requirements in the NDP.</p>

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

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	Implications for the NDP and SEA
Herefordshire Rural Housing Background Report	Evidence	2013	Provides the background for the proportional housing growth targets outlined in the Core Strategy	Hampton Bishop is listed among the settlements which are considered to be sustainable locations for growth of up to 18%, in accordance with the EiP outcome.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air • Biodiversity • Climatic factors • Cultural heritage • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population • Soil • Water 	The Hampton Bishop NDP will need to be in general conformity with the provisions of Local Plan policies concerning the rural areas.

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	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 • Climatic factors • Cultural heritage • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population • Soil • Water 	The Hampton Bishop NDP should establish whether any of the need identified in this assessment falls within the neighbourhood area and seek appropriate pitches and provision.

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	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 Hampton Bishop NDP can help to achieve the priorities set within the LBAP.
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.	The study is focused on those parts of the county which are most likely to be subject to development pressures. Therefore, although the study addresses biodiversity interests in and around the peripheries of the city of Hereford, the parish is not covered in great detail. It does, however, reveal that orchards are a particular feature of the neighbourhood area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air Biodiversity Climatic factors Cultural heritage Flora and fauna Material assets Population 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 Hampton Bishop NDP can overcome any existing constraints and capitalise on opportunities to enhance habitats and their networks.

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	Implications for the NDP and SEA
Urban Fringe Sensitivity Analysis	Evidence	2010	Technical Paper which supports the SHLAA by classifying the landscape sensitivity of the urban fringe on the edges of Hereford and the five market towns.	Provides documentary and photographic evidence of the condition of the neighbourhood's finest landscapes. Each of these landscapes are categorised into different groups, with some identified as being worthy of protection or enhancement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural heritage • Flora and fauna 	The study provides evidence that could be taken into account when preparing policies for the Hampton Bishop NDP.
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 or 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 • Climatic factors • Cultural heritage • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population • Soil • Water 	The study provides evidence that could be taken into account when preparing policies for the Hampton Bishop NDP.

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	Implications for the NDP and SEA
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 • Climatic factors • Cultural heritage • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population • Soil • Water 	The study provides evidence that could be taken into account when preparing policies for the Hampton Bishop NDP.

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	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 Hampton Bishop itself, no specific sites are identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Cultural heritage • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population 	None of merit, but additional local evidence may be required to identify if there is a need for any secured playing pitch facilities within the parish.

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	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 the Central Herefordshire area, to which Hampton Bishop is a part, there is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive over provision of parks and gardens • Extensive over provision of natural and semi-natural green space • Under provision of amenity green space and outdoor sport • Average provision for children and young people. • Extensive under provision of outdoor sports facilities. <p>In terms of Hampton Bishop itself, no specific sites are identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Climatic factors • Cultural heritage • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population 	The open space audit and assessment does not give a specific indication of open space shortfalls and surpluses in the Hampton Bishop neighbourhood area. However, there may be a need to include a policy which encourages and facilitates the provision of outdoor recreational facilities.

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	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 Hampton Bishop no specific sites are identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Climatic factors • Cultural heritage • Flora and fauna • Material assets • Population 	None of merit.

Plans and Programmes	Type of document	Date	Overview	Key message, target/objective/indicator	SEA topic(s)	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 (WCS) examines how water resources and water supply infrastructure, wastewater treatment, water quality, sewerage and flood risk could constrain growth across Herefordshire.</p>	<p>The neighbourhood area is situated in the Lugg River catchment and, apart from the north east and the Court Farm area, the entire parish is within a flood zone.</p> <p>Sub-catchments within this zone record a standard percentage run off of 35-40%, which is potentially highly unsuitable for infiltration source control.</p> <p>The area has a very slow flood response (Tp-time to peak) time at around 11 hours.</p> <p>The WCS identifies a significant number of water bodies in the River Lugg catchment that have poor ecological status.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity • Climatic factors • Material assets • Population • Water 	<p>New development proposed through the Hampton 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 Hampton Bishop NDP.</p>

Appendix A2 – Baseline information for Hampton Bishop

N.B. This is based on countywide baseline information with some additions relevant to Hampton 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 or expand county biodiversity.	Natural environment	Net change in condition of SSSIs across Herefordshire.	Condition of SSSIs within Hampton Bishop: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River Wye (Unfavourable but recovering) • River Lugg (Unfavourable, but recovering) • Lugg and Hampton Meadows (Favourable) 	Percentage of SSSI land in favourable condition. 2006: 22% 2007: 22% 2008: 22% 2010: 24% 2011: 27% Proportion of SSSI land that was in unfavourable condition but recovering increased between 2010 and 2012 going from 41% to 65%.	% 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)	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. The proportion of SSSI in unfavourable condition but recovering is greater than England as a whole, where the figure currently stands at 58.6%.	NE & Defra website (searched August 2014)

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
				Proportion in unfavourable and declining condition had also decreased from 4% to 1%.			
13. Value, maintain, restore or expand county biodiversity.	Natural environment	After use of mineral sites especially wildlife habitat creation.	<i>There is no countywide or locally specific data available at present.</i>	-	Percentage of opportunities taken.	Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations.	-
13. Value, maintain, restore or 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 the Hay and Lugg confluence is currently meeting its phosphate and conservation targets.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

SA Objective ¹	SA Theme	Proposed indicator	Current status	Trends	Targets	Issues and constraints	Baseline (information) source
13. Value, maintain, restore or expand county biodiversity.	Natural environment	Changes to protected habitats and impacts of species within the Herefordshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan.	The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data. <i>There is no locally specific data available at present.</i>	2010/11: 17 Habitat Action Plans and 14 Species Action Plans are currently in operation across Herefordshire. There are no formal records of any unacceptable adverse impacts on habitats or protected species. Originally 156 Priority Species were identified for inclusion in Herefordshire's LBAP. Similarly Herefordshire's LBAP covered 23 habitats with Action Plans.	To protect or enhance the habitats of species identified. Zero net loss of habitats.	Herefordshire Biological Records Centre (HBRC) holds limited data on some individual sites.	NE & Defra website (searched August 2014)

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

SA Objective ¹	SA Theme	Proposed indicator	Current status	Trends	Targets	Issues and constraints	Baseline (information) source
13. Value, maintain, restore or expand county biodiversity.	Natural environment	Changes in the areas of designated nature conservation sites as a consequence of planning permission.	<p>Hampton Bishop has:</p> <p>SWS: 1² SINC: 1 SSSIs: 3</p> <p>There are no SACs, NNRs, and LNRs within the parish.</p>	As of 2012, there had been no change in the areas of designated nature conservation sites as a consequence of the planning permissions granted.	To capitalise on opportunities to protect or enhance areas of value to nature conservation.	Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations.	NDP SEA/HRA Screening Notification Report (May 2013)
13. Value, maintain, restore or expand county biodiversity.	Natural environment	Proportion of local sites where positive conservation management has or is being implemented.	<p>The neighbourhood area comprises the following types of landscape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Riverside meadows Principal settled farmlands. 	-	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).

² View SEA/HRA Screening Notification Report for further details.

SA Objective ¹	SA Theme	Proposed indicator	Current status	Trends	Targets	Issues and constraints	Baseline (information) source
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 locally specific data available at present, there are numerous archaeological and historic sites in Hampton Bishop according to the latest version of the register.	-	No specific targets identified, but need to ensure that the register is kept up to date.	Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations.	Herefordshire Environmental Records Register (searched August 2014).

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

SA Objective ¹	SA Theme	Proposed indicator	Current status	Trends	Targets	Issues and constraints	Baseline (information) source
15. Value, protect, enhance or 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 the aspects of local loss of locally important buildings within a conservation area.	Countywide data would be too large to incorporate into this template. There are no outstanding enforcement actions or appeals concerning locally important buildings within Hampton Bishop village at present.	No historic records of any planning enforcement action or appeals concerning locally important buildings within Hampton Bishop village.	To maintain or enhance current status.	Current status must be verified by Dvt Mgt and Enforcement Officers.	Council Dvt Mgt records (searched August 2014)

SA Objective ¹	SA Theme	Proposed indicator	Current status	Trends	Targets	Issues and constraints	Baseline (information) source
SEA Topic covered by objective: <i>Climatic Factors</i>							
16. Reduce Herefordshire's vulnerability to the impacts of climate change as well as its contribution to the problem.	Resource consumption and climate change.	Transport patronage by mode.	% of Herefordshire residents who travel to work by: Car: 70.1% Foot: 14.7% Bicycle: 4.3% Bus: 2% Train: 0.8% Motorbike: 0.8% Taxi: 0.3% Other: 7% <i>There is no locally specific data available at present</i>	The number of people cycling or travelling by bus as the main form transport to get to work declined between 2001 and 2011 – across England and Wales there was little change in either. Walking or driving a car or van on the other hand increased.	To encourage the take up of less polluting forms 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. <i>There is no locally specific data available at present.</i>	2010/11: None There have been no approvals contrary to EA advice since reporting began in 2004.	To have no applications permitted contrary to EA advice.	Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations.	-
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	<i>There is no countywide data available at present.</i> 2011: Land within the neighbourhood area ranges from Grade 1 (Excellent) and Grade 3 (Good to Moderate) for its agricultural quality.	-	Measure the number 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.	West Midland ALC Map (Natural England 2011).

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 Report (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.	2011/13: 57% <i>There is no locally specific data available at present.</i>	2010/11: 67% 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 (2011/13)
19. Ensure integrated, efficient and balanced land use.	Built environment	Housing densities in urban and rural areas	<i>There is no countywide or locally specific data available at present.</i>	-	No specific targets identified.	Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations.	-

SA Objective ¹	SA Theme	Proposed indicator	Current status	Trends	Targets	Issues and constraints	Baseline (information) source
19. Ensure integrated, efficient and balanced land use.	Built environment	Level of development in urban areas compared to rural.	<i>There is no countywide or locally specific data available at present.</i>	-	No specific targets identified.	Should be monitored through AMR following the adoption of the Core Strategy, in line with SA recommendations.	-
SEA Topic covered by objective: <i>Cultural heritage</i>							
20. Value, protect or enhance the character and built quality of settlements and neighbourhoods and the county's heritage assets, historic environment and cultural heritage.	Built environment	Number and percentage of listed buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments on Buildings at Risk Register (English Heritage).	The 2011-2013 AMR does not contain updated conservation data. There are numerous listed buildings within the parish and 3 SAMs, none of which are currently recorded in the Buildings at Risk Register.	In 2011, there were 58 heritage assets in Herefordshire that were considered to be at high risk and included in the Heritage at Risk Register.	To maintain or enhance current status.	None of the incumbent listed buildings or SAMs are considered to be at risk at present.	Buildings at Risk Register (English Heritage; searched August 2014)

SA Objective ¹	SA Theme	Proposed indicator	Current status	Trends	Targets	Issues and constraints	Baseline (information) source
20. Value, protect or enhance the character and built quality of settlements and neighbourhoods and the county's heritage assets, historic environment and cultural heritage.	Built environment	The need for, frequency and outcomes of planning enforcement investigations/ planning appeals concerning the aspects of local loss of heritage assets, locally important buildings across 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 locally important buildings within Hampton Bishop village at present.	No historic records of any planning enforcement action or appeals concerning locally important buildings within Hampton Bishop village.	To maintain or enhance current status.	Current status must be verified by Dvt Mgt and Enforcement Officers.	Council Dvt Mgt records (searched August 2014)

Appendix A3 – Environmental issues identified from the Hampton 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 less polluting forms of transport.	
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	Hampton Bishop has 3 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 or 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
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

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

		Steady decline in the chemical quality of rivers over the last 10 years.	
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Appendix A4 – SEA framework (objectives, indicators and targets)

SEA Topic(s)	SEA Objective(s)	SA Objective(s)	Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions	Indicators	Targets
Air	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve air quality. To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimise local and global pollution and protect or enhance environmental resources. 	<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. 	Transport patronage by mode.	To encourage the take up of less polluting forms of transport.
Biodiversity, Flora and fauna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To maintain or enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value, maintain, restore or expand county biodiversity. Value, protect, enhance or restore the landscape quality of Herefordshire, including its rural areas and open spaces. 	<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. 	Net change in condition of SSSIs across Herefordshire.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of SSSI land in favourable condition (Increase) % of SSSI land in unfavourable condition but recovering (Increase) % of SSSI land in unfavourable condition and declining (Decrease)
				After use of mineral sites especially wildlife habitat creation.	Percentage of opportunities taken.

SEA Topic(s)	SEA Objective(s)	SA Objective(s)	Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions	Indicators	Targets
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create new appropriate habitats. • 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. 	<p>Phosphate levels within the River Wye SAC and adjoining tributaries that receive increased phosphates from proportional growth.</p> <p>Changes to protected habitats and impacts of species within the Herefordshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan.</p> <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>N/A</p> <p>To protect or enhance the habitats of species identified.</p> <p>Zero net loss of habitats.</p> <p>To capitalise on opportunities to enhance the areas of value to nature conservation as much as possible.</p> <p>The number of local sites under positive conservation management (Increase).</p>

SEA Topic(s)	SEA Objective(s)	SA Objective(s)	Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions	Indicators	Targets
Climatic factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To reduce contributions to climate change To reduce vulnerability to climate change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce Herefordshire's vulnerability to the impacts of climate change as well as its contribution to the problem. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Number of decentralised energy schemes granted permission.	To contribute towards the national target.
				Total CO2 emissions per capita.	To reduce the overall carbon emissions.

SEA Topic(s)	SEA Objective(s)	SA Objective(s)	Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions	Indicators	Targets
Cultural heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To conserve or enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and cultural heritage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value, protect or enhance the character and built quality of settlements and neighbourhoods and the county's heritage assets, historic environment and cultural heritage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve, protect or enhance Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, archaeological remains, and other features and areas of historical heritage and cultural value e.g. locally listed buildings. 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. 	Number and percentage of listed buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments on Buildings at Risk Register (English Heritage).	To maintain or enhance current status in Hampton Bishop.
				The need for, frequency and outcomes of planning enforcement investigations/ planning appeals concerning the aspects of local loss of heritage assets, locally important buildings across the Parish and particularly within a conservation area.	To maintain or enhance current status in Hampton Bishop.

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

SEA Topic(s)	SEA Objective(s)	SA Objective(s)	Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions	Indicators	Targets
Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve the health and well-being of the population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value, protect, enhance or restore the landscape quality of Herefordshire, including its rural areas and open spaces. 	<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.
				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.	To maintain or enhance current status in Hampton Bishop.

SEA Topic(s)	SEA Objective(s)	SA Objective(s)	Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions	Indicators	Targets
Soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To conserve soil resources and quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimise local and global pollution and protect or enhance environmental resources. Ensure integrated, efficient and balanced land use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimise water, air, soil, groundwater, noise and light pollution from current activities and the potential for such pollution. Provide opportunities to improve soil quality or reduce contaminated land. Ensure new developments are in appropriate locations, optimising the use of previously developed land and buildings, primarily focussed on the urban areas and are accessible by walking, cycling or sustainable transport and/or will increase the share of these transport modes, thereby reducing the need to travel. 	Percentage of all new development completed on previously developed land.	To increase the number of homes built on PDL in line with the provisions of national planning policy.
				Housing densities in urban and rural areas.	No specific targets identified.

SEA Topic(s)	SEA Objective(s)	SA Objective(s)	Sub-objectives/Appraisal Questions	Indicators	Targets
Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve water quality To provide for sustainable sources of water supply To reduce, avoid and manage flood risk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the risk of flooding and the resulting detriment to public well-being, the economy and the environment. Minimise local and global pollution and protect or enhance environmental resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce flood risk both presently and taking into account climate change. Prevent inappropriate development of the floodplain, and include flood protection systems. Include sustainable urban drainage systems where appropriate. Minimise water, air, soil, groundwater, noise and light pollution from current activities and the potential for such pollution. Protect or enhance the quality of watercourses. 	Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on flood defence grounds.	To have no applications permitted contrary to EA advice.
				Percentage of river length assessed as good or very good chemical quality and ecological quality.	To ensure that rivers meet their conservation objectives and do not fall below the required standard of quality, as set out in the Water Framework Directive.

Appendix 3

Date: 13 October 2014
Our ref: 131811
Your ref: Hampton Bishop Neighbourhood Area



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

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

T 0300 060 3900

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Mr Latham

Hampton Bishop Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping and Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated and received by Natural England on 08 September 2014.

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

Where Neighbourhood Plans could have significant environmental effects, they may require a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) under the Environment Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

Further guidance on deciding whether the proposals are likely to have significant environmental effects and the requirements for consulting Natural England on SEA are set out in the [National Planning Practice Guidance](#).

We welcome the production of this SEA Scoping report. The following comments are intended to further improve the SEA and its usefulness in assessing the Neighbourhood Plan.

Appendix A1 – Plans, policies and programmes

Natural England approves of the plans, policies and programmes listed.

Appendix A2 – Baseline information

Biodiversity, flora and fauna

In the section on the current status of 13: "Phosphate levels within the River Wye SAC and adjoining tributaries that receive increased phosphates from proportional growth" there is no mention of the existing status of the River Lugg section of the SAC. We also note that there are no trends, targets, issues and constraints and baseline (information) source and would refer you to the Kingsland Neighbourhood Area Scoping Report which does include these details.

Under the proposed indicator 13: "*Changes to protected habitats and impacts of species within the Herefordshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan*", no baseline information source has been identified.



Maps of priority habitats and species are available on *Magic*, Defra's GIS package for environmental assets (www.natureonthemap.naturalengland.org.uk).

Under current status 13: "Changes in the areas of designated nature Conservation sites as a consequence of planning permission", it is stated that there are no SACs within the parish, this is incorrect. The River Wye SAC is within the boundary of the parish.

Baseline information on the landscape and open spaces needs to be included under SA objective 15: "*Value, protect, enhance and restore the landscape quality of Herefordshire, including its rural areas and open spaces*". We welcome the reference to the Historic Landscape Characterisation for Hereford. Reference could also be made to the county Landscape Character Assessment.

Water, air, soil and material assets

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

Soil

We note that the best and most versatile agricultural land has not been considered. We suggest including an indicator to monitor the hectares of the best and most versatile agricultural land lost to development.

Appendix A3 – Environmental issues identified from the baseline

Natural England welcomes the environmental issues identified.

Appendix A4 – SEA Framework

Under the SEA topic "*Nature Conservation (Biodiversity, flora and fauna)*", we would welcome the inclusion of an indicator/target around the impact/benefit to ecological networks (NPPF paragraph 109, 113 and 117). We note that no targets have been identified against the indicator "*After use of mineral sites especially wildlife habitat creation*"; we suggest that perhaps the percentage of opportunities taken could be monitored. Against "*Changes to protected habitats and impacts of species within the Herefordshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan*", we suggest that as a minimum there should be no net losses. The NPPF sets out a requirement to move to net gains for nature (paragraph 9), drawing on the Natural Environment White Paper.

We note that there is no SEA topic for Landscape and we would advise that this is included and that reference could be made to the county Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape Characterisation studies including Historic Landscape Characterisation if this has been carried out. Applications resulting in the loss of open space could be monitored.

Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening

Where a Neighbourhood Plan could potentially lead to significant environmental effects it will be necessary to screen the Plan in relation to the Habitats and Species Regulations (2010), as amended (the 'Habitats Regulations'). One of the basic conditions that will be tested at Examination is whether the making of the plan is compatible with European obligations and this includes requirements relating to the Habitats Directive.

In relation to the Habitats Regulations, a Neighbourhood Plan cannot progress if the likelihood of significant effects on any European Site, either alone (or in combination with other plans and projects) cannot be ruled out (see Schedule 2, The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012). Therefore measures may need to be incorporated into the Neighbourhood Plan to ensure that any likely significant effects are avoided in order to secure compliance with the Regulations. A screening exercise should be undertaken if there is any doubt about the possible effects of the Plan

on European protected sites. This will be particularly important if a Neighbourhood Plan is to progress before a Local Plan has been adopted and/or the Neighbourhood Plan proposes development which has not be assessed and/or included in the Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Local Plan.

We note the recommendation that a full Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening is undertaken due to proximity to the River Wye (including River Lugg) Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

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

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

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

Yours sincerely

Gillian Driver

Miss Gillian Driver
Planning Adviser
South Mercia Team



ENGLISH HERITAGE

WEST MIDLANDS REGION

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

Our ref:

Your ref:

Telephone 0121 625 6887

Fax 0121 625 6820

01 October 2014

Dear Sir or Madam

CONSULTATION ON SEA SCOPING REPORTS FOR NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS IN: Belmont Rural; Border Group; Bosbury & Catley; Cradley; Hampton Bishop; Hatfield & District Group; Kingsland: Kingstone and Thruxton Group; Pembridge.

Thank you for your e-mails and the invitation to comment on the SEA Scoping Reports for the Neighbourhood Plans listed above. We have no substantive objection to the contents of the documents. However, having considered the above Neighbourhood Plans please note that overall our comments and recommendations to you in relation to these remain substantively the same as those which we communicated to you in our letter of the 15th August 2014 in response to the first tranche of SEA Scoping Reports. We urge you to refer back to and consider these representations before finalizing the reports in relation to the above Neighbourhood Plans also.


Specifically in relation to the fourth tranche of consultations we are pleased to note that some of the SEA's now appear to reflect aspects our earlier advice, perhaps particularly Belmont Rural, Hampton Bishop and Border Group.

However, Hatfield and District and Kingstone and Thruxton Group have proposed indicators for locally important buildings in conservation areas but in fact neither Parish has a conservation area so the indicator should more properly refer to locally important buildings "in the Parish". The Kingsland SEA identifies Kingslands Castle and St Michaels Church as BAR but only proposes to address the improvement of the condition of the Castle, which appears to be anomalous.

Both Kingsland and Pembridge and other of the SEA's appear to have anomalous references to SAM's, the Herefordshire SMR, monitoring changes to historic landscapes and historic landscape character assessments in relation to SA Objective 14 "Use natural resources and energy more effectively". Presumably this is unintentional and they would in fact be more relevant under SA Objectives 15 and 20?

I hope this is helpful.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. Boland', with a stylized flourish at the end.

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

Appendix 4

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

SEA Objectives

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

NDP objectives	SEA Objectives																Conclusions	Recommendations	SMART Test of NDP objective	After SMART objectives	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16					
1. To help ensure that the future development is designed and managed to reduce problems associated with poor surface water drainage and flooding in and around the village	0	0	+	0	x	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	0	x	x	0	This objective is generally compatible with the SEA objectives. This objective ensures new proposals have a reduced impact upon flooding	Could go further to incorporate help with reducing the contributions to climate change.	This objective meets all of the SMART criteria. This objective is specific and measurable via the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). It will be attainable, achievable and realistic.	-	
2. To promote high quality design in new buildings and extensions in order to maintain and enhance the historic setting of the Conservation Area and wider rural riparian landscape of the Parish	+	+	+	+	x	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	x	x	x	+	This objective is generally compatible with the SEA objectives. Policy safeguards exist within both the Core Strategy and neighbourhood plan to mitigate any impacts upon the environment.	Could go further to incorporate help with reducing the contributions to climate change.	This objective meets all of the SMART criteria. This objective is specific and measurable via the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). It will be attainable, achievable and realistic.	-

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 Hampton Bishop Neighbourhood Plan options and alternatives in terms of their SMART criteria and their compatibility with the SEA Objectives.

These have been developed from Government guidance on SEA and from the local evidence base gathered for identifying the NDP issues.

NDP Options and alternatives	SEA objectives																Summary in relation to baseline	Overall commentary and any initial cumulative effects/ Recommendations	Conformity with Core Strategy in terms of SEA
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			
Baseline	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	NA	NA	NA	16			
Option 1 NDP preparation A / Prepare a NDP	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+				+	Prepare a NDP allows for certainty for the Parish, and ensures that local policies are in place to guide development.	All policies within the NDP would need to be in general conformity with the national policies and the Local Plan.	This option would meet the requirements of the Core Strategy in terms of SEA.
B / Do nothing	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 Village boundary A / Use a settlement boundary to manage development at Hampton Bishop	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+				+	The designation of a settlement boundary will give additional certainty and help define those areas considered as the built form and open countryside. This can aid the direction of further growth to maintain the quality of the landscape and surroundings. There is less certainty over the positive effects on the baseline as any growth will be adjudged by criteria based policy.	Any settlement boundary would need to be designated to ensure that sufficient capacity was included to permit the proportional growth requirements within Policy RA2 of the Core Strategy. Criteria would need to be included within the policy to safeguard against	This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA.

																			effects on any SEA objectives.		
B / Do not use a settlement boundary to manage village development	?	?	+	?	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	?	?					+	Without a settlement boundary it would risk housing development coming forward which could cause additional environmental concerns. It does not give any level of certainty as to where potential development will be located.	The NDPs policies will need to safeguard against any effects on any of the SEA objectives.	This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA.
Option 3 Housing Delivery A / Allocate further sites for housing other than what is on commitment sites	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	+					+	Allocation of sites for housing or other uses would give certainty to future development. Specific environmental issues could be investigated during the site search and be positively addressed within the policy wording. This option could have a positive effect on the baseline.	Pursuing this option would give greater certainty over future development within the area. If required mitigation criteria can be added to site allocations policies to ensure all SEA objectives are achieved.	This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA.
B / Deliver additional housing through managed windfall development, with no site allocation other than the commitment sites	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+					+	Criteria based policy does not give the same level of certainty as the other options as it will be more reactionary than proactive in terms of growth proposals. However provided criterion 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.	This option would meet the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA
Option 4 Type of Village boundary A / Restrictive boundary, limiting development to that identified in the Plan	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	++	+					+	A restrictive boundary would provide certainty to where the development will take place within the village, this means that specific environmental concerns can be investigated for all sites within this boundary and appropriately addressed within the policy wording.	Caution needs to be paid that the boundary isn't too restrictive that it means cramped development or inappropriate infill; policies should ensure that development is not halted due to insufficient space.	This option would meet with the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA.
B / Permissive boundary, including areas of open land for possible later development	+	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	++	+	+					+	This would allow a certainty for the parish as to where the development will go, but will also allow for capacity for growth within the boundary. Specific environmental concerns can be investigated for all sites within the boundary, and the boundary can be developed in the best location to limit environmental concerns.	Allowances for housing numbers within the settlement boundary will ensure that development will be appropriately located	This option would meet with the Core Strategy requirements in terms of the SEA.

NDP Policies	SEA objectives																Summary in relation to baseline	Overall commentary and any initial cumulative effects/ Recommendations	Conformity with Core Strategy in terms of SEA
	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			
HB1 Development in Areas of Flood Risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	X	X	+	+	++	0	X	X	X	0	Overall the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data	Overall this policy meets the SEA baseline objectives surrounding flooding. The other impacts on the SEA objectives would be neutral impact or not relevant. Criteria have been attached in subsequent policies to reduce any negative impacts on landscape, biodiversity, heritage and resources. Reference could be made to how this development would address quality of landscaped and maintain conservation.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB2 Design for Flood Resilience and Resistance	X	+	+	?	X	X	?	0	?	+	++	0	X	X	X	?	Overall the policy is compatible and has no impact or a positive impact on the baseline data	Overall the policy is positive in relation to the specific SEA objectives. Unknown factors are those that are not necessarily measurable against a specific aspect of the noted NDP policy.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB3 Design to Reduce Surface Water Run Off	+	+	+	0	+	X	0	0	+	++	++	0	+	0	X	++	Overall the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data	Overall the policy addresses the issue in detail which is identified as a significant part of the Hampton Bishop NDP. It will overall have a positive impact on the area.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB4 Protecting Heritage Assets and Archaeology	0	+	?	++	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	Overall the policy is compatible with the baseline data where relevant	The policy is directly beneficial to specific SEA objectives, unknown objectives can be mitigated by other policies in the document concerning design however many SEA objectives are not relevant to this policy.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.

HB5 Hampton Bishop Settlement Boundary	+	+	+	+	?	+	?	?	?	?	+	?	?	X	X	X	For relevant objectives the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data considered	Overall the policy regarding the boundary work towards a positive impact towards the designated area and the criteria considered, however each development should be considered on a case by case basis and specific detail can be addressed at planning stage.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB6 Building Design Principles for New Development	?	++	+	++	?	?	?	?	?	0	X	X	?	X	X	X	Overall the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data	Key SEA objectives relating to design, environment and heritage are positive. Impacts of design of new development on some SEA objectives is unknown and cannot be measured though this overarching policy and plan. More detail in regard to sustainable building methods should be addressed at planning stage as this policy does not have scope to be too prescriptive.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB7 Landscape and Design Principles	++	++	++	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	X	Overall the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data, with unknown impact on climate aspects and flooding	Overall the policy has a positive outcome for key baseline and SEA objectives. Criteria outlined in subsequent policies look at addressing the unknown outcomes of the objectives, including sustainability and flood risk. HB1, HB2 and HB3 address flooding and design however uncertain factors could be addressed at an environmental level at planning stage on a case by case basis.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB8 Green Infrastructure	++	+	++	+	+	X	+	+	+	?	?	+	X	+	X	+	Overall the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data	The policy positively addresses most objectives, with issues such as SEA 10 and 11 being addressed in a supporting policies.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.

HB9 Local Green Spaces	+	++	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	x	?	0	?	+	+	+	Overall the policy has a positive impact on the baseline data with neutral impact in part.	The policy is favourable in terms of the maintenance and improvement of local green spaces, neutral scored relating to some objectives are listed so due to there being no direct infrastructure planned to enhance or mitigate policy projections, but do not aim to change significantly towards a negative impact.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB10 Development on the Urban Fringe of the City of Hereford	+	++	+	++	?	?	?	?	0	?	+	0	?	0	x	+	Overall the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data. The uncertain effects on air quality, traffic impact and flood risk can be determined at planning application stage on a case by case basis.	Overall the policy is positive and aims to protect the rural and historic character of the parish. Unknown impact on objectives is covered in additional design lead objectives, HB2, HB3, and HB6 primarily.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB11 Improving Traffic Management and Accessibility in Hampton Bishop	x	?	++	?	?	++	?	?	?	?	0	x	x	+	x	?	For relevant objectives the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data considered. However there are a few uncertain effects on air quality and flood risk can be determined at planning application stage on a case by case basis.	Overall the policy regarding traffic management work towards a positive impact towards the designated area and the criteria considered. This policy would not lead to development itself but contains criteria to improve traffic and safely aspects in Hampton Bishop.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.

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

It Key:

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

Policy HB1 Development in Areas of Flood Risk

SEA Objective	Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods)			Summary Explanation	Enhancement and mitigation opportunities
	Short term (1 – 5 years)	Medium term (6 – 10 years)	Long term (11 years +)		
To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna)	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but has no significant effect on the biodiversity for short-long term as not directly specified in policy. It looks directly at the location of housing or new development in regard to flooding rather than biodiversity aspects.	There is opportunity for new development to assess the possible general impact on biodiversity though the flood zone assessment process. Policy safeguards are present in the NDP and Core Strategy to ensure detrimental impacts are mitigated against overall.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, its predicted neutral impact is due to no	Care should be taken to assess the location once identified by the

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

townscapes				reference made in the policy but will not purposefully negatively impact.	exception tests outlined in policy.
To improve quality of surroundings	0	0	0	Overall this policy meets the SEA baseline objectives surrounding flooding. The other impacts on the SEA objectives would be neutral impact or not relevant. Criteria have been attached in subsequent policies to reduce any negative impacts on landscape, biodiversity, heritage and resources.	Care should be taken in regard to the surroundings and any possible improvements addressed once location identified by the exception tests outlined in policy.
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	0	0	0	Overall this policy meets the SEA baseline objectives surrounding flooding. The other impacts on the SEA objectives would be neutral impact or not relevant. Criteria have been attached in subsequent policies to reduce any negative impacts on landscape, biodiversity, heritage and resources.	Ensure that drainage takes into account the Heritage Assets and Archaeology.
To improve air quality	0	0	0	Overall this policy meets the SEA baseline objectives surrounding flooding. The other impacts on the SEA objectives would be neutral impact or not relevant. Criteria have been attached in subsequent policies to reduce any negative impacts on air quality.	None identified.
To reduce the effect of	0	0	0	Overall this policy meets the SEA	None identified.

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

traffic on the environment				baseline objectives surrounding flooding. The other impacts on the SEA objectives would be neutral impact or not relevant. Criteria have been attached in subsequent policies to reduce any negative impacts of traffic but does not specify the direct positive impacts.	
To reduce contributions to climate change	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To improve water quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and will benefit water quality by ensuring there is no development in flooding areas, also addressing the issue of septic tank pollution from flooding events.	Could investigate measures to ensure events as have previously occurred with pollution of water from septic tank overflow, readdress existing dwellings when adjacent development is underway or proposed.
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and looks at the need for sustainable drainage systems. This is also supported by HB2 and HB3.	Ensure integration between policies to ensure that mitigation measures are in place
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and directly addresses the issues of building in	None identified.

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

				flood risk areas.	
To conserve soil resources and quality	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified.
To minimise the production of waste	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To improve health of the population	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To reduce crime and nuisance	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To conserve natural and manmade resources	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy.	There is opportunity to develop use of prominent water source in a sustainability context.
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Overall the policy looks to minimise new development in regard to areas that flood. It identifies mitigation measures regarding specific zones in the area and looks at the long term effect that current and future development has and may have. The short term effect is also taken into consideration in regard to having already identified the zones at risk and can immediately mitigate development.				

HB2 Design for Flood Resilience and Resistance

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)	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
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. Due to the criteria based plan there would only be small scale development in line with the proportional growth within the Core Strategy.	None identified
To improve quality of surroundings	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and can be determined on a case by case basis.	There is a clear opportunity to incorporate design principles alongside the practical design aspects.
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	Mitigations measures should be included to ensure that the design principles are sensitive to the cultural heritage of the area.

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

To improve air quality	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To reduce contributions to climate change	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, impacts are unknown as the policy directly references practical design in terms of fixtures and fittings rather than specifying sustainable or environmental aspects but impacts are unknown.	Measures to address sustainable design could be included to mitigate environmental impacts.
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, again it is unknown but unlikely to be of negative effect in terms of vulnerability.	Measures to address sustainable design could be included to mitigate environmental impacts.
To improve water quality	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, however has scope to do though preventing pollution from sewer but not directly specified in policy. Impacts are unknown.	Measures to address sustainable design could be included to mitigate environmental impacts.
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, however has scope to do though preventing pollution from sewer and looking at new infrastructure through	Mitigation measures are covered in the NDP and Core Strategy.

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

				preventives and environmental ways but not directly specified in policy, but is referred to in HB3.	
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and strongly supports SEA objectives	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To conserve soil resources and quality	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and negative or positive impact cannot be predicted from this but should not negatively impact upon objectives	None identified.
To minimise the production of waste	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To improve health of the population	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To reduce crime and nuisance	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To conserve natural and manmade resources	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and is an unknown impact of this policy due to its dwelling specification focus.	None identified.
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	<p>Has a very positive effect in relation to SEA objectives regarding flooding. Looks into the long term effects of managing flooding events through new development. Overall the policies impact on the majority of objectives are unknown, due to the specific nature of the policy and its focus on the resisting flood impact and dwelling specification directly.</p> <p>This could be widened to mention that all amendments to a normal build in line with HB2 should also</p>				

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

	look to consider environmental factors and where possible look towards sustainable methods.
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

HB3 Design to Reduce Surface Water Run Off

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 but does do well to work towards enhancing biodiversity integrated in new development.	None identified.

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

To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	+	+	+	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. Policy safeguards are included within the policy to ensure landscape and townscape features are taken into consideration.	None identified.
To improve quality of surroundings	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and aims to have a positive impact on sustainable design.	Ensure that any systems are designed to not only reduce surface water but also take into consideration design and heritage aspects of the area.
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, with a neutral predicted impact as there is no specific policy reference existing.	Ensure that any systems are designed to not only reduce surface water but also take into consideration design and heritage aspects of the area.
To improve air quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, but actively supports overall biodiversity and subsequently may enhance air quality through green roof	None identified.

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

				schemes.	
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship.	No relationship.
To reduce contributions to climate change	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, with a neutral predicted impact as there is no specific policy reference existing.	None identified.
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, with a neutral predicted impact as there is no specific policy reference existing.	None identified.
To improve water quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but aims to reuse and improve drainage and water use.	Water attenuation systems proposed in new development sites should seek to work with existing water courses where possible.
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but working directly and positively towards objective.	This policy would mitigate issues regarding design in other policies, such as HB6 and HB7 by addressing eco design principles within the plan and directly addressing the need for sustainable water supplies.

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

To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified.
To conserve soil resources and quality	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, with a neutral predicted impact as there is no specific policy reference existing and impact of soil quality uncertain at this stage and could be defined later in the planning application process, on a case by case basis.	None identified.
To minimise the production of waste	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and looks positively towards the issue of wasting water and works on mitigating this.	None identified.
To improve health of the population	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, with a neutral predicted impact as there is no specific policy reference existing.	None identified.
To reduce crime and nuisance	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship.	No relationship.
To conserve natural and manmade resources	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but positively focuses on the reuse of natural water sources.	None identified.
Overall commentary and any cumulative	Looks positively towards covering SEA objectives for the long term in the shape of environmentally sustainable development and addressing and existing surface water issues.				

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

effects	
----------------	--

HB4 Protecting Heritage Assets and Archaeology

SEA Objective	Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods)			Summary Explanation	Enhancement and mitigation opportunities
	Short term (1 – 5 years)	Medium term (6 – 10 years)	Long term (11 years +)		
To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna)	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but protection of heritage assets could also include the conservation of biodiversity directly alongside.	None identified.
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. The policy would only lead to small scale development in line with the proportional growth within the Core Strategy. Policy safeguards are included within the policy to ensure landscape and townscape features are taken into	None identified.

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

				consideration.	
To improve quality of surroundings	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, the outcome and impact is unknown as there are no directly allocated existing building or sites.	Restoration of existing run down or derelict building could be explored
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and makes good reference to enhancing heritage assets.	Look at developing strategy for ensuring sub – surface archaeology is identified.
To improve air quality	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To reduce contributions to climate change	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To improve water quality	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship

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

To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To conserve soil resources and quality	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To minimise the production of waste	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To improve health of the population	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To reduce crime and nuisance	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To conserve natural and manmade resources	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Addresses issues regarding protection and maintenance of heritage now and into the future in line with SEA objectives.				

HB5 Hampton Bishop Settlement Boundary

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	There is opportunity to directly address mitigation measures relating to biodiversity across the settlement boundary.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified.
To improve quality of surroundings	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified.
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified.
To improve air quality	?	?	?	Impact of air quality is uncertain at this stage and could be defined later in the planning application stage, on a case by case basis.	None identified.
To reduce the effect of	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and looks at	None identified.

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

traffic on the environment				overall aspects of traffic impact.	
To reduce contributions to climate change	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, however outcomes and impacts unknown due to the overarching nature of the policy and general mitigation measures.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, however outcomes and impacts unknown due to the overarching nature of the policy and general mitigation measures.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy..
To improve water quality	?	?	?	Impact of water quality is uncertain at this stage and could be defined later in the planning application stage, on a case by case basis.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, however outcomes and impacts unknown due to the overarching nature of the policy and general mitigation measures.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but directly addresses in the overarching policy the importance of not increasing	None identified.

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

				flood risk.	
To conserve soil resources and quality	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, however outcomes and impacts unknown due to the overarching nature of the policy and general mitigation measures.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To minimise the production of waste	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, however outcomes and impacts unknown due to the overarching nature of the policy and general mitigation measures.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To improve health of the population	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To reduce crime and nuisance	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To conserve natural and manmade resources	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Overall the overarching criteria of the policy for development is in line with key SEA objectives, those unknown outcomes may change or become positive in the future throughout further investigation or physical building.				

HB6 Building Design Principles for New Development

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

SEA Objective	Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods)			Summary Explanation	Enhancement and mitigation opportunities
	Short term (1 – 5 years)	Medium term (6 – 10 years)	Long term (11 years +)		
To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna)	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but doesn't directly specify how it could directly impact biodiversity therefore the outcome is unknown	The opportunity to integrate eco design into these principles is a possible enhancement of the policy.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but is directly set to enhance area.	None identified.
To improve quality of surroundings	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified.
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Positively addressed existing and future developments in line with the SEA objective.	None identified.

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. The impact is uncertain and could be defined at the more detailed planning stage.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The impact is uncertain and could be defined at the more detailed planning stage.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To reduce contributions to climate change	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The impact is uncertain and could be defined at the more detailed planning stage.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The impact is uncertain and could be defined at the more detailed planning stage.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To improve water quality	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The impact is uncertain and could be defined at the more detailed planning stage.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but mitigation measures are outlines in HB3.	There is scope within the policy to support policies which directly mention methods of water supply and sustainability and how they conform with design principles

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

To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To conserve soil resources and quality	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To minimise the production of waste	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	Measures to address more sustainable waste disposal could be considered.
To improve health of the population	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To reduce crime and nuisance	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To conserve natural and manmade resources	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	The key design principles look positively towards SEA objectives, however there could be more reference to design principles relating to sustainable water sources as detailed in HB3.				

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

HB7 Landscape Design Principles

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, it directly addresses this aspect and works positively towards enhancement.	None identified
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified
To improve quality of surroundings	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified

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

environment and cultural heritage					
To improve air quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, there is no direct reference to traffic calming but signage is noted, impact of this on this objective is unknown.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To reduce contributions to climate change	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The overall policy looks positively on wildlife habitats and planting which could reduce contributions to climate change however impact at this stage is unknown.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The overall policy looks positively on wildlife habitats and planting which could reduce vulnerability to climate change through strengthening and protecting habitats, however the impact at this stage is unknown.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To improve water quality	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Unknown due to generalised scope of policy.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and 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 is not over and above the Core Strategy, impact of planting and habitat preservation not known against development and the scope to provide sustainable measures.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, impact of planting and habitat preservation not known against the management of flood risk.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To conserve soil resources and quality	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, outcome is unknown due to overarching generalised policy contents.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy.
To minimise the production of waste	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To improve health of the population	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To reduce crime and nuisance	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, however the development of signage for walkers and control of dogs is moving positively towards reducing nuisance in the area.	None identified
To conserve natural and manmade	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship

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

resources					
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	The policy actively and positively works with and towards SEA objectives related to landscape issues and conservation of habitats.				

HB8 Green Infrastructure

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 and looks strongly towards integration in new development, which may help to mitigate issues caused by general development outlined in policies such as HB10.	None identified
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified

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	None identified
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified
To improve air quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To reduce contributions to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified
To improve water quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, the policy focuses on landscape issues away from water sources and therefore the impact is unknown.	Mitigation measures in HB3 cover this and should be considered in terms of landscape as well as physical buildings

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

To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, the policy focuses on landscape issues away from water sources and therefore the impact is unknown.	There is no specific reference to flooding issues and this could be addressed
To conserve soil resources and quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, positive moves made towards orchards and existing eco-system networks.	None identified
To minimise the production of waste	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To improve health of the population	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but any enhancement to landscape areas will not have a negative effect on the health and wellbeing of the parish.	None identified.
To reduce crime and nuisance	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To conserve natural and manmade resources	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Policy directly aims to develop and enhance all aspects of green infrastructure in new development. It positively suggest planning which is a long term benefit, but immediately looks at retaining and maintaining areas of importance, protecting them in the short term.				

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

HB9 Local Green Spaces

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 but suitably moves towards positively protecting and enhancing biodiversity.	None identified
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified
To improve quality of surroundings	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	Enhancements could be made to the policy to look at cleaning up or general enhancement of existing facilities and or

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

					areas
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified
To improve air quality	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Any positive work or work on green space will contribute to an enhancement of the general environment, with limited negative impact, therefore the policy compares neutrally with the SEA objective.	None identified
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Any positive work or work on green space will contribute to an enhancement of the general environment, with limited negative impact, therefore the policy compares neutrally with the SEA objective.	None identified
To reduce contributions to climate change	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Any positive work or work on green space will contribute to an enhancement of the general environment, with limited negative impact, therefore the policy compares neutrally with	None identified

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

				the SEA objective.	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Any positive work or work on green space will contribute to an enhancement of the general environment, with limited negative impact, therefore the policy compares neutrally with the SEA objective.	None identified
To improve water quality	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Any positive work or work on green space will contribute to an enhancement of the general environment, with limited negative impact, therefore the policy compares neutrally with the SEA objective.	None identified
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The addition of planting and enhancement to wildlife habitats could help to reduce flooding issues but the impact is unknown	Ensure that any alterations are assessed alongside criteria such as that detailed in HB1
To conserve soil	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Any positive	None identified.

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

resources and quality				work or work on green space will contribute to an enhancement of the general environment, with limited negative impact, therefore the policy compares neutrally with the SEA objective.	
To minimise the production of waste	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy however outcome is unknown	None identified
To improve health of the population	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	Could make reference to educational benefits and wellbeing benefits of such green infrastructure.
To reduce crime and nuisance	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Any positive work or work on green space will contribute to an enhancement of the general environment, and respect for a preserved environment.	None identified
To conserve natural and manmade resources	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Positively looks at preserving open spaces. Providing and retaining open spaces may also look at reducing any antisocial behaviour by focusing on positives gained from exercise and social activities.				

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

HB10 Development on the Urban Fringe of the City of Hereford

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, takes the development to a more urban area and helps to protect the existing biodiversity in the more rural areas of the parish.	None identified
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, but focuses on the importance of the visual aspects of the parish.	None identified
To improve quality of surroundings	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, by any new development fitting with existing and not breaking skylines.	None identified
To conserve and where appropriate enhance	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, and addresses	None identified

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

the historic environment and cultural heritage				the unique nature of the parish	
To improve air quality	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, outcome of placing development towards the urban edge is unknown	None identified
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, outcome of placing development towards the urban edge is unknown	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy
To reduce contributions to climate change	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, outcome of placing development towards the urban edge is unknown	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, outcome of placing development towards the urban edge is unknown	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy
To improve water quality	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, but will not have a negative effect on key environmental areas and will aim to retain mature trees.	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy
To provide for sustainable sources of	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, outcome of placing development towards the	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy

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

water supply				urban edge is unknown	
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified
To conserve soil resources and quality	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy
To minimise the production of waste	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, outcome of placing development towards the urban edge is unknown	Mitigation measures are covered by the NDP and Core Strategy in reference to water
To improve health of the population	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified
To reduce crime and nuisance	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To conserve natural and manmade resources	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	None identified
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Policy overall positively addresses multiple SEA objectives and aims to protect the rural area.				

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

HB11 Improving Traffic Management and Accessibility in Hampton Bishop

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)	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, the improvement of traffic management is not directly reference to in the scope of enhancing the quality of landscaped and the impact is unknown.	Ensure any works enhance the quality of the landscape
To improve quality of surroundings	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but will significantly enhance the area when implemented.	Any traffic measure should work towards fitting into the surroundings and fit with design principles to

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

					mitigate the impact of the additions.
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, the improvement of traffic management is not directly reference to in the historic and cultural aspects and impact is unknown.	Ensure that any changes or enhancements are sympathetic to the surrounding area
To improve air quality	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, impacts on traffic levels or pollution levels unknown until in place	None identified
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Key focus on slowing traffic and providing alternative routes and accessibility to use other methods of transport safely.	None identified
To reduce contributions to climate change	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but may look at reducing car use but the impacts at this stage are unknown	None identified
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but may look at reducing car use but the impacts at this stage are unknown	None identified
To improve water	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but may look at	None identified

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

quality				reducing car use but the impacts at this stage are unknown	
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, a neutral response to objective as any addition should be of benefit.	Any mitigation measures relating to traffic should take into consideration the flood risk issues in the area.
To conserve soil resources and quality	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To minimise the production of waste	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To improve health of the population	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, will encourage walking and alternative modes of transport which should improve general health of the parish if utilised	None identified
To reduce crime and nuisance	N/A	N/A	N/A	No relationship	No relationship
To conserve natural and manmade resources	?	?	?	Impact of air quality is uncertain at this stage and could be assessed on a case by case basis.	None identified

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

Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Positively addresses traffic management issues according with SEA objectives.
------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Key:

++ Move towards significantly	+ 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	0	0	+	0	x	+	0	+	+	+	++	0	0	x	x	0
Objective 2	+	+	+	+	x	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	x	x	x	+
HB1 Development in Areas of Flood Risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	x	x	+	+	++	0	x	x	x	0
HB2 Design for Flood Resilience and Resistance	x	?	+	?	x	x	?	0	?	+	++	0	x	x	x	?
HB3 Design to Reduce Surface Water Run Off	+	+	+	0	+	x	0	0	+	++	++	0	+	0	x	++
HB4 Protecting Heritage Assets and Archaeology	0	+	?	++	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
HB5 Hampton Bishop Settlement Boundary	+	+	+	+	?	+	?	?	?	?	+	?	?	x	x	x
HB6 Building Design Principles	?	++	+	++	?	?	?	?	?	0	x	x	?	x	x	x

for New Development																
HB7 Landscape and Design Principles	++	++	++	+	+	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	+	x
HB8 Green Infrastructure	++	+	++	+	+	x	+	+	+	?	?	+	x	+	x	+
HB9 Local Green Spaces	+	++	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	x	?	0	?	+	+	+
HB10 Development on the Urban Fringe of the City of Hereford	+	++	+	++	?	?	?	?	0	?	+	0	?	0	x	+
HB11 Improving Traffic Management and Accessibility in Hampton Bishop	x	?	++	?	?	++	?	?	?	?	0	x	x	+	x	?
Sites – there are no allocated sites, criteria based NDP	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Summary of effects of whole plan on each SEA Objective	+	++	++	+	?	+	?	?	?	+	++	0	?	+	X	+
	The plan positively and actively addresses the main purpose of the SEA objective. Policies surrounding	The plan focuses on the importance of the quality of the existing landscapes and it is clear though	The plan looks favourably to improving quality of surroundings with any new development, a key SEA	The plan positively addresses SEA objectives relating to the historic environment and culture	There are no policies specifically addressing air quality, however some of the measures outlined in	The plan specifically directs a policy at traffic management and the effect on the environment	The plan does not specifically aim any policies at reducing contribution to climate change however	The plan does not specifically aim any policies at reducing vulnerability to climate change however	The plan does not specifically aim any policies to improve water quality directly, however some	The plan makes direct reference to sustainable sources of water supply in a policy	The plan actively and positively addresses the issue of flooding in a number	There are no direct policies to address this issue however it is a neutral response to the SEA objective as	There is no direct policy relating to this SEA objective however the impacts of any development and	Although there are no direct policies relating to the direct improvement of the health of the	There is no policy reference to this SEA objective and its impacts are not	The plan makes effort to look at sustainability and biodiversity and the natural resources

	landscape and green infrastructure highlight the importance of maintaining and enhancing biodiversity.	the majority of policies that they are positively addressing the maintaining and enhancement of these key features covered in the SEA objective.	objective.	heritage.	some policies relating to biodiversity and landscaping could be seen as enhancing through planting.	t, therefore overall it does lean to addressing the issue, even though not directly mentioned in other policies.	some policies have positive moves towards the environment and sustainability which in term could work towards reducing contributions to climate change but the impacts are unknown	some policies have positive moves towards the environment and sustainability which in term could be targeted at reduction of vulnerability but the impacts are unknown	policies make reference to water management, the introduction of new water zones and addressing surface runoff. The policies may in time include improved water quality however the impacts are unknown	which does address a key SEA objective therefore overall it is positive	of its policies which is a key SEA objective	any new development should ideally include care and quality of soil and minimise pollution	plans relating to more detailed design are unknown	population the overall direction of the policies took to work with green space and reduce traffic speeds which could encourage more active communities and wellbeing	relevant against the plan	in the area and overall makes positive contributions towards the SEA objective
Cumulative effects of whole plan (1 + 2 + 3...)	<i>Overall, the Hampton Bishop NDP policies positively address the majority of SEA objectives and if implemented correctly will cumulatively have a positive impact in the short and long term on environmental assets in the designated area.</i>															
Commentary for significant cumulative effects	<p><i>This should highlight the significant elements of the plan whether negative or positive and include recommendations for amendments to the plans objectives, policies and sites to maximise any beneficial effects or mitigate any adverse effects.</i></p> <p><i>The plan overall is a positive answer to the objectives of the SEA. There is a specific positive focus on the importance of landscape enhancement, biodiversity, sustainable water supply and mitigation against flooding and the impact of flooding on new and existing dwellings in the parish.</i></p> <p><i>It could be noted that, while taking into consideration the heritage and cultural character of the parish, that policy HB6 Building and design principles for new development could make more specific reference to the importance of sustainable design to help enhance SEA objectives 7,8 and 9 especially.</i></p>															

Appendix 5

Hampton Bishop Options

Option 1: NDP Preparation

- A. Prepare an NDP
- B. Do nothing

Option 2: Village Boundary

- A. Use a settlement boundary to manage development at Hampton Bishop
- B. Do not use a settlement boundary to manage village development

Option 3: Housing Delivery

- A. Allocate further sites for housing other than what is on commitment sites
- B. Deliver additional housing through managed windfall development, with no site allocation other than the commitment sites

Option 4: Type of village boundary

- A. Restrictive boundary, limiting development to that identified in the plan
- B. Permissive boundary. Including areas of open land for possible later development

Appendix 6

Consultation date: 18 April to 1 June 2018

Consultation title: Hampton Bishop Neighbourhood Plan **revised** Regulation 14

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

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Response to Comments
Natural England	Concur with conclusions.	Noted
Historic England	No comments received	
Environment Agency	No comments received	
Natural Resources Wales	No comments received	

Appendix 7

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 Hampton Bishop Neighbourhood Plan policies in terms of their SMART criteria and their compatibility with the SEA Objectives.

These have been developed from Government guidance on SEA and from the local evidence base gathered for identifying the NDP issues.

NDP Policies	SEA objectives																Summary in relation to baseline	Overall commentary and any initial cumulative effects/ Recommendations	Conformity with Core Strategy in terms of SEA
	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			
HB1 Development in Areas of Flood Risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	x	x	+	+	++	0				0	Overall the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data	Overall this policy meets the SEA baseline objectives surrounding flooding. The other impacts on the SEA objectives would be neutral impact or not relevant. Criteria have been attached in subsequent policies to reduce any negative impacts on landscape, biodiversity, heritage and resources.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB2 Design for Flood Resilience and Resistance	x	+	+	?	x	x	?	0	?	+	++	0				?	Overall the policy is compatible and has no impact or a positive impact on the baseline data	Overall the policy is positive in relation to the specific SEA objectives. Unknown factors are those that are not necessarily measurable against a specific aspect of the noted NDP policy.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB3 Design to Reduce Surface Water Run Off	+	+	+	0	+	x	0	0	+	++	++	0				++	Overall the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data	Overall the policy addresses the issue in detail which is identified as a significant part of the Hampton Bishop NPD. It will overall have a positive impact on the area.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.

HB4 Protecting Heritage Assets and Archaeology	0	+	?	++	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	Overall the policy is compatible with the baseline data where relevant	The policy is directly beneficial to specific SEA objectives, unknown objectives can be mitigated by other policies in the document concerning design however many SEA objectives are not relevant to this policy.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB5 Protection of Historic Farmsteads	+	++	++	++	x	x	x	x	x	x	+	+				++			
HB6 Hampton Bishop Settlement Boundary	++	++	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+				x	For relevant objectives the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data considered	Overall the policy regarding the boundary work towards a positive impact towards the designated area and the criteria considered, each development should be considered on a case by case basis and specific detail can be addressed at planning stage.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB7 Building Design Principles for New Development	+	++	+	++	?	x	+	x	+	x	+	x				+	Overall the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data	Key SEA objectives relating to design, environment and heritage are positive. Impacts of design of new development on some SEA objectives is unknown and cannot be measured though this overarching policy and plan. More detail in regard to sustainable building methods should be addressed at planning stage as this policy does not have scope to be too prescriptive.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB8 Landscape and Design Principles	++	++	++	+	+	x	+	+	x	+	+	++				++	Overall the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data, with unknown impact on climate aspects and flooding	Overall the policy has a positive outcome for key baseline and SEA objectives. Criteria outlined in subsequent policies look at addressing the unknown outcomes of the objectives, including sustainability and flood risk. HB1, HB2 and HB3 address flooding and design however uncertain	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.

																			factors could be addressed at an environmental level at planning stage on a case by case basis.	
HB9 Green Infrastructure	++	+	++	+	+	x	+	+	+	x	++	+				+	Overall the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data	The policy positively addresses most objectives, with issues such as SEA 10 and 11 being addressed in a supporting policies.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.	
HB10 Development on the Urban Fringe of the City of Hereford	+	++	++	+	+	++	+	+	+	x	+	+				+	Overall the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data. Any detailed effects on air quality, traffic impact and flood risk can be determined at planning application stage on a case by case basis.	Overall the policy is positive and aims to protect the rural and historic character of the parish. Unknown impact on objectives is covered in additional design lead objectives, HB2, HB3, and HB6 primarily.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.	
HB11 Improving Traffic Management and Accessibility in Hampton Bishop	x	++	++	++	+	++	+	+	+	x	x	x				+	For relevant objectives the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data considered. .	Overall the policy regarding traffic management work towards a positive impact towards the designated area and the criteria considered. This policy would not lead to development itself but contains criteria to improve traffic and safely aspects in Hampton Bishop.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.	

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

It Key:

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

Policy HB1 Development in Areas of Flood Risk

SEA Objective	Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods)			Summary Explanation	Enhancement and mitigation opportunities
	Short term (1 – 5 years)	Medium term (6 – 10 years)	Long term (11 years +)		
To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna)	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but has no significant effect on the biodiversity for short-long term as not directly specified in policy. It looks directly at the location of housing or new development in regard to flooding rather than biodiversity aspects.	There is opportunity for new development to assess the possible general impact on biodiversity though the flood zone assessment process. Policy safeguards are present in the NDP and Core Strategy to ensure detrimental impacts are mitigated against overall.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, its predicted neutral impact is due to no	Care should be taken to assess the location once identified by the

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

townscapes				reference made in the policy but will not purposefully negatively impact.	exception tests outlined in policy.
To improve quality of surroundings	0	0	0	Overall this policy meets the SEA baseline objectives surrounding flooding. The other impacts on the SEA objectives would be neutral impact or not relevant. Criteria have been attached in subsequent policies to reduce any negative impacts on landscape, biodiversity, heritage and resources.	Care should be taken in regard to the surroundings and any possible improvements addressed once location identified by the exception tests outlined in policy.
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	0	0	0	Overall this policy meets the SEA baseline objectives surrounding flooding. The other impacts on the SEA objectives would be neutral impact or not relevant. Criteria have been attached in subsequent policies to reduce any negative impacts on landscape, biodiversity, heritage and resources.	Ensure that drainage takes into account the Heritage Assets and Archaeology.
To improve air quality	0	0	0	Overall this policy meets the SEA baseline objectives surrounding flooding. The other impacts on the SEA objectives would be neutral impact or not relevant. Criteria have been attached in subsequent policies to reduce any negative impacts on air quality.	
To reduce the effect of	0	0	0	Overall this policy meets the SEA	

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

traffic on the environment				baseline objectives surrounding flooding. The other impacts on the SEA objectives would be neutral impact or not relevant. Criteria have been attached in subsequent policies to reduce any negative impacts of traffic but does not specify the direct positive impacts.	
To reduce contributions to climate change	x	x	x	No relationship	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	x	x	x	No relationship	
To improve water quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and will benefit water quality by ensuring there is no development in flooding areas, also addressing the issue of septic tank pollution from flooding events.	
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and looks at the need for sustainable drainage systems. This is also supported by HB2 and HB3.	
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and directly addresses the issues of building in flood risk areas.	

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

To conserve soil resources and quality	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To minimise the production of waste					
To improve health of the population					
To reduce crime and nuisance					
To conserve natural and manmade resources	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy.	There is opportunity to develop use of prominent water source in a sustainability context.
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Overall the policy looks to minimise new development in regard to areas that flood. It identifies mitigation measures regarding specific zones in the area and looks at the long term effect that current and future development has and may have. The short term effect is also taken into consideration in regard to having already identified the zones at risk and can immediately mitigate development.				

HB2 Design for Flood Resilience and Resistance

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

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

		years)			
To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna)	x	x	x	No relationship	
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. Due to the criteria based plan there would only be small scale development in line with the proportional growth within the Core Strategy.	
To improve quality of surroundings	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and can be determined on a case by case basis.	There is a clear opportunity to incorporate design principles alongside the practical design aspects.
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To improve air quality	x	x	x	No relationship	
To reduce the effect of traffic on the	x	x	x	No relationship	

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

environment					
To reduce contributions to climate change	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and the policy is seeking to reduce flood risk	
To improve water quality	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, however has scope to do though preventing pollution from sewer.	
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, however has scope to do though preventing pollution from sewer and looking at new infrastructure through preventives and environmental ways but not directly specified in policy, but is referred to in HB3.	
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and strongly supports SEA objectives	
To conserve soil resources and quality	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and negative or positive impact cannot be predicted from this but should not negatively impact upon objectives	

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

To minimise the production of waste					
To improve health of the population					
To reduce crime and nuisance					
To conserve natural and manmade resources	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and is an unknown impact of this policy due to is dwelling specification focus.	,
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Has a very positive effect in relation to SEA objectives regarding flooding. Looks into the long term effects of managing flooding events through new development.				

HB3 Design to Reduce Surface Water Run Off

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

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

		years)			
To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna)	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but does do well to work towards enhancing biodiversity integrated in new development.	
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. Policy safeguards are included within the policy to ensure landscape and townscape features are taken into consideration.	
To improve quality of surroundings	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and aims to have a positive impact on sustainable design.	Ensure that any systems are designed to not only reduce surface water but also take into consideration design and heritage aspects of the area.
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, with a neutral predicted impact as there is no specific policy reference existing.	Ensure that any systems are designed to not only reduce surface water but also take into consideration design and heritage aspects of

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

					the area.
To improve air quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, but actively supports overall biodiversity and subsequently may enhance air quality through green roof schemes.	
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	x	x	x	No relationship.	
To reduce contributions to climate change	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, with a neutral predicted impact as there is no specific policy reference existing.	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, with a neutral predicted impact as there is no specific policy reference existing.	
To improve water quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but aims to reuse and improve drainage and water use.	
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but working directly and positively towards objective.	

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

To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To conserve soil resources and quality	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, with a neutral predicted impact as there is no specific policy reference existing and impact of soil quality uncertain at this stage and could be defined later in the planning application process, on a case by case basis.	
To minimise the production of waste					
To improve health of the population					
To reduce crime and nuisance					
To conserve natural and manmade resources	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but positively focuses on the reuse of natural water sources.	
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Looks positively towards covering SEA objectives for the long term in the shape of environmentally sustainable development and addressing and existing surface water issues.				

HB4 Protecting Heritage Assets and Archaeology

D3: 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)	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but protection of heritage assets could also include the conservation of biodiversity directly alongside.	
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. The policy is seeking to protect historical assets	
To improve quality of surroundings	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy,	
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and makes good reference to enhancing heritage assets.	Look at developing strategy for ensuring sub – surface archaeology is identified.

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

To improve air quality	x	x	x	No relationship	
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	x	x	x	No relationship	
To reduce contributions to climate change	x	x	x	No relationship	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	x	x	x	No relationship	
To improve water quality	x	x	x	No relationship	
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	x	x	x	No relationship	
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	x	x	x	No relationship	
To conserve soil resources and quality	x	x	x	No relationship	
To minimise the production of waste					
To improve health of the population					
To reduce crime and nuisance					

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

To conserve natural and manmade resources	x	x	x	No relationship	
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Addresses issues regarding protection and maintenance of heritage now and into the future in line with SEA objectives.				

Policy HB05 Protection of Historic Farmsteads

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)	+	+	+	The redevelopment of historic farmsteads may have an impact on any wildlife inhabiting redundant buildings. However, this could also be an opportunity to induce some bat boxes and owl holes	
To maintain and enhance the quality of	++	++	++	The redevelopment of historic farmstead and buildings can	

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

landscapes and townscapes				enhance the landscape and townscape bring redundant buildings back into use.	
To improve quality of surroundings	++	++	++	The redevelopment of historic farmstead and buildings can enhance the landscape and townscape bring redundant buildings back into use.	
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	++	++	++	The redevelopment of historic farmstead and buildings can enhance the landscape and townscape bring redundant buildings back into use.	
To improve air quality	x	x	X	No relationship	
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	X	x	X	No relationship	
To reduce contributions to climate change	X	x	X	No relationship	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	X	x	X	No relationship	
To improve water quality	X	x	x	No relationship	

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

To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	x	x	x	No relationship	
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	x	x	x	No relationship	
To conserve soil resources and quality	+	+	+	The reuse of redundant buildings could help to reduce the requirement to provide new houses on greenfield sites.	
To minimise the production of waste					
To improve health of the population					
To reduce crime and nuisance					
To conserve natural and manmade resources	++	++	++	The policy is seeking to reuse manmade resources in terms of existing rural buildings.	
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	The policy has an overall positive effect on the baseline as it is seeking to bring back into use existing buildings.				

HB5 Hampton Bishop Settlement Boundary

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

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

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

To improve air quality	+	+	+	Impact of air quality is uncertain at this stage and could be defined later in the planning application stage, on a case by case basis.	
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and looks at overall aspects of traffic impact.	
To reduce contributions to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, however outcomes and impacts unknown due to the overarching nature of the policy and general mitigation measures.	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, however outcomes and impacts unknown due to the overarching nature of the policy and general mitigation measures.	
To improve water quality	+	+	+	Impact of water quality is uncertain at this stage and could be defined later in the planning application stage, on a case by case basis.	
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, however outcomes and impacts unknown due to the overarching nature of the policy and general mitigation	

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

				measures.	
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but directly addresses in the overarching policy the importance of not increasing flood risk.	
To conserve soil resources and quality	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, however outcomes and impacts unknown due to the overarching nature of the policy and general mitigation measures.	
To minimise the production of waste					
To improve health of the population					
To reduce crime and nuisance					
To conserve natural and manmade resources	x	x	x	No relationship	
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Overall the overarching criteria of the policy for development is in line with key SEA objectives, those unknown outcomes may change or become positive in the future throughout further investigation or physical building.				

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

HB7 Building Design Principles for New Development

SEA Objective	Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods)			Summary Explanation	Enhancement and mitigation opportunities
	Short term (1 – 5 years)	Medium term (6 – 10 years)	Long term (11 years +)		
To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna)	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but doesn't directly specify how it could directly impact biodiversity therefore the outcome is unknown	
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but is directly set to enhance area.	
To improve quality of	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	

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

surroundings					
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Positively addressed existing and future developments in line with the SEA objective.	
To improve air quality	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The impact is uncertain and could be defined at the more detailed planning stage.	
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	x	x	x	No relationship	
To reduce contributions to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The impact is uncertain and could be defined at the more detailed planning stage.	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	x	x	x	No relationship	
To improve water quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The impact is uncertain and could be defined at the more detailed planning stage.	
To provide for sustainable sources of	x	x	x	No relationship	

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

water supply					
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	+	+	+		
To conserve soil resources and quality	x	x	x	No relationship	
To minimise the production of waste					
To improve health of the population					
To reduce crime and nuisance					
To conserve natural and manmade resources	+	+	+		
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	The key design principles look positively towards SEA objectives, however there could be more reference to design principles relating to sustainable water sources as detailed in HB3.				

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

HB8 Landscape Design Principles

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, it directly addresses this aspect and works positively towards enhancement.	
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To improve quality of surroundings	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	

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

cultural heritage					
To improve air quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	x	x	x		
To reduce contributions to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The overall policy looks positively on wildlife habitats and planting which could reduce contributions to climate change however impact at this stage is unknown.	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The overall policy looks positively on wildlife habitats and planting which could reduce vulnerability to climate change through strengthening and protecting habitats, however the impact at this stage is unknown.	
To improve water quality	x	x	x	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Unknown due to generalised scope of policy.	
To provide for sustainable sources of	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, impact of planting and habitat preservation	

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

water supply				not known against development and the scope to provide sustainable measures.	
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, impact of planting and habitat preservation not known against the management of flood risk.	
To conserve soil resources and quality	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, outcome is unknown due to overarching generalised policy contents.	
To minimise the production of waste					
To improve health of the population					
To reduce crime and nuisance					
To conserve natural and manmade resources	++	++	++		
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	The policy actively and positively works with and towards SEA objectives related to landscape issues and conservation of habitats.				

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

HB9 Green Infrastructure

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 and looks strongly towards integration in new development, which may help to mitigate issues caused by general development outlined in policies such as HB10.	
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To improve quality of surroundings	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	

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

To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To improve air quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	x	x	x	No relationship	
To reduce contributions to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To improve water quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	x	x	x	No relationship	
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, the policy focuses on landscape issues away from water sources and therefore the impact is unknown.	

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

To conserve soil resources and quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, positive moves made towards orchards and existing eco-system networks.	
To minimise the production of waste					
To improve health of the population					
To reduce crime and nuisance					
To conserve natural and manmade resources	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Policy directly aims to develop and enhance all aspects of green infrastructure in new development. It positively suggest planning which is a long term benefit, but immediately looks at retaining and maintaining areas of importance, protecting them in the short term.				

HB10 Development on the Urban Fringe of the City of Hereford

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

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

	5 years)	(6 – 10 years)			
To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna)	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, takes the development to a more urban area and helps to protect the existing biodiversity in the more rural areas of the parish.	
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, but focuses on the importance of the visual aspects of the parish.	
To improve quality of surroundings	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, by any new development fitting with existing and not breaking skylines.	
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, and addresses the unique nature of the parish	
To improve air quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, outcome of placing development towards the urban edge is unknown	
To reduce the effect of traffic on the	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, outcome of	

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

environment				placing development towards the urban edge is unknown	
To reduce contributions to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, outcome of placing development towards the urban edge is unknown	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, outcome of placing development towards the urban edge is unknown	
To improve water quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, but will not have a negative effect on key environmental areas and will aim to retain mature trees.	
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	x	x	x	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, outcome of placing development towards the urban edge is unknown	
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To conserve soil resources and quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To minimise the production of waste					
To improve health of					

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

the population					
To reduce crime and nuisance					
To conserve natural and manmade resources	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Policy overall positively addresses multiple SEA objectives and aims to protect the rural area.				

HB11 Improving Traffic Management and Accessibility in Hampton Bishop

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 +)		

D3: 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)	x	x	x	No relationship	
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, the improvement of traffic management is not directly reference to in the scope of enhancing the quality of landscaped and the impact is unknown.	
To improve quality of surroundings	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but will significantly enhance the area when implemented.	
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, the improvement of traffic management is not directly reference to in the historic and cultural aspects and impact is unknown.	
To improve air quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, impacts on traffic levels or pollution levels unknown until in place	
To reduce the effect of traffic on the	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Key focus on	

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

environment				slowing traffic and providing alternative routes and accessibility to use other methods of transport safely.	
To reduce contributions to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but may look at reducing car use but the impacts at this stage are unknown	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but may look at reducing car use but the impacts at this stage are unknown	
To improve water quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but may look at reducing car use but the impacts at this stage are unknown	
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	x	x	x	No relationship	
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	x	x	x	No relationship	
To conserve soil resources and quality	x	x	x	No relationship	
To minimise the production of waste					
To improve health of					

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

the population					
To reduce crime and nuisance					
To conserve natural and manmade resources	+	+	+	Impact of air quality is uncertain at this stage and could be assessed on a case by case basis.	
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Positively addresses traffic management issues according with SEA objectives.				

Appendix 8

Consultation date: 23 October to 4 December 2018

Consultation title: Hampton Bishop Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16

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

Consultee	Summary of Comments	Response to Comments
Natural England	No comments received	
Historic England	Comments received but not specific to the SEA	
Environment Agency	Comments received but not specific to the SEA	
Natural Resources Wales	No comments received	

Appendix 9

Modifications following examination of the Hampton Bishop NDP

Policy	Modification recommended	Justification
Modification 1 Plan period	Insert the start date of the plan as '2011'	For clarification with the Core Strategy.
Modification 2 Section 2	Update references to the NPPF as necessary Delete any reference and links to the 'Technical Guidance to the NPPF document (paragraphs 2.3 and 2.4 and links 5 and 7) Replace any reference to the 'Technical Guidance to the NPPF' document with relevant references to PPG	To update references to the NPPF
Modification 3 Para 5.1.32	Revise paragraph 5.1.32 on page 23 of the plan to read: 'For proposals in Zone 2 and 3 applicants may need to submit a Sequential Test of alternative sites in lesser Flood Zones to identify if a more suitable site is available. A Sequential Test is not needed if one has already been done for the type of development proposed or for some types of minor development and changes of use. It is therefore important to check what is needed' (Retain the rest of the paragraph from the existing second sentence')	To ensure accuracy and clarity
Modification 4 Policy HB1	Change the words 'will be' to 'may be' and add the words 'in line with national and local policy requirements' after 'Sequential Test' in the first sentence of the second paragraph of the policy. Change the reference to 'Map 6' in the sixth paragraph of the policy to 'Map 5'	To ensure accuracy and clarity Correct typographical error
Modification 5 Policy HB3 / 5.2	Change 'Appendix II' in paragraph 5.2.3 on page 29 of the plan to 'Appendix I'	Correct typographical error
Modification 6 Policy HB4	Add a new second sentence to the policy which reads: 'In relation to non-designated heritage assets, a balance judgement will be made	To ensure the distinction is made between designated and non-designated assets

	having regard to the scale of any harm and the asset's significance'	
Modification 7 Policy HB6	Change criterion 1 of the policy to read: 'Proposals are designed to respond positively to character of the surrounding area and preserve or enhance heritage assets such as conservation areas.'	To ensure text reflects the statutory duty within the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990
Modification 8 Policy HB8	Delete criterion 4 from the policy Reword the second sentence of criterion 5 to read: 'Mature and established trees should be integrated and incorporated into landscaping schemes and be protected unless there are compelling reasons to support their loss' Reword criterion 7 to read: 'Locally distinct landscapes should be retained unless there are compelling reasons to support their loss'	To delete text within is not appropriate for policy To ensure the text is sufficiently robust Reference to traditional orchards are within policy HB9, therefore remove duplicate text.
Modification 9 Policy HB10	Add the words 'within the Plan area' at the end of the policy title	To ensure clarity
Modification 10 Policy HB11	Reword the second paragraph of the policy to read: 'Otherwise acceptable proposals or transport related proposals which improve traffic conditions or contribute to its better management will normally be supported. Example of enhancements include (retain existing a to c) Add the words 'Otherwise acceptable' at the start of the third paragraph of the policy Delete the fourth paragraph from the policy; it could be included in the support text if desired.	To ensure the text is clear and related to land use policy
Modification 11 Next steps	Update and remove this section from the final version of the plan	To ensure text is up to date
Modification 12 Appendices	Add a sentence to Appendix I that reads: 'The information on this map reflects information correct at the time of writing the plan. Up to date information should be	To ensure that the most up to date information is available

	sought from the local planning authority, the parish council or appropriate statutory body.	
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Appendix 10

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

NDP Policies	SEA objectives																Summary in relation to baseline	Overall commentary and any initial cumulative effects/ Recommendations	Conformity with Core Strategy in terms of SEA
	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			
HB1 Development in Areas of Flood Risk	0	0	0	0	0	0	x	x	+	+	++	0				0	Overall the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data	Overall this policy meets the SEA baseline objectives surrounding flooding. The other impacts on the SEA objectives would be neutral impact or not relevant. Criteria have been attached in subsequent policies to reduce any negative impacts on landscape, biodiversity, heritage and resources.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB4 Protecting Heritage Assets and Archaeology	0	+	?	++	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	Overall the policy is compatible with the baseline data where relevant	The policy is directly beneficial to specific SEA objectives, unknown objectives can be mitigated by other policies in the document concerning design however many SEA objectives are not relevant to this policy.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.

HB6 Hampton Bishop Settlement Boundary	++	++	++	++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+				x	For relevant objectives the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data considered	Overall the policy regarding the boundary work towards a positive impact towards the designated area and the criteria considered, each development should be considered on a case by case basis and specific detail can be addressed at planning stage.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB8 Landscape and Design Principles	++	++	++	+	+	x	+	+	x	+	+	++				++	Overall the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data, with unknown impact on climate aspects and flooding	Overall the policy has a positive outcome for key baseline and SEA objectives. Criteria outlined in subsequent policies look at addressing the unknown outcomes of the objectives, including sustainability and flood risk. HB1, HB2 and HB3 address flooding and design however uncertain factors could be addressed at an environmental level at planning stage on a case by case basis.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.
HB11 Improving Traffic Management and Accessibility in Hampton Bishop	x	++	++	++	+	++	+	+	+	x	x	x				+	For relevant objectives the policy is compatible and has a positive impact on the baseline data considered.	Overall the policy regarding traffic management work towards a positive impact towards the designated area and the criteria considered. This policy would not lead to development itself but contains criteria to improve traffic and safety aspects in Hampton Bishop.	This policy meets the Core Strategy requirement for the purposes of the SEA.

D3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the modified policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

It Key:

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

Policy HB1 Development in Areas of Flood Risk

SEA Objective	Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods)			Summary Explanation	Enhancement and mitigation opportunities
	Short term (1 – 5 years)	Medium term (6 – 10 years)	Long term (11 years +)		
To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna)	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but has no significant effect on the biodiversity for short-long term as not directly specified in policy. It looks directly at the location of housing or new development in regard to flooding rather than biodiversity aspects.	There is opportunity for new development to assess the possible general impact on biodiversity though the flood zone assessment process. Policy safeguards are present in the NDP and Core Strategy to ensure detrimental impacts are mitigated against overall.
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, its predicted neutral impact is due to no	Care should be taken to assess the location once identified by the

D3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the modified policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

townscapes				reference made in the policy but will not purposefully negatively impact.	exception tests outlined in policy.
To improve quality of surroundings	0	0	0	Overall this policy meets the SEA baseline objectives surrounding flooding. The other impacts on the SEA objectives would be neutral impact or not relevant. Criteria have been attached in subsequent policies to reduce any negative impacts on landscape, biodiversity, heritage and resources.	Care should be taken in regard to the surroundings and any possible improvements addressed once location identified by the exception tests outlined in policy.
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	0	0	0	Overall this policy meets the SEA baseline objectives surrounding flooding. The other impacts on the SEA objectives would be neutral impact or not relevant. Criteria have been attached in subsequent policies to reduce any negative impacts on landscape, biodiversity, heritage and resources.	Ensure that drainage takes into account the Heritage Assets and Archaeology.
To improve air quality	0	0	0	Overall this policy meets the SEA baseline objectives surrounding flooding. The other impacts on the SEA objectives would be neutral impact or not relevant. Criteria have been attached in subsequent policies to reduce any negative impacts on air quality.	
To reduce the effect of	0	0	0	Overall this policy meets the SEA	

D3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the modified policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

traffic on the environment				baseline objectives surrounding flooding. The other impacts on the SEA objectives would be neutral impact or not relevant. Criteria have been attached in subsequent policies to reduce any negative impacts of traffic but does not specify the direct positive impacts.	
To reduce contributions to climate change	x	x	x	No relationship	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	x	x	x	No relationship	
To improve water quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and will benefit water quality by ensuring there is no development in flooding areas, also addressing the issue of septic tank pollution from flooding events.	
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and looks at the need for sustainable drainage systems. This is also supported by HB2 and HB3.	
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and directly addresses the issues of building in flood risk areas.	

D3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the modified policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

To conserve soil resources and quality	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To minimise the production of waste					
To improve health of the population					
To reduce crime and nuisance					
To conserve natural and manmade resources	0	0	0	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy.	There is opportunity to develop use of prominent water source in a sustainability context.
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Overall the policy looks to minimise new development in regard to areas that flood. It identifies mitigation measures regarding specific zones in the area and looks at the long term effect that current and future development has and may have. The short term effect is also taken into consideration in regard to having already identified the zones at risk and can immediately mitigate development.				

HB4 Protecting Heritage Assets and Archaeology

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

D3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the modified policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

	5 years)	(6 – 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 but protection of heritage assets could also include the conservation of biodiversity directly alongside.	
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. The policy is seeking to protect historical assets	
To improve quality of surroundings	?	?	?	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy,	
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy and makes good reference to enhancing heritage assets.	Look at developing strategy for ensuring sub – surface archaeology is identified.
To improve air quality	x	x	x	No relationship	
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	x	x	x	No relationship	
To reduce contributions to climate change	x	x	x	No relationship	

D3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the modified policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

To reduce vulnerability to climate change	x	x	x	No relationship	
To improve water quality	x	x	x	No relationship	
To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	x	x	x	No relationship	
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	x	x	x	No relationship	
To conserve soil resources and quality	x	x	x	No relationship	
To minimise the production of waste					
To improve health of the population					
To reduce crime and nuisance					
To conserve natural and manmade resources	x	x	x	No relationship	
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Addresses issues regarding protection and maintenance of heritage now and into the future in line with SEA objectives.				

D3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the modified policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

HB8 Landscape Design Principles

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, it directly addresses this aspect and works positively towards enhancement.	
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To improve quality of surroundings	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	

D3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the modified policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

cultural heritage					
To improve air quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy	
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	x	x	x		
To reduce contributions to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The overall policy looks positively on wildlife habitats and planting which could reduce contributions to climate change however impact at this stage is unknown.	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. The overall policy looks positively on wildlife habitats and planting which could reduce vulnerability to climate change through strengthening and protecting habitats, however the impact at this stage is unknown.	
To improve water quality	x	x	x	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Unknown due to generalised scope of policy.	
To provide for sustainable sources of	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, impact of planting and habitat preservation	

D3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the modified policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

water supply				not known against development and the scope to provide sustainable measures.	
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, impact of planting and habitat preservation not known against the management of flood risk.	
To conserve soil resources and quality	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, outcome is unknown due to overarching generalised policy contents.	
To minimise the production of waste					
To improve health of the population					
To reduce crime and nuisance					
To conserve natural and manmade resources	++	++	++		
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	The policy actively and positively works with and towards SEA objectives related to landscape issues and conservation of habitats.				

D3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the modified policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

HB11 Improving Traffic Management and Accessibility in Hampton Bishop

SEA Objective	Assessment of effect (consider cumulative effects, significance of the effect and magnitude of the effect in terms of the three time periods)			Summary Explanation	Enhancement and mitigation opportunities
	Short term (1 – 5 years)	Medium term (6 – 10 years)	Long term (11 years +)		
To maintain and enhance nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna)	x	x	x	No relationship	
To maintain and enhance the quality of landscapes and townscapes	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, the improvement of traffic management is not directly reference to in the scope of enhancing the quality of landscaped and the impact is unknown.	
To improve quality of surroundings	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but will significantly enhance the area when implemented.	

D3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the modified policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

To conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment and cultural heritage	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, the improvement of traffic management is not directly reference to in the historic and cultural aspects and impact is unknown.	
To improve air quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy, impacts on traffic levels or pollution levels unknown until in place	
To reduce the effect of traffic on the environment	++	++	++	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy. Key focus on slowing traffic and providing alternative routes and accessibility to use other methods of transport safely.	
To reduce contributions to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but may look at reducing car use but the impacts at this stage are unknown	
To reduce vulnerability to climate change	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but may look at reducing car use but the impacts at this stage are unknown	
To improve water quality	+	+	+	This Policy is not over and above the Core Strategy but may look at reducing car use but the impacts at this stage are unknown	

D3: Predict and evaluate the effects of the modified policies within the Neighbourhood Development Plan

To provide for sustainable sources of water supply	x	x	x	No relationship	
To avoid, reduce and manage flood risk	x	x	x	No relationship	
To conserve soil resources and quality	x	x	x	No relationship	
To minimise the production of waste					
To improve health of the population					
To reduce crime and nuisance					
To conserve natural and manmade resources	+	+	+	Impact of air quality is uncertain at this stage and could be assessed on a case by case basis.	
Overall commentary and any cumulative effects	Positively addresses traffic management issues according with SEA objectives.				

Appendix 11

Objectives and context	Where are the points covered in Neighbourhood Development Plan 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 objectives; between SEA and Neighbourhood Development Plan objectives; and between SEA objectives and other local plan objectives are identified and described. 	<p>Chapter 1.6 – 1.10</p> <p>Chapter 2 methodology, chapter 3 and tables A2 and A3</p> <p>Chapter 3 paragraph 3.5 and 3.7</p> <p>Chapter 3, paragraph 3.1</p> <p>Chapter 3</p>
<p>Scoping</p> <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. • Reasons are given for eliminating issues from further consideration. 	<p>Chapter 2, paragraphs 2.6-2.9</p> <p>Chapter 2 and chapter 4</p> <p>Chapter 2</p> <p>Chapter 2, chapter 4 and chapter 5</p>
<p>Alternatives</p> <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. 	<p>Chapter 4 and chapter 5</p> <p>Paragraph 5.4</p> <p>Chapter 5</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Chapter 5, chapter 3,</p> <p>Chapter 5</p>
<p>Baseline information</p> <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. 	<p>Chapter 1, Chapter 3</p> <p>Initial screening report and Chapter 1</p> <p>Chapter 2</p>
<p>Prediction and evaluation of likely significant environmental effects</p> <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. 	<p>Tables A2, A3 and A4</p> <p>Tables B2 and B3, Table D2 and D3 and Table D2/D3 post examination</p> <p>Table B4</p> <p>Chapter 5, chapter 6</p> <p>Chapter 5, chapter 6</p> <p>Chapter 2</p>
<p>Mitigation measures</p>	

<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. 	<p>Chapter 6, paragraph 6.6 – 6.9</p> <p>Chapter 6</p>
<p>The Environmental Report</p> <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. 	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>Chapter 2</p> <p>Paragraph 2.6-2.9</p> <p>Paragraph 2.8-2.9</p> <p>Page 1 / Paragraph 1.8 / Chapter 6</p>
<p>Consultation</p> <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. 	<p>Paragraph 2.6-2.9</p> <p>Chapter 8</p>
<p>Decision-making and information on the decision</p> <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 	<p>Chapter 8</p> <p>Following draft consultation</p> <p>Following draft</p>

Development Plan as adopted, in the light of other reasonable alternatives considered.	consultation
<p>Monitoring measures</p> <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.) And that • Proposals are made for action in response to significant adverse effects arising from the monitoring of the Neighbourhood Development Plan. 	<p>Chapter 7</p> <p>Chapter 7</p> <p>Chapter 7</p> <p>Chapter 7</p>